

Open Mobile Alliance (“OMA”) filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, ACE*COMM, Gaithersburg, MD; ASmobile Communications Inc., Taipei, Taiwan; BenQ Mobile, Munich, Germany; BND Co., Ltd., Buk-gu, Daegu, Republic of Korea; Celltick Technologies Ltd., Herzliya, Israel; Coretrust, Inc., Gangnam-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Critical Path Inc., San Francisco, CA; DigiCAPS, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Edge Technologies, Inc., Fairfax, VA; Emtruce Technologies, Inc., Gangnam-Gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Fangtek, Ltd., Cpuertino, CA; Fenestrae BV, The Hague, Netherlands; Fraunhofer, IIS, Erlangen, Germany; KT Corporation, Seocho-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea, Leadtone Wireless Ltd., Chaoyang District, Beijing, People’s Republic of China; Linkuall-Alcomia, Bordeaux, France; Miengine Corp., Daechi-dong, Seoul, Republic of Korea, NETS, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Newbay Software, Dublin, Ireland; Navarra, Itasca, IL; NTT Software Corporation, Mitaka-shi, Tokyo, Japan; Pacific DataVision, Inc., San Diego, CA; Plurimedia, Paris, France; PrismTech, Gageshead, United Kingdom; Reigncom Ltd., Gangnam-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea; RFI Global Services Ltd., Basingstoke, Hampshire, United Kingdom; SIPquest Inc., Kananta, Ontario, Canada, Smart Internet Technology, Eveleigh, Sydney, Australia; Softhis SP. z o.o., Krakow, Poland; Sonus Networks, Chelmsford, MA; Susteen Inc., Irvine, CA; Synapsy Mobile Network GmbH, Himmelstadt, Germany; Telespree Communications, San Francisco, CA; Tira Wireless, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Trio Network Solutions Oy, Helsinki, Finland; Websync, Buk-gu, Daegu, Republic of Korea; and Yahoo! Inc., Sunnyvale, CA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, CAMEO InfoTech Inc., Hsinchu, Taiwan; Darts Technologies Corporation, Chung Ho, Taiwan; Finjurdata, Rotkreuz, Switzerland; Freescale Semiconductor, Austin, TX; Infocom, Tokyo, Japan; Integreat, Bergen op Zoom, Netherlands; InterOP Technologies, LLC, Fort Myers, FL; Intrado, Longmont, CO; LocatioNet, Netanya, Israel, Mobtime Inc., Chengdu, People’s Republic of China; MontaVista

Software, Sunnyvale, CA; Nextel Communications Inc., Rensteon, VA; Push Messenger, Courbevoie, France; Quasar Innovations Pvt. Ltd., Kormangala, Bangalore, India; SafeNet, Inc., Belcamp, MD; SGS Japan Inc., Hodogaya-ku, Yokahama, Japan; tcl & Alcatel Mobile Phones, Colombes Cedex, France; and Visto Corporation, Seattle, WA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

Also, Locus Technologies has changed its name to Inticube Corp., Seoul, Republic of Korea.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and OMA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 18, 1998, OMA filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act of December 31, 1998 (63 FR 72333).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 12, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on August 30, 2005 (70 FR 51366).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06–1453 Filed 2–15–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Web Sling & Tie Down Association

Notice is hereby given that, on January 3, 2006, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Web Sling & Tie Down Association (“WSTDA”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization and (2) the nature and scope of its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization is: Web Sling & Tie Down Association, Bel Air, MD. The nature and scope of WSTDA’s standards development activities are: The development and promotion of voluntary recommended standards and associated reference materials for synthetic web slings and tie downs, polyester roundslings, synthetic webbing, fibers, thread and related components.

Additional information about WSTDA may be obtained by visiting its Web site <http://www.wstda.com>.

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06–1452 Filed 2–15–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4419–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

February 10, 2006.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or e-mail: king.darrin@dol.gov.

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, 202–395–7316 (this is not a toll-free number), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;