

(16) What incentives could be provided to encourage companies to state clear, specific purposes for using personal information?

(17) How should purpose specifications be implemented and enforced?

(18) How can purpose specifications and use limitations be changed to meet changing circumstances?

(19) Who should be responsible for demonstrating that a private sector organization's data use is consistent with its obligations? What steps should be taken if inconsistencies are found?

(20) Are technologies available to allow consumers to verify that their personal information is used in ways that are consistent with their expectations?

(21) Are technologies available to help companies monitor their data use, to support internal accountability mechanisms?

(22) How should performance against stated policies and practices be assessed?

(23) What incentives could be provided to encourage companies to adopt technologies that would facilitate audits of information use against the company's stated purposes and use limitations?

(24) Should the FTC be given rulemaking authority triggered by failure of a multi-stakeholder process to produce a voluntary enforceable code within a specified time period?

(25) How can the Commerce Department best encourage the discussion and development of technologies such as "Do Not Track"?

(26) Under what circumstances should the PPO recommend to the Administration that new policies are needed to address failure by a multi-stakeholder process to produce an approved code of conduct?

(27) How can cooperation be fostered between the National Association of Attorneys General, or similar entities, and the PPO?

(28) Do FIPPs require further regulatory elaboration to enforce, or are they sufficient on their own?

(29) What should be the scope of FTC rulemaking authority?

(30) Should FIPPs be considered an independent basis for FTC enforcement, or should FTC privacy investigations still be conducted under Federal Trade Commission Act Section 5 "unfair and deceptive" jurisdiction, buttressed by the explicit articulation of the FIPPs?

(31) Should non-governmental entities supplement FTC enforcement of voluntary codes?

(32) At what point in the development and of a voluntary, enforceable code of

conduct should the FTC review it for approval? Potential options include providing an ex ante "seal of approval," delaying approval until the code is in use for a specific amount of time, and delaying approval until enforcement action is taken against the code.

(33) What steps or conditions are necessary to make a company's commitment to follow a code of conduct enforceable?

(34) What factors should breach notification be predicated upon (e.g., a risk assessment of the potential harm from the breach, a specific threshold such as number of records, etc.)?

(35) Are there lessons from sector-specific privacy laws—their development, their contents, or their enforcement—that could inform U.S. commercial data privacy policy?

(36) Should a preemption provision of national FIPPs-based commercial data privacy policy be narrowly tailored to apply to specific practices or subject matter, leaving states free to regulate emerging technologies? Or should national policy, in the case of legislation, contain a broad preemption provision?

(37) How could a preemption provision ensure that federal law is no less protective than any existing state laws? What are useful criteria for comparatively assessing how protective different laws are?

(38) To what extent should state Attorneys General be empowered to enforce national commercial data privacy legislation?

(39) Should national FIPPs-based commercial data privacy legislation preempt state unfair and deceptive trade practices laws?

(40) The Task Force seeks case studies and statistics that provide evidence of concern—or comments explaining why concerns are unwarranted—about cloud computing data privacy and security in the commercial context. We also seek data that links any such concerns to decisions to adopt, or refrain from adopting, cloud computing services.

(41) The Task Force also seeks input on whether the current legal protections for transactional information and location information raise questions about what commercial data privacy expectations are reasonable and whether additional protections should be mandated by law. The Task Force also invites comments that discuss whether privacy protections for access to location information need clarification in order to facilitate the development, deployment and widespread adoption of new location-based services.

(42) The Task Force seeks information from the law enforcement community

regarding the use of ECPA today and how investigations might be affected by proposed amendments to ECPA's provisions.

Dated: December 16, 2010.

Gary Locke,
Secretary of Commerce.

Lawrence E. Strickling,
Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information.

Francisco J. Sánchez,
Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

Patrick Gallagher,
Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2010-31971 Filed 12-20-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Notice of Establishment of the White House Council for Community Solutions

AGENCY: Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS).

ACTION: Notice of establishment of the White House Council for Community Solutions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), the Chief Executive Officer, CNCS, announces the establishment of the White House Council for Community Solutions by Presidential Executive Order. The Council will focus on highlighting ways to enlist more Americans and leaders across sectors to help catalyze change in communities and have an impact in addressing our nation's important goals in education, youth development and employment.

DATES: The White House Council for Community Solutions was established on December 14, 2010 by Presidential Executive Order.

ADDRESSES: The public is invited to submit written statements to the Council by electronic mail: Send written statements to the Council's electronic mailbox at

WhiteHouseCouncil@cns.gov.

The public can follow the Council's work by visiting its Web site: *http://www.serve.gov/communitysolutions.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susannah Washburn, Executive Director, White House Council for Community Solutions, Corporation for National and Community Service, 1201 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20525, *swashburn@cns.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with Section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. II, § 10(a), and the regulations thereunder, Susannah Washburn, Designated Federal Officer of the Council, has ordered publication of this Establishment Notice that the White House Council for Community Solutions was established on December 14, 2010 by Executive Order.

I. Background and Authority

The Council is governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), which sets forth standards for the formation and use of advisory committees. The White House Council for Community Solutions shall advise the President on how to engage individuals, academia, non-profits, philanthropy and business to support innovative community solutions that are having a real impact in solving our Nation's pressing social issues relating to education, youth development, and employment. This new Presidential Council enlists leaders from a variety of sectors—businesses, non-profit and philanthropic organizations, universities, and community groups—to encourage the growth and maximize the impact of innovative, community-developed solutions.

II. Structure

The Council shall consist of not more than 30 members, including its Chair. All Council members shall be appointed by the President. Members shall not be Federal Government employees. In selecting individuals for appointment to the Council, appropriate consideration will be given to selecting leaders from a variety of sectors. The composition of the Council will reflect a diverse set of perspectives from across the country. Each member of the Council will be appointed to serve a term of two years. The members of the Council will be Special Government Employees (SGEs).

Meetings shall be held approximately 4 times a year and will be coordinated by the Designated Federal Officer or designee who shall approve the agenda and shall be present at all meetings. A vacancy on the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall be subjected to any conditions that applied with respect to the original appointment. An individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the remainder of the term of the member replaced. The vacancy shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Council.

All members of the White House Council for Community Solutions shall

adhere to the conflict of interest rules applicable to Special Government Employees as such employees are defined in 18 U.S.C. 202(a). These rules include relevant provisions in 18 U.S.C. related to criminal activity, Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (5 CFR part 2635), and Executive Order 12674 (as modified by Executive Order 12731). Management and support services shall be provided by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS).

December 14, 2010.

Susannah Washburn,
Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2010-31965 Filed 12-20-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050-SS-P

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Federal Advisory Committee Act; Board of Advisors Charter Renewal

AGENCY: Election Assistance Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Charter Renewal.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), the purpose of this notice is to announce that the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has renewed the charter for the Board of Advisors for a two-year period through December 14, 2012. The Board of Advisors is a federal advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

DATES: Renewed through December 14, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Election Assistance Commission, 1201 New York Avenue, NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas R. Wilkey, Designated Federal Officer, at (202) 566-3100. *E-mail:* boardofadvisors@eac.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board of Advisors is a Federal advisory committee created by statute whose mission is to advise EAC through review of the voluntary voting system guidelines (VVSG) described in Title II Part 3 of HAVA when EAC proposes updates to the VVSG; through review of the voluntary guidance described under Title III subtitle B of HAVA; and through review of the best practices recommendations contained in the report submitted under Section 242(b) of Title II of HAVA.

Thomas R. Wilkey,
Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-31938 Filed 12-20-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-KF-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP11-44-000; Docket No. CP11-47-000]

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Kinetica Partners, LLC; Notice of Application and Petition for Declaratory Order

December 14, 2010.

Take notice that on December 3, 2010, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee), 1001 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP11-44-000 an application, pursuant to section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), for permission and approval to abandon by sale certain natural gas facilities located offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and onshore in the State of Louisiana (Production Area Facilities). Also take notice that on December 10, 2010, Kinetica Partners, LLC (Kinetica), Lyric Center, 440 Louisiana St., Suite 425, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP11-47-000, a petition for a declaratory order finding that, upon Kinetica's acquisition from Tennessee, the Production Area Facilities will be non-jurisdictional gathering facilities pursuant to section 1(b) of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the applications which are on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, Tennessee proposes to sell to Kinetica certain pipeline systems consisting of approximately 800 miles of various diameter pipeline, three separation and dehydration facilities, and six offshore platforms. Kinetica asks that the Commission declare that all of the facilities will perform a gathering function. However, if the Commission determines that all but a small portion of the facilities are gathering, Kinetica requests that the Commission issue a limited jurisdiction certificate to cover such interstate transportation as Kinetica may perform on the facilities. Further, the facilities will be purchased at less than net book value. Tennessee filed, concurrently with its abandonment application in Docket No. CP11-44-000, an offer of settlement in Docket No. RP11-1597-000 addressing rate treatment and rate relief related to the proposed abandonment. Tennessee states that, because the effectiveness of the approval requested in each proceeding is precedent on approval in the other, it requests that the Commission consolidate its review of the application and offer of settlement for issuance of its findings in a single order. Kinetica requests that a single