Secretary for Management is the lead Department of State official for overall operational implementation of the Executive Order. The retrospective team answers to that official, not to the rule writers. With respect to prospective rules, proposed drafts of such rules must be cleared by the Office of the Legal Adviser, the Bureau of Resource Management, and other offices relevant to the regulation’s subject matter, which are typically independent of the rule writers. For example, rules affecting visa policy and procedures require clearance by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) while various additional circumstances may require clearance by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). These required clearance steps ensure objective channels of review for rule drafts.

f. Describe Agency Actions, If Any, To Strengthen Internal Review Expertise. This Could Include Training Staff, Regrouping Staff, Hiring New Staff, or Other Methods

A working group was created to enforce the Department’s efforts for making the most up-to-date information available online for the public and Department staff, for discussing information about the requirements of the E.O. and for planning the initial and on-going annual reviews. Looking forward, the Department’s bureaus will participate in the rule writing process by contributing staff to the retrospective team. This approach will provide a rich retrospective review exchange with the public and will ensure that all aspects of the Department’s broad expertise are reflected in the E.O.’s retrospective analysis of existing rules efforts.

g. How will the agency plan for retrospective analysis over the next two years, and beyond?

This plan has been developed collaboratively under the direction of the Under Secretary of Management. The team is composed of leading bureau representatives currently active in the rule writing and rule review process. Because the Department regulatory procedures are dynamic in nature, there are triggers that promote our on-going review and amendment to our rules and other guidance.

h. How will the agency decide what to do with analysis?

The Under Secretary for Management will decide, with input from the retrospective team and input from the public received in response to this notice.

i. What are the agency’s plans for revising rules? How will agencies periodically revisit rules (e.g., though sunset provisions, during regular intervals)?

The Department will review each rule and determine whether or not it should be revised.

j. Describe How the Agency Will Coordinate With Other Federal Agencies That Have Jurisdiction or Similar Interests

As administrators of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and rules dealing with passport/visa issues, the Department already coordinates with other Federal agencies when it promulgates rules, and will do the same if the retrospective analysis reveals existing rules that must be changed.

k. Will the plan be peer reviewed?

This plan was developed by a team led by the Department’s Under Secretary for Management, composed of employees throughout the Department. The public will be given an opportunity to comment on the plan, but it will not be peer-reviewed in the scientific sense.

VI. Components of Retrospective Cost-Benefit Analysis

a. What metrics will the agency use to evaluate regulations after they have been implemented? For example, will the agency use increases in net benefits, increases in cost effectiveness ratios, or something else?

During the initial review process, each specific rule will be evaluated individually. The Department generally implements rules based on statutory requirements, recouping the cost of service, and increase in net benefits.

b. What steps has the agency taken to ensure that it has the data available with which to conduct a robust retrospective analysis?

A working group has been formed consisting of individuals with expertise in rule writing, which will ensure an effective retrospective analysis.

c. How, if at all, will the agency incorporate experimental designs into retrospective analyses?

This does not apply to the Department of State.

VII. Publishing the Agency’s Plan Online

a. Will the agency publish its retrospective review plan and available data on its Open Government Web site (http://www.agency.gov/open).

Yes. The point of contact will be T. J. Furlong (FurlongT@state.gov) in the Department’s Bureau of Administration.

Dated: April 27, 2011.

Patrick F. Kennedy,
Under Secretary for Management,
Department of State.
[FR Doc. 2011–11242 Filed 5–6–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4710–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

7 CFR Parts 301 and 319
(Docket No. APHIS–2010–0127)
RIC 0579–AD34

Movement of Hass Avocados From Areas Where Mediterranean Fruit Fly or South American Fruit Fly Exist

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are reopening the comment period for our proposed rule that would relieve certain restrictions regarding the movement of fresh Hass variety avocados. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before May 18, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:
• Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery: Please send one copy of your comment to Docket No. APHIS–2010–0127, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238. Please state that your comment refers to Docket No. APHIS– 2010–0127.

Reading Room: You may read any comments that we receive on this docket in our reading room. The reading
This document.
prepare and submit comments. We will
interested persons additional time to
May 18, 2011. This action will allow
required to be received on or before May
avocados imported from Peru.
requirements for trapping or origin from
Mediterranean fruit fly for Hass
proposed to amend our foreign
regulations for
avocados from Mediterranean fruit
quarantined areas in the United
States with a certificate if the fruit is
safeguarded after harvest in accordance
with specific measures. We also
proposed to amend our foreign
quarantine regulations to remove
trapping requirements for
Mediterranean fruit fly for Hass
avocados imported from the State of
Michoacán, Mexico, requirements for
treatment or origin from an area free of
Mediterranean fruit fly for Hass
avocados imported from Peru, and
requirements for trapping or origin from
an area free of South American fruit fly
for Hass avocados imported from Peru.

Comments on the proposed rule were
required to be received on or before May
4, 2011. We are reopening the comment
period on Docket No. APHIS–2010–0127
for an additional 14 days, until
May 18, 2011. This action will allow
interested persons additional time to
prepare and submit comments. We will
also consider all comments received
between May 5, 2011, and the date of
this document.

      Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701, 7772, and
7781, 7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR
2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

      Done in Washington, DC, this 3rd day of
May 2011.

Gregory L. Parham,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health
Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–1173 Filed 5–6–11; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

9 CFR Parts 300, 441, 530–534, 537,
539, 540, 541, 544, 548, 550, 552, 555,
557, and 559–561

[Docket No. FSIS–2011–0010]

Public Meetings on the Proposed Rule
for Mandatory Inspection of Catfish
and Catfish Products

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection
Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings;
request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Food Safety and
Inspection Service (FSIS) is announcing
that it will hold two public meetings to receive
comments on the proposed regulation to implement a program for
mandatory inspection of catfish and
catfish products (Docket No. FSIS–
2008–0031), published February 24,
2011 in the Federal Register.

DATES: The first meeting will be held in
Washington, DC, on May 24, 2011: 9
a.m. to 12 p.m. EDT, in the USDA
Jefferson Auditorium (South Building),
1400 Independence Avenue SW.,
Washington, DC 20250. Attendees must
provide a photo ID to enter the building.
The Jefferson Auditorium is located at
Wing 6 in the South Building. Attendees
should enter the building via Wing 5 or
7 on 14th Street and Independence
Avenue, SW.

The second meeting will be held in
Stoneville, Mississippi, on May 26, 9
a.m. to 12 p.m., in the Charles Capp
Center at the Delta Research and
Extension Center of the Mississippi
State University. The Charles Capp
Center is located at 82 Stoneville Road,
Stoneville, MS 38776. The telephone
contact number is (662) 686–3442.

Registration will begin at 8:30 a.m.
local time at each location.

Meeting times may be adjusted
according to public participation and
comments.

For further information contact:
Joan Lindenberger, Office of Public Affairs
and Consumer Education, (202) 720–
6755, or by e-mail at
Joan.Lindenberger@fsis.usda.gov.

Public Comment: Anyone wishing to make a public comment must indicate
that preference during the registration
process. In addition to these meetings,
interested persons may submit
comments on the proposed rule (76 FR
10434) on or before June 24, 2011, using
either of the following methods:
Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to
http://www.regulations.gov and follow
the online instructions at that site for
submitting comments.

Mail, including CD-ROMs, and hand-
or courier-delivered items: Send to
Docket Clerk, U.S. Department of
Agriculture, Food Safety and Inspection
Service, Room 2–2127 George
Washington Carver Center, 5601
Sunnyside Avenue, Mailstop 5272,
Beltsville, MD 20705–5272.

Instructions: All items submitted by
mail or electronic mail must include the
Agency name and docket number
FSIS—2008–0031. Comments received
in response to this docket will be made
available for public inspection and
posted without change, including any
personal information, to: http://
www.regulations.gov.

Docket: For access to background
documents or comments received, go to
the FSIS Docket Room at the address
listed above between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30
p.m., Monday through Friday.

Supplementary Information:

I. Background

U.S. catfish processors, exporters, and
importers are currently subject to the
U.S. Food and Drug Administration’s
(FDA’s) Hazard Analysis and Critical
Control Point (HACCP) regulations for
seafood (9 CFR part 123), including
catfish, and to other requirements under
the Food, Drug and Cosmetic (FD&C)
Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.). The National
Marine Fisheries Service conducts
voluntary, fee-for-service inspection and
certification programs for catfish under
provisions of the Agricultural Marketing
Act (7 U.S.C. 1622, 1624) and
regulations implementing that Act (50
CFR part 260).

The Food, Conservation, and Energy
Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–246,
§10016(b)), known as the 2008 Farm
Bill, amended the Federal Meat
Inspection Act (FMIA) to provide that
“catfish, as defined by the Secretary,” is
a species amenable to the FMIA (21
U.S.C. 601 (w)(2)) and amended the
FMIA in other ways to provide for
catfish inspection. FSIS, the Agency that
administers the FMIA, has proposed
regulations to implement the Farm Bill
amendments of the FMIA that require
inspection of catfish and catfish