exist for receivers, what is the relationship between these standards and the method for determining appropriate harm claim thresholds for receivers? How do actual receivers perform in relation to existing performance standards? How are receivers evaluated in meeting those industry standards? Where there are industry standards, how are such standards enforced? To the extent standards are voluntary, how do users of receivers know whether equipment meets or exceeds such standards? Where there are no industry standards for receiver performance, how should acceptable thresholds of receiver performance be developed and validated? What are the technical and performance issues among diverse wireless services that need to be understood and analyzed between different stakeholder groups, especially the developers of wireless transmitters, receivers and components? What are the cost and performance trends of key receiver components that determine practical thresholds of system performance?

9. The TAC recommends that the FCC implement a Web accessible repository (*e.g.,* through the FCC spectrum dashboard) of existing receiver standards, and a voluntary repository of receiver specifications for existing receivers. This, the TAC contends, would facilitate technical information sharing among diverse stakeholder groups of wireless system developers who need to know and understand the specifications of systems other than their own. How effective would this method of information sharing be for product developers? What are the source documents that would be appropriate for such a repository? Are there additional and/or more effective methods, perhaps industry-led, to share receiver technical standards and specifications between stakeholder groups that traditionally do not work together in the same industry groups (*e.g.,* standards organizations)? Given the increasing number of devices developed for international use, would an industry-led approach be more effective than a US-specific repository?

Multi-Stakeholder Organizations

10. The TAC recommends that the Commission encourage the formation of one or more multi-stakeholder groups to investigate interference limits policy at suitable high-value inter-service boundaries. We seek comment on such a multi-stakeholder process and solicit interest from candidate participants. What frequency bands would be most appropriate for considering the formation of a multi-stakeholder organization to develop technical parameters and methods for implementing an interference limits policy? Are there more effective methods of organizing a diverse group of stakeholders for developing such technical parameters?

11. What is the best way to initiate the formation of a multi-stakeholder group? We invite comment and recommendations on applicable governance, issue resolution, and enforcement methods, including but not limited to how stakeholders can coordinate across industry segments, such as those where voluntary standards are needed and/or developed. Also, recognizing that service boundaries and spectrum sharing often involve both non-federal and federal spectrum users, we seek comment on the costs and benefits of a comprehensive approach between the FCC and NTIA to incorporate receiver performance into spectrum management practices. How should the FCC and NTIA coordinate with government agencies and other stakeholders to address situations where large numbers of users are impacted by changes to adjacent spectrum licenses? Should the FCC and NTIA perform band assessments to determine where possible future repurposing in a band might impact adjacent bands and develop plans and processes to ensure proper protections?

Role of the FCC

12. We seek general comment on whether and how the Commission should implement a policy that incentivizes improved interference tolerance of wireless systems. Specifically, should the FCC adopt a policy of employing interference limits in certain cases of neighboring bands and services? Should the FCC adopt specific rules for establishing interference limits that are recommended by one or more multi-stakeholder groups? Should the FCC develop a compliance model similar to the one used in the context of CALEA, in which there is industry-led establishment of standards and solutions and the Commission would get involved only via special petition? We envision that the FCC could be a facilitator in a non-directive role with convening stakeholders. Also, the GAO recommends consideration of small-scale pilot tests of options for improving receiver performance. What should be the scope of an appropriate pilot test? What role should the FCC play in encouraging and initiating industry action? Are there existing FCC proceedings where incentives to improve the interference tolerance of wireless systems should be applied?

Federal Communications Commission.

Julius P. Knapp,

Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2013–10840 Filed 5–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreements Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreements under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreements to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within ten days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the agreements are available through the Commission's Web site (*www.fmc.gov*) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202) 523–5793 or *tradeanalysis@fmc.gov.*

Agreement No.: 011325–042.

Title: Westbound Transpacific Stabilization Agreement.

Parties: American President Lines, Ltd./APL Co. Pte Ltd. (withdrawal from agreement effective September 1, 2012); COSCO Container Lines Company Limited; Evergreen Line Joint Service Agreement; Hanjin Shipping Co., Ltd.; Hapag-Lloyd AG; Hyundai Merchant Marine Co. Ltd.; Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.; Nippon Yusen Kaisha Line; Orient Overseas Container Line Limited; and Yangming Marine Transport Corp.

Filing Party: David F. Smith, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 627 I Street NW.; Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006.

Synopsis: This amendment reflects the suspension of the agreement, effective May 1, 2013 through April 14, 2015.

Agreement No.: 011602–013.

Title: Grand Alliance Agreement II.

Parties: Hapag-Lloyd AG; Hapag-Lloyd USA LLC; Nippon Yusen Kaisha; Orient Overseas Container Line, Inc.; Orient Overseas Container Line Limited; and Orient Overseas Container Line (Europe) Limited.

Filing Party: David F. Smith, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1627 I Street NW., Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006.

Synopsis: The amendment would revise the agreement to reflect the fact that the parties have agreed to charter and rationalize vessel space among themselves and with other VOCCs in the trade pursuant to the parties' participation in the G6 Alliance Agreement.

Agreement No.: 012194–001.

Title: The G6 Alliance Agreement.

Parties: American President Lines, Ltd. and APL Co. Pte, Ltd. (Operating as one Party); Hapag-Lloyd AG; Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd.; Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd.; Nippon Yusen Kaisha; and Orient Overseas Container Line, Limited and Orient Overseas Container Line Inc. (Operating as one party).

Filing Party: David F. Smith, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1627 I Street NW., Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006.

Synopsis: The amendment corrects the name of Orient Overseas Container Line Limited and Orient Overseas Container Line Inc. (Operating as one party).

Agreement No.: 012206.

Title: Industria Armamento Meridionale S.P.A./K-Line Space Charter Agreement.

Parties: Industria Armamento Meridionale S.P.A. (''Inarme'') and Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.

Filing Party: John P. Meade, Esq.; General Counsel; K- Line America, Inc.; 6009 Bethlehem Road; Preston, MD 21655.

Synopsis: The agreement authorizes Inarme to charter space on K-Line vessels in the trade from the United Kingdom to the U.S. East Coast.

Dated: May 3, 2013.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Karen V. Gregory,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–10926 Filed 5–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The applications will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than June 3, 2013.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Jacqueline G. King, Community Affairs Officer) 90 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480–0291:

1. *Lake Shore III Corporation,* Glenwood City, Wisconsin; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of Hiawatha National Bank, Hager City, Wisconsin.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 3, 2013.

Margaret McCloskey Shanks,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–10907 Filed 5–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies; Correction

This notice corrects a notice (FR Doc. 78–FR 25084) published on pages 25084–25085 of the issue for Monday, April 29, 2013.

Under the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City heading, the entry for First Central Nebraska Co, Broken Bow, Nebraska is revised to read as follows:

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (Dennis Denney, Assistant Vice President) 1 Memorial Drive, Kansas City, Missouri 64198–0001:

1. *Gene R. Giles, Alliance, Nebraska, Sally J. Giles, Denver, Colorado, Randall D. Giles, San Diego, California, Nicholas G. Giles, Lincoln, Nebraska, and Lucas G. Giles,* Lincoln, Nebraska, all of the Giles family group; the Bradley S. Norden Irrevocable Trust and the Brett A. Norden Irrevocable Trust, Brett A. Norden and Bradley S. Norden, as co-trustees of both trusts, all of Highlands Ranch, Colorado, and as members of the Norden family group; Cheryl L. Ryan, the Michael L. Ryan 2011 Irrevocable Trust and the Cheryl L. Ryan 2012 Irrevocable Trust, all of Minden, Nebraska, Jeffrey M. Ryan, Heartwell, Nebraska, and Jamie Johnson, Minden, Nebraska, as co-trustees of both trusts; and Walter D. Wood Revocable Trust, Walter D. Wood, trustee, both of Omaha, Nebraska, as part of the Ryan/Wood family group; to acquire voting shares of First Central Nebraska Co., and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of Nebraska State Bank and Trust Company, both in Broken Bow, Nebraska.

Comments on this application must be received by May 23, 2012.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 3, 2012.

Margaret McCloskey Shanks,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–10922 Filed 5–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[30Day-13–0041]

Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) publishes a list of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). To request a copy of these requests, call the CDC Reports Clearance Officer at (404) 639–7570 or send an email to *omb@cdc.gov.* Send written comments to ATSDR Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

National Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) Registry—Revision (0923–0041, Expiration 7/31/13)—Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).

Background and Brief Description

On October 10, 2008, President Bush signed S. 1382: ALS Registry Act which amended the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) Registry. The activities described are part of the effort to create the National ALS Registry. The purpose of the registry is to: (1) Better describe the incidence and prevalence of ALS in the United States; (2) examine appropriate