Pilot Mentor-Protege Program; OMB Control Number 0704–0332.

Needs and Uses: DoD needs this information to evaluate whether the purposes of the DoD Pilot Mentor-Protege Program have been met. The purposes of the Program are to: (1) Provide incentives to major DoD contractors to assist protege firms in enhancing their capabilities to satisfy contract and subcontract requirements; (2) increase the overall participation of protege firms as subcontractors and suppliers; and (3) foster the establishment of long-term business relationships between protege firms and major DoD contractors. This Program implements Section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510) and Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) (10 U.S.C. 2302 note). Participation in the Program is voluntary.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Annual Burden Hours: 931 (includes 538 recordkeeping hours).

Number of Respondents: 269. Responses Per Respondent: 3. Annual Responses: 393.

Average Burden Per Response: 1 hour reporting; 3.7 hours recordkeeping.

Frequency: Semiannually (mentor); Annually (protege).

## **Summary of Information Collection**

DFARS Appendix I–111(a) requires mentor firms to report on the progress made under active mentor-protege agreements semiannually for the periods ending March 31st and September 30th. The September 30th report must address the entire fiscal year. Reports must include—

(1) Data on performance under the mentor-protege agreement, including dollars obligated, expenditures, credit taken under the Program, small disadvantaged business (SDB) subcontract awards under DoD contracts, developmental assistance provided, impact of the agreement, and progress of the agreement; and

(2) For each contract where developmental assistance was credited toward an SDB subcontracting goal, a copy of Standard Form 294, Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts, with a statement

identifying—

(i) The amount of dollars credited to the SDB subcontracting goal as a result of developmental assistance provided to protege firms under the Program; and

(ii) The number and dollar value of subcontracts awarded to the protege firm(s), broken out per protege. DFARS Appendix I–111(b) requires the mentor firm and the protege firm to annually provide data on the progress made by the protege firm in employment, revenues, and participation in DoD contracts during each fiscal year of the Program participation term and each of the 2 fiscal years following the expiration of the Program participation term. During the Program participation term, the firms may provide this data as part of the mentor report required by I–111(a) for the period ending September 30th.

# Michele P. Peterson,

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

[FR Doc. 00-27248 Filed 10-24-00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

#### Office of the Secretary

## Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title and OMB Number: Central Contractor Registration (CCR); OMB Number 0704–0400.

Type of Request: Revision.
Number of Respondents: 300,000.
Responses Per Respondent: 1.
Annual Responses: 300,000.
Average Perden Per Responses: 0.5

Average Burden Per Response: 0.5 hours.

Annual Burden Hours: 150,000. Needs and Uses: The Central Registration (CCR) provides a single point of entry for vendors that want to do business with the Department of Defense. As of June 1, 1998, both current and potential DoD vendors are required to register in the CCR in order to do business with the DoD if the contract solicitation occurred after May 31, 1998. Vendors are required to complete a one-time registration to provide basic information relevant to procurement and financial transactions. Vendors must update or renew their registration annually to maintain active status. The CCR validates the vendor's information and electronically shares the secure and encrypted data with the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) to facilitate paperless payments through electronic funds transfer (EFT). Additionally, CCR shares the data with several government

procurement and electronic business systems.

Affected Public: Business or other forprofit; not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion and annually. Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain and retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Mr. Lewis W. Oleinick.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Oleinick at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD (Acquisition), Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

DOD Clearance Officer Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202–4302.

Dated: October 19, 2000.

#### Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 00–27319 Filed 10–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-10-M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

# Office of the Secretary

#### **Defense Science Board**

**ACTION:** Notice of Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Systems
Technology for the Future U.S. Strategic Posture will meet in closed session on November 13–14, 2000, at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. This Task Force will review the likely nature and evolution of potential future strategic challenges to the U.S., advanced technologies for nuclear weapons systems and non-nuclear strategic weapons systems, and advanced C4ISR technology applications for strategic contingencies.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting, the Defense Science Board Task Force will consider the extent to which technologies and systems currently being developed and applied for regional contingencies are relevant and applicable to future strategic contingencies; take into account