

DPR-27 from a licensed power level of 1518 megawatts thermal to 1518.5 megawatts thermal. A similar revision is made in the bases of Technical Specification 15.3.1.B, "Pressure/Temperature Limits."

Date of issuance: August 6, 1997

Effective date: August 6, 1997

Amendment Nos.: 175 and 179

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27: Amendments revised the licenses.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: October 9, 1996 (61 FR 52972) The July 14, 1997, supplement provided a corrected bases page and did not affect the staff's no significant hazards considerations determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 6, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document location: The Lester Public Library, 1001 Adams Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendments: February 12, 1997, as supplemented on March 11, 1997 (TSCR 196)

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise Point Beach Nuclear Plant's (PBNP) Technical Specifications (TSs) to relocate turbine overspeed protection specifications, limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements, and associated bases from TS Section 15.3.4, "Steam and Power Conversion System," and Section 15.4.1, "Operational Safety Review," to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) in accordance with Generic Letter 95-10.

Date of issuance: August 6, 1997

Effective date: These license amendments are effective as of the date of issuance and shall be implemented by incorporating the turbine overspeed protection specifications, limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements, and associated bases into the FSAR by June 30, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 176 and 180

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: April 23, 1997 (62 FR 19838) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 6, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document location:

Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241
Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 20th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

John A. Zwolinski,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects - I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[Doc. 97-22635 Filed 8-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

POSTAL SERVICE

Specifications for Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) Postal Security Devices and Indicia (Postmarks)

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Notice of USPS response to public comments and availability of Specifications.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service received hundreds of comments in response to our **Federal Register** notices on the draft specifications for Information Based Indicia Program Postal Security Device (PSD) and Indiciam. The Postal Service has reviewed all those comments and developed a response. Some of the comments were within the scope of the draft proposed specifications and some of the comments were not. Those within the scope of the draft proposed specifications have responses included herein. Those outside the scope of the draft proposed specifications will be included in subsequent responses. Some of the topics not dealt with herein include key management, host system specifications, cash management, certificate authority, product life-cycle management, mail classes, customer usage requirements, market research, procurement policy, product submission requirements, product/service provider infrastructure, and program development activities.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the draft PSD and Indiciam specifications dated July 23, 1997, may be obtained from Ed Zelickman, United States Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW Room 1P801, Washington, DC 20260-6807. Comments should be submitted to the same address. These documents supersede all previously issued Indiciam and PSD Specifications. Copies of all written comments may be inspected between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the above address.

DATES: All written comments must be received on or before October 27, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ed Zelickman at (202) 268-3940.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Postal Service received hundreds of comments on the proposed draft Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) Indicia and Postal Security Device specifications (62 FR 37631, July 14, 1997). Those outside the scope of the draft proposed specifications will be dealt with in subsequent specifications and documents and will not be addressed herein.

Indiciam Specification

Many comments were received regarding Indiciam data contents. Generally, these comments fall into six categories:

1. Reserve Field Usage

The specific use of the reserved field has not been defined. Product Service Providers are welcome to suggest how the customer or service provider could best use this field. This field was installed in the indicia data set as a customer defined field.

2. The PSD Certificate in the Indiciam

The USPS has included in the initial draft the PSD certificate in the indicia. The removal of the certificate in subsequent releases of these specifications is dependent upon the key management infrastructure.

3. Size and Format of the Indiciam Fields

The USPS feels that all fields (except the reserve field) in the indicia contribute to either the security/verification of the indicia or the audit control of IBIP products. We will continue to explore replacement methods in an effort to reduce indicia size.

4. Rate Category Definition

The Rate category is defined in the draft DMM and CFR policies and is not defined in these documents.

5. Ascending Register as a Data Element

The ascending register along with the device ID provides absolute uniqueness to each indicium. The inclusion of the ascending register also provides one audit control data element.

6. Special Purpose Field

The special purpose field is included as an audit control field. This data element within the barcode should match the human readable value on the mailpiece. If these two do not match, this could be a fraud indicator.

Many comments were received regarding the use of digital signatures and associated technology. Specifically, a question arose on use of varying hash

functions within a given digital signature algorithm. Additionally, use of alternate algorithms was suggested.

Recent discoveries concerning the use of one of the hash functions (MD5) specified in the PSD specification have prompted the USPS to modify the requirements to read that the hash function required is now SHA-1. The specification also indicates that the USPS will consider other equally secure digital signature algorithms. These changes will be included in the next release of the specifications.

A few comments were received regarding the selection of the error correction level.

The recommended minimum error correction level was selected based on the data capacity of the Indicum. Product service providers are at liberty to use a higher error correction level. If additional data is added to the Indicum, the error correction level must be chosen to comply with the PDF417 standard.

A few comments were received regarding envelope issues.

There is no requirement for indicia to be printed directly on the envelopes. Indicia could be printed on labels and those labels subsequently applied to envelopes, or indicia-window envelopes could be used.

Numerous comments were received regarding the size and position of the Indicum on the mailpiece.

The PDF 417 barcode symbology offers great flexibility in tailoring its dimensions to the particular application. The 2-inch maximum barcode width was chosen so as not to infringe on the FIM or the OCR region. The X dimension feature size was the minimum considered acceptable for processing using USPS equipment. Larger feature sizes can be used at the discretion of the product service provider to achieve the specified read rates. However, other issues such as printing technologies, paper physics, and required read rates should also be considered by the product service provider to arrive at an appropriate rate. All issues regarding positioning, format, and content of the envelope should be referred to the DMM, which is being updated to include provisions for IBIP. The Indicum must be visible from the front of the mailpiece. The Postal Service will continue to explore methods to minimize real estate requirements on envelopes while continuing to satisfy security, audit and control, administration, and customer value-added functions. Our position will be reflected in the next version of the specifications.

Numerous comments were received regarding reflectance issues.

All issues regarding ink, reflectance and fluorescence should be referred to the DMM, which is being updated to include provisions for IBIP. The product service provider must evaluate the Indicum to ensure USPS readability and quality specifications are met. The product service provider is required to correct any deficiencies that are discovered from this evaluation.

A few comments were received regarding the minimum and maximum postage value issue.

These values will be set by USPS policy.

Numerous comments were received regarding the aesthetics of the sample Indicum.

Use of IBIP indicia is not mandatory; the Information Based Indicia represents a fourth form of postage. Design of mailpieces with regard to evidence of postage is left to the discretion of the product service provider so long as it is a USPS-recognized form of postage. As a result, the IBIP indicia design is left to the discretion of the product service provider so long as it is in compliance with the Indicum Specification and the Domestic Mail Manual (DMM).

Numerous comments were received regarding print contrast ratio issues.

IBIP does not limit requirements for paper selection and printing options. We encourage mailers to take sample mailpieces to their product service provider for evaluation. Mailpiece design analysis will determine pass or fail on a case-by-case basis.

A few comments were received regarding a Postal Service pre-disposition on print technology. No specific technology has been assumed for printing of the new indicia.

Numerous comments were received regarding readability rate.

Mail submitted must comply with USPS read rate regulations. The readability of a barcode that represents postage is quite a different issue than reading a Postnet barcode. There are a number of modifiable factors that contribute to the readability of a barcode, and the product service provider must weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the particular path they have chosen to implement IBIP products.

Many comments were received regarding the selection of PDF-417 as the two-dimensional symbology.

Alternate symbologies may be submitted for consideration, as part of product/service provider proposals.

Several comments were received regarding barcode characteristics.

Most of the comments received concerned the specifications of a minimum mil feature size with a statement of concern that it was too small because it would lead to the USPS' not being able to achieve a 99.9 percent read rate. The USPS plans to hand scan/sample mailpieces in the initial phases of the IBIP program. The USPS will consider raising the minimum X dimension to 15 mils. With regard to the alignment (skew) tolerance of the barcode, the USPS has not specified the tolerance levels at this time.

Many comments were received regarding the requirement to use the facing identification mark (FIM). Additionally, comments were made suggesting changes to the existing FIM printing requirements because of the difficulty of printing close to the edge of an envelope.

FIM marks are needed for any IBIP mail subject to entry through our opening 010 operation. This includes mail dropped in collection boxes. No changes to existing FIM requirements are proposed in this rulemaking.

Many comments were received regarding the applicability of automation requirements to First-Class Mail.

In order to provide customer capabilities to print evidence of postage using open systems including use of current desktop laser and ink jet printing technologies, fluorescent ink is not required. To compensate the handling of these mailpieces for facing, a facing identification mark (FIM) is required for IBIP mail. The requirement for inclusion of delivery point barcode and standardized addresses is for IBIP open systems only. This is a security-based requirement.

A few comments were received regarding mailpiece design issues.

The USPS is not contemplating address block placement of the IBI symbology on letter/flat mail at this time. The USPS will entertain the placement of the indicia in a window of an envelope in the upper right corner as long as the read rate is met.

A few comments were received regarding use of ink types.

If fluorescent ink is used, the facing identification mark is not required. Additionally, black ink is not required per se. It is the intent of IBIP for indicia to be produced using black ink.

Several questions and comments were received regarding key lengths with the digital signature. Some comments argued that the key length proposed is unnecessarily strong, increasing computation requirements and indicia

size and resulting in more expensive meters.

The key lengths chosen were selected to ensure adequate device lifetime against cryptographic attack.

Many comments were received regarding intellectual property and patent issues.

The specifications included references to intellectual property and patent issues to remind product service providers that technologies they chose to use in implementing IBIP may be subject to third party intellectual property rights. By including or referring to any specific technology in the specifications, the USPS does not purport to grant product service providers the right to use such technologies. The indemnification provision is included to protect the USPS against claims by third parties that a particular product service provider's product infringes third party intellectual property rights. Product service providers are responsible for securing any right, such as license rights, that may be necessary to develop IBIP systems.

The USPS is internally studying intellectual property issues that may be raised by the specifications based on USPS use of this technology. The USPS does not intend to release the results of our internal studies at this time. The USPS will consider amendments to the specifications that may be helpful to the product service provider community and the public in avoiding or resolving intellectual property issues. Product service providers are encouraged to bring any known issues to USPS' attention as soon as possible.

Postal Security Device Specification

A few questions were received regarding postage loading amounts and the maximum and minimum postage value.

It is not the intent of section 3.2.1.5 of the Draft PSD specification to imply that only rate break postage can be selected. The maximum and minimum postage value will be announced in the policy documents.

A few questions were received regarding the print function and whether the print functions are to be controlled by the PSD.

The PSD specifications do not state that the PSD controls the print function.

A few comments were received regarding the use of the transaction ID. The transaction ID is PSD unique. All messages containing the transaction ID will be signed.

Many comments were received regarding the use of the term "IBIP Infrastructure" and its definition.

The use of the term IBIP Infrastructure in the document was generalized at the time of the writing of the document to be referable to either the USPS or the product service provider. For further definition of the responsibilities of these, the Product Service Provider should contact the USPS under the Interim Product Submission Procedures. The proposed draft IBIP specifications are written with respect to a target system that assumes that a USPS infrastructure is in place to handle postage download, device audit, and other interactions. Until that infrastructure is in place, an interim product service provider-focused system will be used.

Many comments were received regarding resetting functions.

At this time all postage value downloads or resets will be handled by the product service providers through CMRS. All details for this issue can be found in draft CFR section 502.26, Computerized Remote Postage Resetting, and in The Cash Management Operating Specifications for the Computerized Remote Postage Meter Resetting System.

Several comments were received regarding the device audit message.

Because of the digital signature creation and verification process that the Device Audit Message will be subjected to, both the format and content of this message must be specified.

Many comments were received regarding PSD functionality.

The PSD will not be a general signature device, it will be used only for IBIP signatures. Additionally, the PSD is anticipated to be limited to the functionality detailed in the PSD specification. This will be reflected in the next iteration of the PSD documentation. In terms of remote loading of cryptographic keys into the PSD, the Postal Service is considering the possibility of this action. Our response will be reflected in the soon to be published draft Key Management Plan.

Several comments were received requiring PSD specification clarification.

The proposed draft IBIP specifications are written with respect to a target system that assumes that a USPS infrastructure is in place to handle postage download and device audit, among other things. Until that infrastructure is in place, an interim product service provider-centric system will be used.

A comment was received regarding device authorization.

When security is an issue, the USPS has a vested interest in the communications link between the customer and the product service provider even though the product service provider may own both ends of that communication circuit. All such communications, formats, protocols, and content will be subject to the approval of the USPS or its representatives.

A comment was received regarding the watchdog timer function.

Yes, the watchdog timer is reset only after a successful device audit.

A large number of comments were received regarding PSD physical characteristics and FIPS 140-1 certification.

The PSD must conform to the FIPS 140-1 requirements. All questions concerning FIPS validation testing should be directed to the specific NIST Cryptographic Module Testing laboratory chosen by the product service provider for validation testing. For further explanation regarding specific PSD design issues, please contact one of the NIST certified labs.

One comment was received regarding PSD testing. Testing of the PSD by the product service provider should ensure that the registers cannot be altered except as specified in the PSD specification.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 97-22695 Filed 8-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on April 18, 1997 [62 FR 19160].

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 26, 1997.