

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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Scott on (202) 366-4104.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Federal Highway Administration

Title: Developing and Recording Costs for Utility Adjustments.

OMB Number: 2125-0519.

Type of Request: Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

Affected Public: 3,000 U.S. Utilities Companies.

Form(s): N/A.

Abstract: Under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 123, Federal-aid highway funds may be used to reimburse State highway agencies (SHAs) when they have paid for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of Federal-aid highway projects. This reimbursement is based on actual costs incurred by a utility company as a result of adjusting its facilities. Payment for "costs incurred" is a basic tenet of the Federal-aid program. This general principle is also established in 23 U.S.C. 121 when Federal-aid highway funds are being used to reimburse the State highway agencies for the cost of construction of Federal-aid highway projects. To implement these provisions of law, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations, 23 CFR 645, Subpart A, require that the utility be able to document its costs or expenses for adjusting its facilities. This record of costs then forms the basis for payment by the SHA to the utility company and in turn FHWA reimburses the SHA for its payments to the utility company. A utility company's cost accounting records establish a means of identifying the costs incurred in adjusting utility facilities. The SHA uses these records to verify the costs to base its payments on. The FHWA payment is based on the costs the State pays for. If the utility did not keep a record of its costs, then there would be no documentation of the expenses it would have incurred in adjusting its facilities. If this should occur, there would be no basis for Federal-aid highway fund participation in the costs and, under 23 U.S.C. 123, the FHWA would not be able to reimburse the State for utility adjustments. There are approximately 30,000 utility companies in the United States. In any one year, it is estimated that about 10 percent, or 3,000, of these utilities will be involved with reimbursable utility adjustments on Federal-aid projects. It is further estimated that each of these 3,000 utilities will have about 3 adjustments

of its facilities per year on Federal-aid projects. The net impact is approximately 9,000 reimbursable utility adjustments. For a typical adjustment, about 20 hours of staff time (16 hours professional staff; 4 hours secretarial staff) are expended to establish and maintain the record of costs.

Estimated Annual Burden: 180,000 hours.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention FHWA Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 20, 1997.

Phillip A. Leach,

Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 97-22741 Filed 8-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Task Force on Assistance to Families in Aviation Disasters Open Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Task Force on Assistance to Families in Aviation Disasters will hold a meeting to discuss assistance to families of passengers involved in aviation accidents. The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 18, 1997, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and on Friday, September 19, 1997, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will take place in Room 2230 of Department of Transportation (DOT) Headquarters, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven R. Okun, Task Force Executive

Director, telephone 202-366-4702, or Marc C. Owen, Task Force Staff Director, mailing address, 400 7th Street SW., Room 5424, Washington, DC 20590, telecopier 202-366-7147, and telephone 202-366-6823.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix), DOT gives notice of a meeting of the Task Force on Assistance to Families in Aviation Disasters (Task Force). The Task Force was established by the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act of 1996 to develop recommendations on ways to improve the treatment of families of passengers involved in aviation accidents. The meeting is open to the public both days. In particular, topics for discussion at the September 18 session include a presentation by the National Transportation Safety Board on the lessons learned from the Korean Air Flight 801 disaster as well as a review of the recommendations to be issued by the Task Force in its Final Report to Congress, including a discussion of passenger manifest requirements that could be implemented to speed family notification. On September 19, the Task Force will hear testimony regarding the treatment of families by lawyers and continue the review of the recommendations to be issued by the Task Force in its Final Report to Congress.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 21, 1997.

Steven R. Okun,

Task Force Executive Director, Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 97-22740 Filed 8-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 97-28, Notice 2]

Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Cooper Tire & Rubber Company (Cooper) has determined that some of its tires fail to comply with the labeling requirements of 49 CFR 571.119, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 119, "New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars" and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." Cooper has also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301,