Total Annual Burden: 141 hours.

Needs and Uses: Collection of information complies with creation of regulatory symmetry among similar mobile services. The information is necessary to ensure that commercial mobile radio service is made available to the public at reasonable rates and on resonable terms in a competitive marketplace. The information is used by Commission staff in carrying out its duties under the Communications Act. This collection is being revised to eliminate a one-time collection requirement and a collection requirement that must have been filed by August 10, 1994.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–96 Filed 1–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

Notice of Public Information Collections Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

December 27, 1996.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commissions burden estimates; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before February 5, 1997. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Dorothy Conway, Federal Communications, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to dconway@fcc.gov and Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB 725 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20503 or fain__t@a1.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Dorothy Conway at 202–418–0217 or via internet at dconway@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060–0710.

Title: Policy and Rules Concerning the Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996—CC Docket 96–98 First Report and Order.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit; State, Local and Tribal Governments.

Number of and Estimated Time for Response are as follows:

Type of information submitted	Responses	Time per response	Total burden
a. Submission of Information Necessary to Reach Agreement	255	100 hours	25,500 hours.
b1. Submission of Agreements to the State Commission (new)	255	1 hour	255 hours.
b2. Submission of Agreements to the State Commission (pre-existing Class A)	80	1 hour	80 hours.
b3. Submission of Agreements to the State Commission (Non Class A)	500	1 hour	500 hours.
c. Burden of Proof Regarding Interconnection and Access to Unbundled Network Elements.	1,000	25 hours	25,000 hours.
d. Collocation	1,000	25 hours	25,000 hours.
e. Notification of the State Commission	30	1 hour	30 hours.
f. Rural and Small Carriers	500	10 hours	5,000 hours.
g1. Pole Attachment Modifications	1,050,000	30 minutes	525,000 hours.
g2. Maintaince Modification Notifications	12,250	30 minutes	6,125 hours.
h1. Pole Attachment Requests	2,500	1 hour	2,500 hours.
h2. Pole Attachment Denials	250	3 hours	750 hours.
i1. Dispute Resolution Complainants	250	4–25 hours	7,250 hours.
j. Economic Cost Studies to Determine Rates for Interconnection	100	1,440 hours	144,000 hours.
k. Cost Studies on Avoidable Costs to Determine Resale Discounts	200	480 hours	96,000 hours.
l. Economic Cost Studies to Determine Reciprocal Rates	100	1,440 hours	144,000 hours.
m. Measurement of Traffic	550	700 hours	385,000 hours.
n. File Required for Arbitration	200	4 hours	800 hours.
o. Determination of Rates for Interconnection . . . State Commission Review	50	2,160 hours	108,000 hours.
p. Determination of Resale Discount Percentage . . . State Commission Review	50	640 hours	32,000 hours.
q. Petition for Incumbent LEC Status	30	1 hour	30 hours.
r. Use of Proxies by State . . . Articulating Reasons for Choice	50	120 hours	6,000 hours.
s. Preparation of Forward-looking Economic Cost Studies to Establish Rates for Transport.	50	720 hours	36,000 hours.

Total Annual Burden: 1,574,820 hours.

Needs and Uses: CC Docket 96–98, First Report and Order, the Commission adopts rules and regulations to implement parts of the Sections 251 and 252 that affect local competition. Specifically, the Order required incumbent local exchange carrier (LEC's) to offer interconnection, unbundled network elements, transport and termination, and wholesale rates for retail services to new entrants; that incumbent LECs' price such services at rates that are cost based and just and reasonable; and that they provide access to rights-of way as well as establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications traffic.

Federal Communications Commission.
William F. Caton,
Acting Secretary.
[FR Doc. 97–97 Filed 1–3–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System

AGENCY: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of adoption of policy statement.

SUMMARY: The Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) (Board) has considered the proposed revisions to the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System (UFIRS) as approved by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) on December 9, 1996. On December 20, 1996, the Board adopted the updated UFIRS as a policy statement of the FDIC and rescinded the 1979 statement of policy published in the FDIC's regulatory service (*FDIC Law, Regulations and Related Acts*) at page 5079.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel M. Gautsch, Examination Specialist, (202) 898–6912, Office of Policy, Division of Supervision. For legal issues, Linda L. Stamp, Counsel, (202) 898–7310, Supervision and Legislation Branch, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 550 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20429.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FDIC is a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency under the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978. The FFIEC adopted an updated UFIRS after a notice and request for comment was published in the Federal Register on July 18, 1996 at 61 FR 37472. On December 9, 1996, the Task Force on Supervision of the FFIEC approved under delegated authority the updated UFIRS to update the rating system to address changes in the financial services industry and in supervisory policies and procedures occurring since the rating system was adopted in 1979.

Section 303(a)(2) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4803(a)) (Riegle Act) provides that the FDIC shall, consistent with the principles of safety and soundness, statutory law and policy, and the public interest, work jointly to make uniform all regulations and guidelines implementing common statutory or supervisory policies. Section 303(a)(1) of the Riegle Act requires the FDIC to review its own regulations and written policies and to streamline those regulations and policies where possible. To fulfill the section 303 mandate, the FDIC has been reviewing on an interagency basis and internally, its regulations and written policies to identify those areas where streamlining or updating is appropriate. As a result of those reviews, the FDIC is adopting the updated UFIRS effective for examination commenced on or after January 1, 1997.

The text of the policy statement follows:

Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System

Introduction

The Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System (UFIRS) was adopted by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) on November 13, 1979. Over the years, the UFIRS has proven to be an effective internal supervisory tool for evaluating the soundness of financial institutions on a uniform basis and for identifying those institutions requiring special attention or concern. A number of changes, however, have occurred in the banking industry and in the Federal supervisory agencies' policies and procedures which have prompted a review and revision of the 1979 rating system. The revisions to UFIRS include the addition of a sixth component addressing sensitivity to market risks, the explicit reference to the quality of risk management processes in the management component, and the identification of risk elements within the composite and component rating descriptions.

The revisions to UFIRS are not intended to add to the regulatory burden of institutions or require additional policies or processes. The revisions are intended to promote and complement efficient examination processes. The revisions have been made to update the rating system, while retaining the basic framework of the original rating system.

The UFIRS takes into consideration certain financial, managerial, and compliance factors that are common to all institutions. Under this system, the supervisory agencies endeavor to ensure that all financial institutions are evaluated in a comprehensive and uniform manner, and that supervisory attention is appropriately focused on the financial institutions exhibiting financial and operational weaknesses or adverse trends.

The UFIRS also serves as a useful vehicle for identifying problem or deteriorating financial institutions, as well as for categorizing institutions with deficiencies in particular component areas. Further, the rating system assists Congress in following safety and soundness trends and in assessing the aggregate strength and soundness of the financial industry. As such, the UFIRS assists the agencies in fulfilling their collective mission of maintaining stability and public confidence in the nation's financial system.

Overview

Under the UFIRS, each financial institution is assigned a composite rating based on an evaluation and rating of six essential components of an institution's financial condition and operations. These component factors address the adequacy of capital, the quality of assets, the capability of management, the quality and level of earnings, the adequacy of liquidity, and the sensitivity to market risk. Evaluations of the components take into consideration the institution's size and sophistication, the nature and complexity of its activities, and its risk profile.

Composite and component ratings are assigned based on a 1 to 5 numerical scale. A 1 indicates the highest rating, strongest performance and risk management practices, and least degree of supervisory concern, while a 5 indicates the lowest rating, weakest performance, inadequate risk management practices and, therefore, the highest degree of supervisory concern.

The composite rating generally bears a close relationship to the component ratings assigned. However, the composite rating is not derived by computing an arithmetic average of the component ratings. Each component rating is based on a qualitative analysis of the factors comprising that component and its interrelationship with the other components. When assigning a composite rating, some components may be given more weight than others depending on the situation at the institution. In general, assignment of a composite rating may incorporate any factor that bears significantly on the overall condition and soundness of the financial institution. Assigned composite and component ratings are disclosed to the institution's board of directors and senior management.

The ability of management to respond to changing circumstances and to address the risks that may arise from