

assessment of support and delivery at service providers:

- ☐ The adequacy of customer service provided to clients.
- ☐ The ability of the entity to provide and maintain service level performance that meets the requirements of the client.

1. A rating of "1" indicates strong IT support and delivery performance. The organization provides technology services that are reliable and consistent. Service levels adhere to well-defined service level agreements and routinely meet or exceed business requirements. A comprehensive corporate contingency and business resumption plan is in place. Annual contingency plan testing and updating is performed; and, critical systems and applications are recovered within acceptable time frames. A formal written data security policy and awareness program is communicated and enforced throughout the organization. The logical and physical security for all IT platforms is closely monitored and security incidents and weaknesses are identified and quickly corrected. Relationships with third-party service providers are closely monitored. IT operations are highly reliable, and risk exposure is successfully identified and controlled.

2. A rating of "2" indicates satisfactory IT support and delivery performance. The organization provides technology services that are generally reliable and consistent, however, minor discrepancies in service levels may occur. Service performance adheres to service agreements and meets business requirements. A corporate contingency and business resumption plan is in place, but minor enhancements may be necessary. Annual plan testing and updating is performed and minor problems may occur when recovering systems or applications. A written data security policy is in place but may require improvement to ensure its adequacy. The policy is generally enforced and communicated throughout the organization, e.g. via a security awareness program. The logical and physical security for critical IT platforms is satisfactory. Systems are monitored, and security incidents and weaknesses are identified and resolved within reasonable time frames. Relationships with third-party service providers are monitored. Critical IT operations are reliable and risk exposure is reasonably identified and controlled.

3. A rating of "3" indicates that the performance of IT support and delivery is less than satisfactory and needs improvement. The organization provides technology services that may not be reliable or consistent. As a result,

service levels periodically do not adhere to service level agreements or meet business requirements. A corporate contingency and business resumption plan is in place but may not be considered comprehensive. The plan is periodically tested; however, the recovery of critical systems and applications is frequently unsuccessful. A data security policy exists; however, it may not be strictly enforced or communicated throughout the organization. The logical and physical security for critical IT platforms is less than satisfactory. Systems are monitored; however, security incidents and weaknesses may not be resolved in a timely manner. Relationships with third-party service providers may not be adequately monitored. IT operations are not acceptable and unwarranted risk exposures exist. If not corrected, weaknesses could cause performance degradation or disruption to operations.

4. A rating of "4" indicates deficient IT support and delivery performance. The organization provides technology services that are unreliable and inconsistent. Service level agreements are poorly defined and service performance usually fails to meet business requirements. A corporate contingency and business resumption plan may exist, but its content is critically deficient. If contingency testing is performed, management is typically unable to recover critical systems and applications. A data security policy may not exist. As a result, serious supervisory concerns over security and the integrity of data exist. The logical and physical security for critical IT platforms is deficient. Systems may be monitored, but security incidents and weaknesses are not successfully identified or resolved. Relationships with third-party service providers are not monitored. IT operations are not reliable and significant risk exposure exists. Degradation in performance is evident and frequent disruption in operations has occurred.

5. A rating of "5" indicates critically deficient IT support and delivery performance. The organization provides technology services that are not reliable or consistent. Service level agreements do not exist and service performance does not meet business requirements. A corporate contingency and business resumption plan does not exist. Contingency testing is not performed and management has not demonstrated the ability to recover critical systems and applications. A data security policy does not exist, and a serious threat to the organization's security and data integrity exists. The logical and physical

security for critical IT platforms is inadequate, and management does not monitor systems for security incidents and weaknesses. Relationships with third-party service providers are not monitored, and the viability of a service provider may be in jeopardy. IT operations are severely deficient, and the seriousness of weaknesses could cause failure of the financial institution or service provider if not addressed.

Dated: January 13, 1999.

**Keith J. Todd,**

*Executive Secretary, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council.*

[FR Doc. 99-1175 Filed 1-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-P, 6720-01-P, 6714-01-P and 4810-33-P

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreement(s) Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement(s) under the Shipping Act of 1984.

Interested parties can review or obtain copies of agreements at the Washington, DC offices of the Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Room 962. Interested parties may submit comments on an agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within 10 days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**.

*Agreement No.:* 202-010689-080.

*Title:* Transpacific Westbound Rate Agreement.

*Parties:* Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd., A.P. Moller-Maersk Line, Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd., Nippon Yusen Kaisha, Ltd., Orient Overseas Container Line, Inc., Sea-Land Service, Inc.

*Synopsis:* The proposed amendment provides that members to individual service contracts subject to the Agreement, which are filed through and by the Agreement staff, may authorize the Agreement Manager to execute such contracts on their behalf.

Dated: January 13, 1999.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

**Bryant L. VanBrakle,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-1176 Filed 1-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreement(s) Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following

agreement(s) under the Shipping Act of 1984.

Interested parties can review or obtain copies of agreements at the Washington, DC offices of the Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, Room 962. Interested parties may submit comments on an agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within 10 days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**.

*Agreement No.:* 232-011648

*Title:* APL/Crowley/Ivaran/MLL Space Charter and Sailing Agreement

*Parties:*

American President Lines, Ltd.  
APL Co. PTE Ltd.  
Crowley American Transport, Inc.  
Ivaran Lines Limited Mexican Lines Limited  
Transportacion Maritima  
Grancolombiana, S.A.

*Synopsis:* The proposed agreement authorizes the parties to discuss and agree upon the vessels to be operated in the trades between the United States Gulf Coast and the Caribbean and the east coast of South America, to charter vessel space to and from one another, and to engage in related cooperative activities. The parties have requested expedited review.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: January 13, 1999.

**Bryant L. VanBrakle,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-1192 Filed 1-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Ocean Freight Forwarder License Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following applicants have filed with the Federal Maritime Commission applications for licenses as ocean freight forwarders pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718 and 46 CFR 510).

Persons knowing of any reason why any of the following applicants should not receive a license are requested to contact the Office of Freight Forwarders, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C. 20573.

Container Port Services, Inc., 8201 La Porte Freeway, Suite 111, Houston, TX 77012, Officers: Robert W. Lee, President, Russell K. Lee, Vice President

E & M International L.L.C., 5304 West 135th Street, Hawthorne, CA 90250, Marion Kroc, Evelyn Jones, Partnership

Dated: January 13, 1999.

**Bryant L. VanBrakle,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-1191 Filed 1-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

**TIME AND DATE:** 11:00 a.m., Monday, January 25, 1999.

**PLACE:** Marriner S. Eccles Federal Reserve Board Building, 20th and C Streets, NW., Washington, DC 20551.

**STATUS:** Closed.

#### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Personnel actions (appointments, promotions, assignments, reassignments, and salary actions) involving individual Federal Reserve System employees.
2. Any items carried forward from a previously announced meeting.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Lynn S. Fox, Assistant to the Board; 202-452-3204.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** You may call 202-452-3206 beginning at approximately 5 p.m. two business days before the meeting for a recorded announcement of bank and bank holding company applications scheduled for the meeting; or you may contact the Board's Web site at <http://federalreserve.gov> for an electronic announcement that not only lists applications, but also indicates procedural and other information about the meeting.

Dated: January 15, 1999.

**Robert deV. Frierson,**

*Associate Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc. 99-1380 Filed 1-15-99; 3:30 pm]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-P

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Differences in Capital and Accounting Standards Among the Federal Banking and Thrift Agencies; Report to Congressional Committees

**AGENCY:** Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (FRB).

**ACTION:** Notice of report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the United States Senate and to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the United States House of Representatives.

**SUMMARY:** This report was prepared by the FRB pursuant to section 121 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (12 U.S.C. 1831n(c)). Section 121 requires each Federal banking and thrift agency to report annually to the above specified Congressional Committees regarding any differences between the accounting or capital standards used by such agency and the accounting or capital standards used by other banking and thrift agencies. The report must be published in the **Federal Register**.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Norah Barger, Assistant Director (202/452-2402), Barbara Bouchard, Manager (202/452-3072), Charles Holm, Manager, (202/452-3502), or Ali Emran, Senior Financial Analyst, (202/452-2208), Division of Banking Supervision and Regulation. For the hearing impaired *only*, Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD), Diane Jenkins (202/452-3544), Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th & C Street, NW, Washington DC 20551.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The text of the report follows:

### Report to the Congressional Committees Regarding Differences in Capital and Accounting Standards Among the Federal Banking and Thrift Agencies

#### Introduction and Overview

This is the ninth annual report<sup>1</sup> on the differences in capital standards and accounting practices that currently exist among the three banking agencies (the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (FRB), the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)) and the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS).<sup>2</sup>

#### Overview

As stated in the previous reports to Congress, the three bank regulatory agencies have, for a number of years, employed a common regulatory framework that establishes minimum

<sup>1</sup> The first two reports prepared by the FRB were made pursuant to section 1215 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA). The subsequent reports were made pursuant to section 121 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (FDICIA), which superseded section 1215 of FIRREA.

<sup>2</sup> At the federal level, the Federal Reserve has primary supervisory responsibility for state-chartered banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System, as well as for all bank holding companies and certain operations of foreign banking organizations. The FDIC has primary responsibility for state nonmember banks and FDIC-supervised savings banks. National banks are supervised by the OCC. The OTS has primary responsibility for savings and loan associations.