type of synthetic web material used in the sling.

Paragraph (i)(8)(i) prohibits the use of repaired synthetic web slings until they have been proof tested by the manufacturer or equivalent entity.

Paragraph (i)(8)(ii) requires the employer to retain a certificate of the proof test and make it available for examination.

The inspection and repair records provide employers with information about the condition of the slings. These records also provide the most efficient means for an OSHA compliance officer to determine whether an employer is complying with the Standard. Proof-testing certificates give employers, employees, and OSHA compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers with an efficient use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use.

The inspection and repair records provide employers with information about when the last inspection was made and about the type of the repairs made. This information provides some assurance about the condition of the slings. These records also provide the most efficient means for an OSHA compliance officer to determine that an employer is complying with the Standard. Proof-testing certificates give employers, employees, and OSHA compliance officers assurance that slings are safe to use. The certificates also provide the compliance officers with an efficient means to assess employer compliance with the Standard.

II. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency’s functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA’s estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employees who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

III. Proposed Actions

OSHA proposes to extend the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) approval of the collection of information (paperwork) requirements necessitated by the Standard on Slings (29 CFR 1910.184). In its extension request, OSHA also is proposing to reduce the total burden hours for these requirements from 21,517 hours to 19,167 hours. The Agency will include this summary in its request to OMB to extend the approval of the collection of information requirements.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved information collection requirements.


OMB Number: 1218–0223.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profits; Not-for-profit organizations; Federal Government; State, local, or tribal government.

Number of respondents: 65,000.

Frequency of Response: On occasion annually;

Average Time per Response: Varies from 1 minute (.02 hour) to maintain a certificate to 30 minutes (.50 hour) for a manufacturing worker to acquire information from a manufacturer for a new tag, make a new tag, and affix it to a sling.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 19,167.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): $0.

IV. Public Participation—Submission of Comments on This Notice and Internet Access to Comments and Submissions

You may submit comments and supporting materials in response to this notice by (1) hard copy, (2) fax transmission (facsimile), or (3) electronically through the OSHA Web page. Because of security-related problems, a significant delay may occur in the receipt of comments by regular mail. Please contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 (TTY 877 889–5627) for information about security procedures concerning the delivery of submissions by express delivery, hand delivery, and courier service.

All comments, submissions and background documents are available for inspection and copying at the OSHA Docket Office at the above address. Comments and submissions posted on OSHA’s Web page are available through the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 (TTY 877 889–5627) for information about security procedures concerning the delivery of submissions by express delivery, hand delivery, and courier service.

Electronic copies of this Federal Register notice as well as other relevant documents are available on OSHA’s Web page. Since all submissions become public, private information such as social security numbers should not be submitted.

V. Authority and Signature

Jonathan L. Snare, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506 et seq.), and Secretary of Labor’s Order No. 5–2002 (67 FR 65008).

Signed at Washington, DC, on May 20, 2005.

Jonathan L. Snare,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor.

A. Introduction

The NCUA is proposing to adopt an Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement (IRPS) on Sales of Nondeposit Investments. The proposed IRPS provides requirements, direction, and guidance to federally-insured credit unions on the establishment and operation of third party brokerage arrangements. The proposed IRPS updates and replaces NCUA’s Letter to Credit Unions No. 150 on the sales of nondeposit investments.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 25, 2005.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods (please send comments by one method only):

- E-mail: Address to regcomments@ncua.gov. Include “[Your name] Comments on Proposed IRPS (Sales of Nondeposit Investments)” in the e-mail subject line.
- Fax: (703) 518–6319. Use the subject line described above for e-mail.
- Mail: Address to Mary Rupp, Secretary of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314–3428.
- Hand Delivery/Courier: Same as mail address.
Credit unions cannot register as securities brokers. The requirements the SEC places on brokers, including capital and reserve requirements, are inconsistent with those that NCUA and state supervisory authorities place on credit unions. If credit unions wish to bring the option of nondeposit investments to their members, they must structure their involvement so that the SEC will not require them to register as brokers.

The most common method credit unions employ is the third party brokerage arrangement. In third party brokerage arrangements, a credit union can facilitate a brokerage firm that is properly registered and licensed with the SEC in selling securities. The SEC permits certain facilitating entities, including credit unions, to receive transaction-related compensation from the brokerage firm without subjecting them to broker registration requirements. In essence, the credit union brings the brokerage firm to its members, the members buy the securities from the brokerage firm, and the broker provides transaction-related remuneration to the credit union.

Third party brokerage arrangements can be either bilateral or multilateral. Bilateral arrangements involve an agreement between a credit union and a registered broker. The broker may or may not be a credit union service organization (CUSO). Multilateral arrangements involve an agreement between a credit union, an unregistered CUSO, and a registered broker. The SEC expects a CUSO to register a broker if its activities rise to the level of "effecting the transfer of securities." Accordingly, a credit union and brokerage firm must limit the involvement of an unregistered CUSO in the sales of nondeposit investments.

Credit unions have limited powers so, in addition to compliance with securities laws, the nondeposit investment sales activities of credit unions must be authorized under their chartering statutes. Federal credit unions do not have the authority to sell nondeposit investments directly to their members. Under the incidental powers finder activity, however, a federal credit union may bring a third party vendor, the broker, to its members to offer them a financial service, the purchase of investments. 12 CFR 721.3(f). State chartered credit unions must look to their own state law for authority to engage in third party brokerage activities.

The antifraud provisions of applicable federal and state laws prohibit materially misleading or inaccurate representations in connection with offers and sales of securities. The broker could face potential liability if members are misled about the nature of nondeposit investment products, including their uninsured status. The broker could also face potential liability for other improper sales practices, such as account churning or failing to evaluate the suitability of a particular nondeposit investment for a member.

While responsibility for proper sales practices falls on the broker, a credit union could also be liable if it fails to ensure that the brokerage activity is properly separated from the credit union’s other activities, such as its deposit taking and lending. Complete separation of the credit union from the nondeposit investment activities is not possible because the sales are being offered to the member through the auspices of the credit union. The broker’s sales representative, for example, will often be located on credit union premises, credit union employees may refer members to the sales representative, and credit union employees are permitted to provide literature about nondeposit investments to the member. The use of dual employee sales representatives, meaning an employee who works for both the credit union and the broker, may increase the legal risk to the credit union.

Credit union management must be aware of how the member will perceive the relationship between a credit union and the broker and how the two may be connected in the member’s mind. The greater the possible connection, the more management must be involved in oversight of nondeposit investment sales practices. One federal court considered a case where an unsophisticated bank customer took out a mortgage loan to finance speculative securities purchases from the bank’s third party broker. The court concluded that various facts, including the use of a dual employee relationship, created a fiduciary relationship between the bank and the customer that the bank violated when it allowed the inappropriate mortgage and securities transaction to occur. Scott v. Dime Savings Bank, 886 F.Supp. 1073 (S.D.N.Y. 1995), aff’d 101 F.3d 107 (2d Cir. 1996), cert. den. 520 U.S. 1122 (1997).

See also Conte v. U.S. Alliance Federal Credit Union, 303 F.Supp.2d 220 (D. Conn. 2004)(Existence or not of fiduciary relationship between credit union and member growing out of third party broker nondeposit investment sales is a factual question for the trial jury to decide).

NCUA’s Letter No. 150, issued in 1993, contains NCUA’s current
guidance to credit unions on the sales of nondeposit investments. Several events since 1993 require that NCUA update the information in Letter No. 150. One change is NCUA’s replacement of the Group Purchasing Activities rule with the Incidental Powers rule and the elimination of some restrictions on the compensation a federal credit union may receive from its finder activities. 12 CFR part 721.

Another change is a proposed Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regulation that would expand and clarify a credit union’s authority to participate in third party brokerage arrangements without requiring the credit union to register as a broker. SEC Regulation B, 69 FR 39682 (June 30, 2004)[Proposed]. Regulation B, when finalized, will replace current SEC guidance applicable to credit unions contained in a series of “no action” letters. See, e.g., SEC Letter Re: Chubb Securities Corporation (Nov. 24, 1993). The SEC has not yet finalized Regulation B. If the final Regulation B differs materially from the proposed Regulation B, the NCUA Board will make appropriate changes to the text of the final IRPS. The NCUA Office of General Counsel has also issued several legal opinion letters since 1993 interpreting various aspects of the sale of nondeposit investment sales.

Accordingly, NCUA has determined to update the guidance in Letter No. 150 and issue the update in IRPS form. NCUA believes that the IRPS is a better medium for the information than a letter to credit unions. The IRPS is more accessible, and is also appropriate for both mandatory requirements and guidance.

C. Regulatory Procedures

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires that NCUA prepare an analysis describing any significant economic impact agency rulemaking may have on a substantial number of small credit unions. 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq. For purposes of this analysis, NCUA considers credit unions under $10 million in assets as small credit unions. Since the binding requirements in this IRPS are generally restatements of requirements in other laws and regulations, NCUA does not believe this proposed IRPS will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small credit unions. NCUA invites the public to comment on this issue.

Paperwork Reduction Act

NCUA has determined that this proposed IRPS does not increase paperwork requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) and regulations of the Office of Management and Budget.

Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132 encourages independent regulatory agencies to consider the impact of their regulatory actions on state and local interests. In adherence to fundamental federalism principles, NCUA, an independent regulatory agency as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(5), voluntarily complies with the executive order.

This proposed IRPS applies to all credit unions, but does not have substantial direct effect on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. NCUA has determined that this proposed IRPS does not constitute a policy that has federalism implications for purposes of the executive order.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board, on May 19, 2005.

Mary Rupp,
Secretary of the Board.

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 1752a, 1756, 1757, 1766, 1783, 1784.

 Proposed Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement No. 05–1; Sales of Nondeposit Investments

I. Introduction

This Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement (IRPS) provides requirements, direction, and guidance to federally-insured credit unions offering their members nondeposit investments through third party brokerage arrangements. Among other things, this IRPS discusses the relationship between the credit union and the brokerage firm and the responsibilities of each, the separation of investment sales activities from the receipt of deposits or shares, contacts with members concerning securities sales, compensation and referral fees, the use of dual employees, sales to nonmembers, and related issues and concerns.

The information in this IRPS comes from a variety of sources, including the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD), and NCUA. This IRPS addresses the SEC’s requirements and related guidance first. The IRPS concludes with additional NCUA requirements and guidance.

II. Purpose

• This IRPS supersedes NCUA’s Letter to Credit Unions No. 150, Sales of Nondeposit Investments. The information in this IRPS is intended to help credit unions conduct third party brokerage activities in a manner that is legal, protects members from potential securities fraud and abuse, and minimizes safety and soundness concerns for the credit union. The use of the word “must” in this IRPS reflects a legal requirement for credit unions. The use of the word “should” indicates guidance as to best practices.

III. Scope

The scope of this IRPS is sales of nondeposit investments to members through third party brokerage arrangements. This IRPS does not cover:

• No-load money market mutual fund transactions through a sweep account arrangement;
• Securities safekeeping activities, such as IRA custodianships;
• Nondeposit investment transactions for the credit union’s own investment account; and
• Transactions in insurance products that do not include an investment component. Examples of these insurance products generally include whole life insurance and insurance sold in connection with loans.

IV. Conduct of Third Party Brokerage Arrangements: SEC Requirements

Sales of nondeposit investments are subject to the securities laws and the regulation and oversight of the SEC. This section contains the SEC’s regulatory requirements for the conduct of third party brokerage arrangements at credit unions. After each SEC requirement are additional direction and guidance from National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD) Rule 2350 and the NCUA.

SEC Requirement: The broker must perform brokerage services in an area that is clearly marked and, to the extent practicable, physically separate from the routine deposit-taking activities of the credit union. The broker must clearly identify to members that it is providing the brokerage services, not the credit union. Any materials a credit union or broker uses to advertise or promote the availability of brokerage services under the arrangement must comply with federal securities laws. Advertising and promotional material must also clearly indicate that the brokerage services are being provided by the broker and not by the credit union. The credit union or broker must also inform each customer that the securities being offered are not
shares or other obligations of the credit union, are not guaranteed by the credit union, and are not insured by the National Credit Union Administration or any other federal agency.

Credit unions and the brokerage firms must market nondeposit investment products in a manner that does not mislead or confuse members as to the nature or risks of these uninsured products. To avoid member confusion about these products, credit union policies should specifically address the locations at which sales will take place. The best practice is that deposit-taking be physically separated from nondeposit sales functions.

The broker’s sales representative must make complete and accurate disclosures to avoid the possibility that a member might confuse an uninsured investment product with an insured share account. When selling, advertising, or otherwise marketing uninsured investment products to members, members must be informed that the products offered:

- Are not federally insured;
- Are not obligations of the credit union;
- Are not guaranteed by the credit union or any affiliated entity;
- Involve investment risks, including the possible loss of principal; and

If applicable, are being offered by a dual employee who serves both functions of accepting members’ deposits and the selling of nondeposit investment products.

These disclosures must be clear and conspicuous, and the broker’s sales representative must obtain a separately signed statement acknowledging the disclosures from members at the time a nondeposit investment account is opened. These disclosures must also be featured conspicuously in all written or oral sales presentations, advertising and promotional materials, prospectuses, and periodic statements that include information on both deposit and nondeposit products. Abbreviated versions of the disclosures may be used in certain advertising media as described in NASD Rule 2350.

The sales representative should also, when discussing nondeposit investments with a member face-to-face, display a sign, readily visible to the member, that states: “Investments sold here are NOT offered by the credit union, NOT guaranteed by the credit union, and DO NOT have any federal insurance. These investments may lose value.”

To avoid confusion, brokerage firms should not offer investment products with a product name similar to the credit union’s name.

SEC Requirement: Credit union employees who are not dual employees of the broker and the credit union may perform only clerical or ministerial functions in connection with brokerage transactions. Clerical and ministerial functions include scheduling appointments with the broker’s sales representative, forwarding customer funds or securities, and describing in general terms the types of investments available from the credit union and the broker under the arrangement.

SEC Requirement: Only employees of the brokerage firm, or dual employees of the brokerage firm and the credit union, may receive incentive compensation for brokerage transactions. Other credit union employees may receive compensation for referral of members to the brokerage sales representative if the compensation is a nominal one-time cash fee of a fixed dollar amount and the payment of the fee is not contingent on whether the referral results in a transaction. In this context, “nominal” generally means that the payment may not exceed the greater of twenty-five dollars or the wages the employee is paid for one hour of work.

The SEC’s Regulation B indexes the maximum amount of a referral fee to inflation, so credit unions seeking to set referral fees as high as the SEC permits should consult with qualified counsel.

SEC Requirement: The credit union must have a written contract with any broker that offers brokerage services on the credit union’s premises.

The credit union should also have a written contract with any brokerage firm that offers brokerage services through credit union mailings, e-mails or telephone calls made or sent by the credit union, or through the credit union’s Web site.

V. Conduct of Third Party Brokerage Arrangements: Additional NCUA Requirements, Direction, and Guidance

The SEC’s regulatory requirements are primarily intended to protect the customer. This section contains additional guidance that is not dictated by or directly related to the SEC’s requirements. Much of this guidance relates to the safety and soundness of the credit union.

Risks to the Credit Union

As with any business activity, a credit union’s directors must evaluate the risks associated with nondeposit investment activities. The risks include:

- Legal Risk: The credit union could be held liable for abusive sales practices perpetrated by nondeposit investment sales representatives.
- Reputation Risk: The credit union could be damaged by association with abusive sales practices, even if not liable for the practices.
- Economic Risk: The credit union could lose money if it commits itself to pay any expenses associated with the nondeposit investment activity and the sales and associated revenue are insufficient to pay those expenses.

Due Diligence in Selecting an Appropriate Brokerage Firm

Before entering into a third party brokerage arrangement, credit unions must take care to select an appropriate brokerage firm. For each firm under consideration, the credit union should:

- Ensure the firm can provide the services that credit union members need.
- Review the firm’s financial statements and capital adequacy.
- Determine if the firm can adequately supervise its sales representatives at the credit union’s location.
- Ask the firm to provide references, preferably other depository institutions, and talk with those references.
- Conduct background and NASD checks on the firm’s principals and the sales representatives that will be working at the credit union.

Credit Union Policies, Procedures, and Contracts

The credit union must adopt written policies and procedures concerning the brokerage arrangement. Many of these policies and procedures should be reflected in the contract with the brokerage firm. At a minimum, the policies, procedures, and contracts should address:

- The features of the sales program. Credit union policies should describe the types of products that a broker may offer through the third party brokerage arrangement. For all products, the credit union should identify specific laws, regulations, and any other limitations or requirements, including qualitative considerations, that will express govern the selection and marketing of products a broker may offer. Qualitative considerations include an analysis of the level of complexity and volatility in the investments that you will permit the broker to offer your members.
- A description of the relative responsibilities of the credit union and the brokerage firm. The credit union’s policies and the contract between the brokerage firm and the credit union must make clear that the brokerage firm is primarily responsible for ensuring that the nondeposit sales function is conducted in compliance with all
entities involved in the sales of nondeposit investments. Credit union personnel performing the compliance function should be independent of any credit union personnel involved in investment product sales and management. At a minimum, the compliance function should include a system that monitors member complaints; ensures supervisory personnel at the broker make scheduled examinations of their sales personnel; and contacts members that have purchased nondeposit investments to ensure they received and understood the required disclosures. Compliance personnel should also conduct periodic, random samplings of account activity to look for evidence of abuse. When conducting sampling, compliance personnel should look for evidence such as:
- Accounts with a high rate of investment turnover, which may indicate the sales representative is churning accounts to generate commissions;
- Accounts with complex investments that may be unsuitable for the particular member; and
- A combination of loan accounts and nondeposit investment accounts that might indicate a member borrowed large sums of money from the credit union to finance nondeposit investment purchases.

Credit unions should consult with qualified counsel for further information about what to review when examining member accounts. The intensity of the credit union’s compliance effort will depend on the nature and extent of nondeposit investment sales, evidence of the effectiveness of the broker’s compliance systems, and the level of member complaints. Whether the credit union can obtain an unambiguous indemnification agreement from the brokerage firm should also affect the intensity of the compliance effort.

The Use of Dual Employees

Credit unions may establish a third party brokerage arrangement using dual employees. These arrangements create additional risk for the credit union and must be designed, operated, and monitored carefully.

- Separation of duties. A dual employee should have separate, written job descriptions for the duties performed for the credit union and the nondeposit investment sales duties, which are performed for the brokerage firm. The duties performed for the credit union should be unrelated to the sale of nondeposit investments. The duties performed for the credit union should not bring the employee into contact with members that might also purchase nondeposit investments. The dual employee should have no management or policy-setting responsibilities within the credit union related to nondeposit investments.

- Indemnification. The use of dual employees increases the risk a credit union may be held liable for abusive sales practices. At the same time, the brokerage firm may have less incentive to supervise nondeposit sales activities properly when conducted by a dual employee. Accordingly, the credit union should seek an indemnification agreement from the brokerage firm as described above. The credit union should also seek fidelity bond coverage or additional insurance for any credit union liability arising from employee misconduct related to the nondeposit investment function.

Sales of Nondeposit Investments to Nonmembers

Because credit unions may only provide services to members, a credit union may generally only accept income and pay expenses associated with nondeposit investment sales to its members. NCUA recognizes, however, that in some cases it may be difficult for a credit union to connect particular

Department of Labor
income to a transaction involving a member. For example, some sales representatives may have generated sales that occurred before the representative joined the brokerage arrangement. These representatives may bring with them a stream of trailer income that cannot now be associated with any particular person or is not otherwise attributable to members of the credit union. A similar situation may arise in brokerage arrangements involving multiple credit unions working with one broker and sales made to members of the various credit unions.

To address these situations, NCUA will allow a credit union in a third party brokerage arrangement to accept a de minimus amount of income that is not directly attributable to sales to its members. In this context, de minimus means that the ratio of income not directly attributable to members to the total gross income the credit union receives under the arrangement cannot exceed five percent.

A similar issue may arise if a credit union pays expenses associated with the sales of nondeposit investments. NCUA will allow a credit union in a third party brokerage arrangement to pay a de minimus amount of expenses associated with the sale of nondeposit investments to nonmembers. In this context, de minimus means that the ratio of nonmember sales expenses paid by the credit union to the total expenses paid by the credit union under the arrangement cannot exceed five percent.

VI. Applicable Law and Regulation

• The Federal Credit Union Act, 12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.
• Regulation B, Securities Activities of Banks and Other Financial Institutions, 15 CFR 242.710 et seq.
• NASD Rule 2350, Broker/Dealer Conduct on the Premises of Financial Institutions.
• NASD Rule 3040, Private Securities Transactions of an Associated Person.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: National Science Foundation Applicant Survey.
OMB Approval Number: 3145–0096.
Type of Request: Intent to seek approval to extend an information collection for three years.
Proposed Project: The current National Science Foundation Applicant survey has been in use for several years. Data are collected from applicant pools to examine the facial/sexual/disability composition and to determine the source of information about NSF vacancies.
Use of the Information: Analysis of the applicant pools is necessary to determine if NSF’s targeted recruitment efforts are reaching groups that are underrepresented in the Agency’s workforce and/or to defend the Foundation’s practices in discrimination cases.

Burden on the Public: The Foundation estimates about 8,000 responses annually at 1 minute per response; this computes to approximately 133 hours annually.


Suzanne H. Plimpton,
Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

FR Doc. 05–10484 Filed 5–25–05; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; Comment Request.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104–13. This is the second notice; the first notice was published at 70 FR 13544 and no comments were received. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send e-mail to splimpto@nsf.gov. Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling (703) 292–7556.

NSF may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The Foundation estimates about 8,000 responses annually at 1 minute per response; this computes to approximately 133 hours annually.


Suzanne H. Plimpton,
Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

FR Doc. 05–10484 Filed 5–25–05; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; Comment Request.

SUMMARY: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), and as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the National Science Foundation (NSF) is inviting the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this proposed continuing information collection. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the Federal Register at 70 FR 9981 and no comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice.

DATES: Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received by OMB within 30 days of publication in the Federal Register.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NSF, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of NSF’s estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; or (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of