

the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12866.

This rule designates Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport as a port of embarkation and three facilities in Georgia—the Atlanta Equine Complex in Atlanta, Tumbleweed Farm in Mableton, and Southern Cross Ranch in Madison—as approved export inspection facilities. The Atlanta Equine Complex and Tumbleweed Farm are located in the immediate vicinity of the Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport. The location of Southern Cross Ranch less than 60 miles from the airport, or approximately an hour's driving time, offers businesses within the Madison, GA, area a convenient alternative location at which animals destined for export could receive inspections.

We do not expect that designating these three facilities as export inspection facilities and Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport as a port of embarkation will have any adverse impact on businesses. These actions should benefit exporters of animals in the region by reducing their animal transportation costs. Currently, the closest designated ports of embarkation from which exporters in Georgia may ship their animals are in Kentucky and Florida. From past export activity in the area, we anticipate that, at least initially, a yearly average of about 50 exportations of animals, mostly horses and some goats, will take place through Atlanta.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12372

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

Executive Order 12988

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping

requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 91

Animal diseases, Animal welfare, Exports, Livestock, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 91 is amended as follows:

#### **PART 91—INSPECTION AND HANDLING OF LIVESTOCK FOR EXPORTATION**

1. The authority citation for part 91 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 105, 112, 113, 114a, 120, 121, 134b, 134f, 136, 136a, 612, 613, 614, and 618; 46 U.S.C. 466a, 466b; 49 U.S.C. 1509(d); 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

2. In § 91.14, paragraphs (a)(3) through (a)(17) are redesignated as paragraphs (a)(4) through (a)(18), and a new paragraph (a)(3) is added to read as follows.

##### **§ 91.14 Ports of embarkation and export inspection facilities.**

(a) \* \* \*

(3) *Georgia.*

(i) Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport.

(A) Atlanta Equine Complex, 1270 Woolman Place, Atlanta, GA 30354, (404) 767-1700.

(B) Tumbleweed Farm (horses only), 1677 Buckner Road, Mableton, GA 30059, (770) 948-3556.

(C) Southern Cross Ranch (horses only), 1670 Bethany Church Road, Madison, GA 30650, (706) 342-8027.

\* \* \* \* \*

Done in Washington, DC, this 28th day of January 1997.

Terry L. Medley,

*Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 97-2959 Filed 2-5-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

### **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

#### **18 CFR Part 284**

[Docket No. RM96-1-003; Order No. 587-B]

#### **Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines**

**AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is amending its open access regulations by incorporating by reference standards promulgated by the Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB). These standards require interstate natural gas pipelines to conduct certain standardized business transactions across the Internet according to protocols.

**DATES:** This rule is effective March 10, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of March 10, 1997.

Pipelines are to implement the Internet protocols beginning April 1, 1996, according to a staggered schedule established in Order No. 587, 61 FR 19211 (May 1, 1996).

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington DC, 20426.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael Goldenberg, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208-2294

Marvin Rosenberg, Office of Economic Policy, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208-1283

Kay Morice, Office of Pipeline Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208-0507.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the Federal Register, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to inspect or copy the contents of this document during normal business hours in Room 2A, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington DC 20426.

The Commission Issuance Posting System (CIPS), an electronic bulletin board service, provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission. CIPS is available at no charge to the user and may be accessed using a personal computer with a modem by dialing 202-208-1397 if dialing locally or 1-800-856-3920 if dialing long distance. To access CIPS, set your communications software to 19200, 14400, 12000, 9600, 7200, 4800, 2400, or 1200 bps, full duplex, no parity, 8 data bits and stop bit. The full text of this order will be available on CIPS in ASCII and WordPerfect 5.1 format. CIPS user assistance is available at 202-208-2474.

CIPS is also available on the Internet through the Fed World system. Telnet software is required. To access CIPS via the Internet, point your browser to the URL address: <http://www.fedworld.gov> and select the "Go to the FedWorld Telnet Site" button. When your Telnet software connects you, log on to the FedWorld system, scroll down and select FedWorld by typing: 1 and at the command line and type: /go FERC. FedWorld may also be accessed by Telnet at the address [fedworld.gov](http://fedworld.gov).

Finally, the complete text on diskette in WordPerfect format may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, La Dorn Systems Corporation. La Dorn Systems Corporation is also located in the Public Reference Room at 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426.

Before Commissioners: Elizabeth Anne Moler, Chair; Vicky A. Bailey, James J. Hoecker, William L. Massey, and Donald F. Santa, Jr.

#### Final Rule

January 30, 1997.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is amending its open access regulations to adopt standards by which interstate natural gas pipelines will conduct business transactions with their business partners over the Internet. The regulations incorporate by reference standards promulgated by the Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB), a private standards organization devoted to developing standards representing a consensus of the interests in the natural gas industry.

#### I. Background

In Order No. 587,<sup>1</sup> the Commission incorporated by reference consensus standards developed by GISB covering certain industry business practices—Nominations, Flowing Gas, Invoicing, and Capacity Release—as well as GISB datasets in Electronic Data Interchange ASC X12 (EDI) format that detailed the data requirements needed to conduct business transactions in these areas. These standards are to be implemented by the pipelines according to a staggered compliance schedule from April to June 1997.

In Order No. 587, the Commission did not adopt GISB standards governing the method for transmitting the business transaction datasets (the electronic delivery mechanism (EDM)) because

GISB was still in the process of testing its standards governing Internet communications. The Commission anticipated that the EDM standards for the business transactions would be implemented in April through June 1997 in conjunction with the implementation of the business practices standards.

After a successful pilot test, GISB filed, on September 30, 1996, consensus EDM standards for conducting the standardized business transactions across the Internet. It also included in the filing additional standards for providing other information using the Internet and additional business practice standards. For communications involving business transactions, the GISB standards would require trading partners (pipelines and their customers as well as others communicating with pipelines, such as producers or point operators that confirm nominations) to maintain Internet servers and Internet addresses and to exchange files formatted in ASC X12 using HTTP (hyper-text transfer protocol) as the Internet protocol (hereinafter Internet server model).<sup>2</sup>

On November 13, 1996, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR)<sup>3</sup> proposing to adopt all the standards GISB submitted on September 30, 1996.<sup>4</sup> The Commission proposed to follow the implementation schedule suggested by GISB. Under this schedule, the standards for Internet communication of business transactions would be implemented according to the staggered schedule adopted in Order No. 587, beginning April 1, 1997. With respect to the other Internet standards and the additional business practice standards, GISB proposed a March 1997 final rule, with implementation of the additional Internet standards in August of 1997 and pipeline tariff filings for the business practices standards to be made in May, June, and July of 1997, with implementation in November 1997.

Thirteen comments were filed on the NOPR from Natural Gas Supply Association, Williams Interstate Natural Gas System (WINGS), Burlington Resources Oil & Gas Company, Natural Gas Clearinghouse, Conoco, Inc., and Vastar Gas Marketing Inc. (filing jointly) (NGC/Conoco/Vastar), Pacific Gas and

Electric Company (PG&E), Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), Altra Energy Technologies, L.L.C. (Altra), Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB), NorAm Gas Transmission Company and Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (filing jointly) (NorAm), ANR Pipeline Company and Colorado Interstate Gas Pipeline Company (filing jointly), Enron Capital & Trade Resources Corp., Southern California Edison Company (SoCal Edison), and the PanEnergy Companies.

#### II. Discussion

The Commission is incorporating by reference the GISB Internet server standards for conducting business transactions. Pipelines will be required to implement these standards according to the April through June schedule for implementing the associated business practice standards. Since the additional Internet standards and business practice standards are not to be implemented as quickly, the Commission will address these standards in a later order.

The industry and GISB have developed a communication infrastructure that is at the forefront of the use of Internet-based protocols to conduct business transactions.<sup>5</sup> The protocols adopted in this rule promise to provide the gas industry with the ability to use automated computer-to-computer communications to more efficiently conduct crucial and time-sensitive business transactions, such as nominating and confirming daily gas flows, as well as invoicing and payment. The impact of these standards is not limited to the Commission-regulated aspect of communication between customers and pipelines. These protocols also carry the potential for enhancing the effectiveness of communication between all members of the gas industry, including confirmations between pipelines and upstream point operators, confirmations among upstream and downstream pipelines, as well as business transactions involving local distribution companies, marketers, and producers.

Under the GISB Internet server standards adopted in this rule, pipelines and their trading partners would each maintain an Internet server and an Internet address. Files would be transmitted, when ready, to the trading partners' Internet address and these files will be received and processed automatically by the recipient's server,

<sup>2</sup> See Standards 4.3.1–4.3.4 and 4.3.7–4.3.15.

<sup>3</sup> Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 61 FR 58790 (Nov. 19, 1996), IV FERC Stats. & Regs. Proposed Regulations ¶ 35,521 (Nov. 13, 1996).

<sup>4</sup> The NOPR also gave notice of a staff technical conference to discuss the future direction of standardization and disputed issues.

<sup>5</sup> See EDI Industry Poised to Invade the Internet, EDI News, January 6, 1997 (Vol. 11, No. 1); Dave Kosiur, Electronic Commerce Edges Closer, PCWeek On Line, Oct. 10, 1996, <http://www.pcweek.com/@netweek/1007/07set.html> (Jan. 9, 1997).

<sup>1</sup> Standards For Business Practices Of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, Order No. 587, 61 FR 39053 (Jul. 26, 1996), III FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,039 (Jul. 17, 1996), *reh'g denied*, 61 FR 55208 (Oct. 25, 1996), 77 FERC ¶ 61,061 (Oct. 21, 1996).

with a response sent to the sender indicating successful receipt or identifying the nature of certain errors, such as the use of an improper common code identifier.

WINGS, SoCal Edison, and PG&E object to the adoption of the Internet server approach, principally because of concerns about the cost and difficulty to customers of establishing and operating an Internet server. Instead, they recommend what they term a more traditional Internet approach in which the pipeline would establish an Internet World Wide Web page which the customer can access by contracting with a traditional Internet Service Provider (ISP) and then using a standard Internet browser, such as Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet Explorer (hereinafter Web Browser model).<sup>6</sup>

Under the Web browser model, like the Internet server approach, a customer can send a document to the pipeline's Internet server. Unlike the Internet server approach, however, the customer's computer would not automatically receive responsive documents or confirmations from the pipeline. The customer would have to reconnect to the pipeline's Web page to retrieve all confirmations and responses from the pipeline. SoCal Edison maintains that the Web browser model has the capability of transmitting gas transactions in a standardized file format using the normal Internet file transfer protocol (FTP). It further maintains that the Web browser model has the capability for on-line data entry and validation of time critical nominations, like the pipeline's current Electronic Bulletin Boards (EBBs).

SoCal Edison further states that, based on its estimates, the minimum cost of using the Internet server model is \$18,000 per year (under a contract with a "specialized" third-party service provider) compared with a yearly cost of \$240 for the Web browser model. SoCal maintains that even if the Internet server model is adopted for users capable of using the ASC X12 formats and an Internet server, a lower-cost interactive solution, such as the Web browser model, also should be provided.

GISB, Altra, Williston Basin, and NGC/Conoco/Vastar support the consensus agreement to use the Internet server approach as the appropriate model for time-sensitive transactional data. The Internet server approach, they contend, allows for automatic transmittal and reception of documents,

which will facilitate computer-to-computer exchanges of information. They argue that the Web browser approach is more appropriate for one-way communication where customers wish to gather information from the pipeline, without having to return information, than it is for the two-way communication of business transactions where both parties have to send and receive data. They regard the Web browser approach as more appropriate for transmitting non-transactional data where humans seek to obtain information from computers, for example, if a person sought information about a tariff provision and needed to search the pipeline's electronic tariff to find the information. Altra emphasizes that the time-stamping feature of the Internet server approach provides significant benefits to the industry, because it enables the sender of a document to know that the document has been received by the server of the other party to the transaction and has not been lost in transmission. It also maintains that the GISB Future Technology Task Force considered using the FTP protocol, but concluded it presented numerous problems.

Altra maintains the capital and operating cost of the Internet server approach for the pipelines' customers will vary depending on each customer's needs, the size of its business, and the number of pipelines with which it deals. GISB points out that there are many ISP's who provide everything from basic worldwide web access to complete Internet server sites at reasonable prices. Altra and GISB further maintain that many customers can effectively share the cost (and minimize individual outlays) by using a third-party service provider to maintain the Internet server.

Williston Basin is concerned that its shippers may not be willing to make the investment to support the Internet server model if they perceive that another, different model may be developed in the future. It, therefore, requests a definitive decision and implementation schedule so pipelines, shippers, and third-party service providers have certainty in the process.

GISB finally points out that none of these standards have yet been implemented and suggests that until they are, no assessment can be made of any need for changes or modifications. It urges that the standards be given a chance to accomplish their intended goal of helping to create a seamless national marketplace for natural gas.

The Commission is adopting the consensus view of the industry that the Internet server model is needed to

provide customers with a framework for conducting these business transactions efficiently. For example, each standardized business transaction requires parties to exchange numerous files, including "Quick Response" transmissions at varying points in the process to verify receipt and errors in communication. The Internet server model provides that these multiple files can be sent and received automatically by computers at both ends. It further enables the party sending the document to obtain a time stamp establishing whether the transmission has been received and whether there are any errors. If a problem occurs, the sender can resubmit the information. In addition, the model provides customers with significant flexibility to manage their gas business in the way that most effectively meets their needs. Customers (or third-party providers) will be receiving transaction information directly from the pipelines when the information is ready and can program their computers to process such information automatically.

In contrast, the Web browser approach advocated by WINGS, PG&E, and SoCal Edison does not provide the same level of functionality as the Internet server model. The Web browser model does not support automatic computer-to-computer exchanges; an employee of the customer must access the pipeline's home page in order to obtain each quick response and confirmation document. There also would be no record that the recipient has received a transmitted document.

As GISB and Altra point out, the Internet server model also provides a standardized platform which computer software developers and third-party service providers can use to provide customers, including smaller customers, with the interface that meets their business needs. Third-party service providers should enjoy scale economies in establishing Internet servers, which would reduce the costs to smaller customers. According to SoCal Edison's cost estimates, for instance, the use of a specialized third-party service provider would be the most cost-effective way for it to use the Internet server approach, with an estimated cost of \$1,500/month. Such cost estimates prior to implementation are necessarily tentative, since the market has not yet had a full opportunity to develop competing products and interfaces to meet market demand. However, even if the Internet server model ultimately costs more than the Web browser approach advocated by WINGS, PG&E, and SoCal Edison, the Internet server model provides benefits not available

<sup>6</sup>This model is similar to the GISB model for disseminating additional information over the Internet, such as pipeline tariffs, affiliated marketer information, and an index of customers.

from the Web browser approach, such as permitting direct computer-to-computer communications and automatic processing of information as well as reducing the inefficiency, and cost, to shippers of having their personnel access the pipeline's home page each time they need to check on whether the pipeline has sent a quick response, confirmation, or other information.

Whether changes to the Internet server model or a lower-cost, lower-functionality model for transactional exchanges may be needed in the future can be determined only after the Internet server model has been implemented and GISB, the industry, and the Commission have the opportunity to evaluate its performance. Even if it is ultimately determined that a lower-cost model is needed for smaller customers, an investment in the Internet server model is still needed to provide computer-to-computer communication, which appears necessary to provide an efficient communication system. Moreover, since the Internet server model uses many of the same protocols as the Web browser model, the investment and learning involved in developing the Internet server approach also would be valuable in the development of additional Internet approaches. In the meantime, the Commission has not eliminated the pipeline EBBs, so that customers can continue using this means of transacting business while the computer services market is developing.

NorAm requests consideration of three issues as the transition from EBBs to the Internet is occurring. First, although GISB has seemingly resolved data security and transmission reliability concerns with the Internet, NorAm contends the Commission should consider providing pipelines protection from negligence claims based on unreliability or interference with communications. Second, since the Internet is a third-party controlled media, NorAm believes customers should still be able to communicate using proprietary pipeline EBBs, the costs of which, it asserts, should remain in the pipeline's cost-of-service. Third, as a related matter, NorAm asks that the Commission be sensitive to the costs and the technological newness of the Internet server model and not require customers to incur large costs for implementing the Internet server model. On the other hand, Altra expresses a long-run concern that if pipelines continue to provide non-standard electronic services as a cost-of-service item, third-party vendors will be at a competitive disadvantage.

The Commission sees no need to provide unspecified protection from liability since NorAm has not shown that existing negligence principles are inadequate to deal with transmission problems. Indeed, one of the benefits of the Internet server approach is that it should provide notice whether a transmission has been received.

Both the Internet and the telephone system used to connect EBBs are third-party networks, and both systems require computers on both sides of the transaction to function properly, with the more likely breakdown occurring on the computer systems at either end than on the network in between.<sup>7</sup> Thus, pipelines and their customers should consider, if they have not already, fail-safe procedures to deal with such problems. Moreover, the Commission is not, at this point, proposing to eliminate the pipeline EBBs, so that customers will still have the ability to use these systems while the Internet mechanism is fully implemented.

### III. Implementation Procedures

Pipelines are required to implement the standards adopted in this final rule according to the staggered schedule set forth in Order No. 587, beginning on April 1, 1997.<sup>8</sup> When a pipeline files its tariff sheets (as distinct from its *pro forma* tariff sheets) under section 154.203 of the Commission's regulations to implement Order No. 587, it must incorporate by reference into its tariff the Electronic Delivery Mechanism Standards adopted in this rule. A pipeline must further conform the definitions and its personnel contacts in its tariff to reflect any changes or additions related to the adoption of these standards. In complying with the requirements of section 154.203 of the Commission's regulations, a pipeline must file a marked version of the tariff sheets (under section 154.201) identifying all changes to the *pro forma* tariff sheets previously filed. In addition, the pipeline must file, as part

<sup>7</sup> What is now termed the Internet initially was conceived during the cold war as a communication method to maintain continuing transmission capability in the event of nuclear war. The concept was to replace the then current point-to-point networks, where each site on the network was dependent on the link before it, with a web network, where information could find its own path even if a section was destroyed. See e.g., Life on the Internet, The Online Edition of the PBS Series About the People Who are Shaping the Internet, Net History, <http://www.pbs.org/internet/history> (Jan. 7, 1997). The more likely eventuality, therefore, is an individual problem such as a pipeline or customer's Internet service provider going down, just as in the current EBB system a pipeline or customer's EBB computer can malfunction.

<sup>8</sup> 61 FR at 39066-67; III FERC Stats. & Regs. Preambles at 30,076-78.

of its statement of the nature, the reasons, and the basis for the filing, a complete table showing for each GISB standard adopted by the Commission, in Order No. 587 and in this rule, the complying tariff sheet number, and an explanatory statement, if necessary, describing any reasons for deviations from or changes to each GISB standard. Any pipeline seeking waiver or extension of the requirements of this rule is required to file its request within 30 days of the issuance of this rule.

### IV. Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA)<sup>9</sup> generally requires a description and analysis of final rules that will have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The regulations adopted in this rule impose requirements only on interstate pipelines, which are not small businesses, and, these requirements are, in fact, designed to reduce the difficulty of dealing with pipelines by all customers, including small businesses. Accordingly, pursuant to section 605(b) of the RFA, the Commission hereby certifies that the regulations adopted in this rule will not have a significant adverse impact on a substantial number of small entities.

### V. Environmental Analysis

The Commission is required to prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement for any action that may have a significant adverse effect on the human environment.<sup>10</sup> The Commission has categorically excluded certain actions from these requirements as not having a significant effect on the human environment.<sup>11</sup> The action taken here falls within categorical exclusions in the Commission's regulations for rules that are clarifying, corrective, or procedural, for information gathering, analysis, and dissemination, and for sales, exchange, and transportation of natural gas that requires no construction of facilities.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, an environmental assessment is unnecessary and has not been prepared in this rulemaking.

### VI. Information Collection Statement

OMB's regulations in 5 CFR 1320.11 require that it approve certain reporting and recordkeeping requirements

<sup>9</sup> 5 U.S.C. 601-612.

<sup>10</sup> Order No. 486, Regulations Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act, 52 FR 47897 (Dec. 17, 1987), FERC Stats. & Regs. Preambles 1986-1990 ¶ 30,783 (1987).

<sup>11</sup> 18 CFR 380.4.

<sup>12</sup> See 18 CFR 380.4(a)(2)(ii), 380.4(a)(5), 380.4(a)(27).

(collections of information) imposed by an agency. Upon approval of a collection of information, OMB shall assign an OMB control number and an expiration date. Respondents subject to the filing requirements of this Rule shall not be penalized for failing to respond to these collections of information unless the collections of information display valid OMB control numbers.

The cost estimates for complying with the Internet protocols for transmission of the business practice standards were included in the FERC-549C information collection costs estimates in Order No. 587. OMB has approved the information collection under FERC-549C, Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, (OMB Control No. 1902-0174), through September 30, 1999.

The adoption of the Internet protocols by this rule will create a more efficient communication medium for conducting business with interstate pipelines and reduce the burdens created by the disparity in log-on and other procedures among the pipeline's EBBs. The information collection requirements in this final rule will be reported directly to the industry users and later be subject to audit by the Commission. The implementation of these data requirements will help the Commission carry out its responsibilities under the Natural Gas Act and coincide with the current regulatory environment which the Commission instituted under Order No. 636 and the restructuring of the natural gas industry.

Interested persons may obtain information on the reporting requirements by contacting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street N.E., Washington, DC 20426 [Attention: Michael Miller, Information Services Division, (202) 208-1415] or the Office of Management and Budget [Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (202) 395-3087].

VII. Effective Date

These regulations are effective March 10, 1997. The Commission has determined, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, that this rule is not a "major rule" as defined in section 351 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of March 10, 1997.

List of Subjects in 18 CFR Part 284

Continental shelf, Incorporation by reference, Natural gas, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

By the Commission.  
Lois D. Cashell,  
Secretary.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Commission amends Part 284, Chapter I, Title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below.

**PART 284—CERTAIN SALES AND TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS UNDER THE NATURAL GAS POLICY ACT OF 1978 AND RELATED AUTHORITIES**

1. The authority citation for Part 284 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 717-717w, 3301-3432; 42 U.S.C 7101-7532; 43 U.S.C. 1331-1356.

2. In § 284.10, paragraph(b)(1)(iv) is redesignated (b)(1)(v), and new paragraph (b)(1)(iv) is added to read as follows:

**§ 284.10 Standards for Pipeline Business Operations and Communications.**

\* \* \* \* \*  
(b) \* \* \*  
(1) \* \* \*

(iv) Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards, Principles 4.1.1 through 4.1.15 and Standards 4.3.1 through 4.3.4 and 4.3.7 through 4.3.15 (Version 1.0, October 24, 1996); and

\* \* \* \* \*  
[FR Doc. 97-2931 Filed 2-5-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Food and Drug Administration**

**21 CFR Part 520**

**Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Amoxicillin Bolus and Soluble Powder**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to codify two previously approved supplemental new animal drug applications (NADA's) filed by Pfizer, Inc. The supplemental NADA's provide for the use of amoxicillin boluses and soluble powder in preruminating calves including veal calves.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 6, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dianne T. McRae, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV-102), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301-594-1623.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pfizer, Inc., 235 East 42d St., New York, NY 10017, is sponsor of NADA 55-087 Amoxi-Bol® (amoxicillin trihydrate) bolus and NADA 55-088 Amoxi-Sol® (amoxicillin trihydrate) soluble powder which provide for treatment of bacterial enteritis when due to susceptible *Escherichia coli* in preruminating calves including veal calves. Use is by or on the order of a licensed veterinarian. These supplemental NADA's were approved on October 7, 1993, but the regulations were inadvertently not amended at that time to reflect these approvals. The regulations are now being amended in §§ 520.88d(d) and 520.88e(d) (21 CFR 520.88d(d) and 520.88e(d)) to reflect the approvals. In addition, the term "nonruminating" is being changed to "preruminating" to better describe the type of animal being treated.

The supplemental approvals provided for further clarification of the class of animals indicated for treatment. No additional safety or effectiveness data were required. Therefore, a freedom of information (FOI) summary is not required.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 520

Animal drugs.  
Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 520 is amended as follows:

**PART 520—ORAL DOSAGE FORM NEW ANIMAL DRUGS**

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 520 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Sec. 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b).

2. Section 520.88d is amended by revising the heading for paragraph (d), paragraph (d)(2), and the third sentence in paragraph (d)(3) to read as follows:

**§ 520.88d Amoxicillin trihydrate soluble powder.**

\* \* \* \* \*  
(d) *Conditions of use. Preruminating calves including veal calves—*

\* \* \* \* \*  
(2) *Indications for use.* Treatment of bacterial enteritis when due to susceptible *Escherichia coli* in preruminating calves including veal calves.