

Finally, with respect to satellite subscribers who have their service of network signals disconnected due to the white area restriction, what means of redress can they be afforded to determine that termination of their service was accurate and required? Can the subscriber require that either the satellite carrier terminating service, or the network affiliate challenging service, conduct a test at his/her household to determine if he/she is eligible for network service? Who should pay for such test and how should it be administered? What should be the appropriate standards of the test? If a test is created, should subscribers who currently receive network signals be grandfathered in their receipt of those signals? Should the matter of a subscriber's eligibility to receive network service from a satellite carrier be a matter of private determination between broadcasters and satellite carriers, or should a government agency make the determination?

Another area of recent interest is the enforcement of the white area restriction. If such a restriction continues, how can it be more economically and efficiently enforced? Are there better ways to identify which subscribers may receive network signals under the satellite license, and those who are not eligible? Should the remedies for copyright infringement be amended to provide for additional and/or different remedies for violations of the white area restriction?

2. *Other issues.* Aside from the white area restriction, other areas of the satellite carrier compulsory license warrant consideration. Network signals are currently paid for at a lower royalty rate than superstation signals. Should the disparity be eliminated, so that all signals are paid for at the same rate? Should there be special provision for retransmission or transmission of a national satellite feed of the Public Broadcasting Service, and a separate royalty rate for this signal? What should the rate or rates be?

The satellite carrier license will expire at the end of 1999. Should the license be extended on a permanent basis, or is temporary extension still an appropriate solution? If an extension is temporary, what mechanisms can be put into place to encourage a smooth and efficient transition into a free marketplace system? Is collective administration of copyrighted broadcast programming an appropriate solution, and, if so, who should administer such a system?

The Copyright Office welcomes and encourages response and discussion of

these issues, as well as any other related matters interested parties deem relevant and important.

Dated: March 17, 1997.  
Marybeth Peters,  
*Register of Copyrights.*  
[FR Doc. 97-7091 Filed 3-17-97; 2:51 pm]  
BILLING CODE 1410-33-P

---

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (97-030)]

### Notice of Prospective Patent License

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of prospective patent license.

**SUMMARY:** NASA hereby gives notice that Howard Industries, Inc., of 1840 Progress Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43207, has applied for an exclusive patent license to practice the invention described and claimed in U.S. Patent No. 5,373,110, entitled "Ion Exchange Polymer and Method of Making," which is assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Written objections to the prospective grant of a license should be sent to the NASA Lewis Research Center.

**DATES:** Responses to this notice must be received by May 19, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kent N. Stone, Patent Attorney, NASA Lewis Research Center, 21000 Brookpart Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44135, telephone (216) 433-8855.

Dated: March 14, 1997.  
Edward A. Frankle,  
*General Counsel.*  
[FR Doc. 97-7072 Filed 3-19-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

---

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Advisory Committee for Biological Sciences (BIO); Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Advisory Committee for Biological Sciences (BIO) (1110).

*Date and Time:* April 9, 1997, 8:45 a.m.-5 p.m.; April 10, 1997, 8:45 a.m.-5 p.m.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230, Room 1235.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Mary E. Clutter, Assistant Director, Biological Sciences, Room 605, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230 Tel No.: (703) 306-1400.

*Minutes:* May be obtained from the contact person listed above.

*Purpose of Meeting:* The Advisory Committee for BIO provides advice, recommendations, and oversight concerning major program emphases, directions, and goals for the research-related activities of the divisions that make up BIO.

*Agenda:* Government Performance and Review Act (GPR) and Future Plans.

Dated: March 17, 1997.

Linda Allen-Benton,

*Deputy Director, Division of Human Resource Management, Acting Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 97-7022 Filed 3-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

---

### Special Emphasis Panel in Design, Manufacture, and Industrial Innovation; Meetings

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Special Emphasis Panel in Design, Manufacture, and Industrial Innovation—(1194)

*Date and Time:* April 8-9, 1997; 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m.

*Place:* Rooms 365 and 530, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Tony Centodocati, SBIR Program Manager, Ritchie Coryell, SBIR Program Manager, Darryl Gorman, SBIR Program Manager, and Joseph Hennessey, SBIR Program Manager, Small Business Innovation Research Program, (703) 306-1390, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NSF's SBIR Program.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate SBIR Phase II proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

*Reason for Closing:* The proposals being reviewed include information of proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.