exceeding established limits and rate them separately from the rest of the policyholder population. This concept is consistent with other private and public insurance programs which have the means to identify participants with high losses and separately rate them for the risk associated with the losses they have incurred. In 1997 25,126 NCS listings appeared on county crop actuarial documents. This number, which is less than two percent of the policyholders with active crop policies in 1996, includes producers no longer actively engaged in farming, as well as duplicate names for those producers who farm multiple crops or farm in more than one county. The list does not include other persons who share in the crop with a NCS producer, but who are required to pay the same NCS rates as the listed producer. The primary benefit of the NCS program is that by individually rating high loss producers under this process, FCIC is able to exclude their loss histories from the premium rating formulas. It has been estimated that on a crop policy basis, this saves non-NCS producers from five to nine percent on the cost of their crop insurance coverage. It has also been estimated that if NCS were eliminated, the reintroduction of the loss history into the rating pool would result in across the board premium increases for all non-NCS producers of $50 to $90 per crop policy annually.

Under the current NCS regulations, producers are selected for NCS adjustment if they meet the following criteria:

(1) Three or more indemnified losses during the NCS base period, (The base period generally means ten consecutive crop years. The base period for 1998 NCS selections is 1987–1996 for most crops.)

(2) Cumulative indemnities exceed same period cumulative premiums by at least $1,000.

(3) A premium has been earned in at least one of the most recent 4 crop years in the base period.

(4) The result of dividing the number of indemnified losses during the base period by the number of years premium is earned is equal to, or greater than, .60.

(5) Either of the following apply:

(a) The ''Z'' score (a reference loss ratio used to ensure comparability between producers) equals 2.00 or greater; or

(b) Five or more indemnified losses have occurred during the NCS base period and the cumulative loss ratio equals 1.50 or greater.

The consecutive occurrence of widespread adverse weather conditions in the Upper Midwest and Southwest, at the same time when changing U.S. farm policy has increased producer's reliance on crop insurance, has resulted in a greater awareness of the NCS program. Some producers are concerned that their recent losses will be followed by selection for NCS rate or coverage adjustments. This concern has also been echoed by producer organizations and elected representatives. FCIC had formulated a two tiered strategy to deal with these concerns. The short-term plan was to thoroughly review the 1998 NCS selections to ensure that producers who had been impacted by widespread disasters were not placed on NCS based primarily on losses associated with the disasters. For the longer term, FCIC was to survey interested parties about NCS and form a work group to recommend changes to the NCS program for the 1999 crop year. The survey was completed and the responses received reviewed. The work group was not formed because of concerns relating to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Instead, FCIC has determined to seek public comment regarding the NCS process through the **Federal Register** and this notice. Comments received in response to the original survey will be considered in conjunction with any comments received in response to this notice.

Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined this rule to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866, and, therefore, this rule has not been reviewed by OMB.

Signed in Washington, D.C., on September 12, 1997.

Kenneth D. Ackerman,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 97–24770 Filed 9–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–ANE–05]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to Pratt & Whitney JT8D series turbofan engines, that currently requires a determination of the utilization rate and coating type of the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th stage high pressure compressor (HPC) disks, and removal, inspection for corrosion, and recoating of those HPC disks based on utilization rate. This action would shorten the inspection interval for certain low utilization disks. This proposal is prompted by reports of an additional uncontained 9th stage HPC disk failure due to corrosion pitting. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent fracture of the HPC disks, which can result in uncontained release of engine fragments, inflight engine shutdown, and airframe damage.

DATE: Comments must be received by November 17, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–ANE–05, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: ''9-ad-engineprop@faa.dot.gov''. Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Pratt & Whitney, 400 Main St., East Hartford, CT 06108; telephone (860) 565–6600, fax (860) 565–4503. This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Spinney, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7175, fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All

communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 97–ANE–05.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–ANE–05, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299.

Discussion

On September 15, 1994, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued airworthiness directive AD 94–20–01, Amendment 39–9029 (59 FR 49175, September 27, 1994), applicable to Pratt & Whitney (PW) JT8D–1, –1A, –1B, –7, –7A, –7B, –9, –9A, –11, –15, –15A, –17, –17A, –17R, and –17AR turbofan engines, to require a record search, initial and repetitive on-wing and shop inspections to detect corrosion on high pressure compressor (HPC) disks, and removal from service of engines with HPC disks corroded beyond serviceable limits. That action was prompted by an investigation into an uncontained PW JT8D engine failure caused by severe corrosion on the 9th stage HPC disk. That condition, if not corrected, could result in fracture of the HPC disks, which can result in uncontained release of engine fragments, inflight engine shutdown, and airframe damage.

Since the issuance of that AD, the FAA has received a report of a Boeing 737–232 powered by JT8D–7B turbofan engines that experienced an uncontained 9th stage HPC disk rupture in December 1995 during takeoff, which resulted in aircraft damage. The investigation determined that the 9th stage HPC disk rim failed due to a fatigue crack originating from a corrosion pit on the forward surface of the rim in the bottom of a compressor blade dovetail slot, which propagated in low cycle fatigue, and eventually fractured the hub. The investigation also identified extensive corrosion pitting in multiple sites that were concentrated in the outer web and rim areas of the disk.

Airworthiness Directive 94–20–01 was published due to a similar uncontained PW JT8D series 9th stage HPC disk failure in which corrosion pitting was a factor. The investigation into this earlier failure also identified extensive corrosion on the failed 9th stage disk as well as the 8th and 10th stage disks. Corrosion pits as deep as 0.020 inch and 0.060 inch in diameter were found in some areas of the ruptured 9th stage HPC disk. This earlier investigation concluded that PW JT8D HPC disks are more susceptible to severe corrosion when operating in a low utilization profile. Low utilization operating profiles can induce formation of condensation within the engine, thereby promoting corrosion scales and pits, which adversely affect the disk fatigue lives. As a compounding influence, low utilization rates imply longer on-wing calendar intervals and less frequent engine shop visits and module disassembles.

This earlier investigation also evaluated the effectiveness of the protective coatings and lubricant/anti-gallant films used on the PW JT8D HPC disks. The FAA determined that varying degrees of corrosion resistance depends on the type of coating. As a result of this earlier investigation, the FAA issued AD 94–20–01, requiring a record search of the service history of the 8th, 9th, and 10th high pressure compressor disks, initial and repetitive on-wing and shop inspections to detect corrosion on HPC disks, and removal from service of engines with HPC disks corroded beyond serviceable limits. The inspection program of AD 94–20–01 accounts for the variability in corrosion resistance and provides separate inspection instructions and criteria depending on the type of protective coating applied.

This proposed AD would supersede AD 94–20–01 and require the same record search and inspection program but on a more conservative inspection schedule. The proposed AD would require the low utilization disks, regardless of the disk coating, to be inspected at an interval of 7 years since new, replated, or corrosion inspected (YRSNRC) in accordance with the engine manual. Currently, the inspection interval for low utilization disks is based on the disk coating and the maximum inspection interval ranges from 9 to 11 YRSNRC depending on the part number and the type of coating. The high utilization disk inspection interval remains unchanged.

The FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of PW Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, that describes on-wing and shop inspections to detect corrosion on HPC disks, and removal from service of HPC disks corroded beyond serviceable limits.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 94–20–01 to shorten the inspection interval for certain low utilization disks.

There are approximately 11,119 engines of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimated that 6,815 engines installed on aircraft of U.S. registry were affected by AD 94–20–01, and 2 work hours would be necessary to determine the utilization rate and type of surface treatment. Based on domestic fleet-wide data, the FAA estimated that approximately 8.7% or 593 engines were considered to have low utilization rates. Approximately 8.6 work hours would be required to remove these engines from the aircraft, 500 work hours to tear down, deblade, and to reassemble the engine, and 8.6 work hours to reinstall the reassembled engines. The FAA estimated 69% of the removed engines would require scrapping the disks. The FAA assumed that three disks per engine may require replacement, and the cost of a new disk would be approximately $7,000. The average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of AD 94–20–01 on U.S. operators was estimated to be $14,279,542. The cost increase between AD 94–20–01 and this proposed AD is based on the increased inspections of some low utilization disks. The FAA estimates 31% of the low utilization disks would require an additional inspection. The cost of these additional inspections is estimated to be $4,426,658.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects 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. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient

federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39–9029 (59 FR 49175, September 27, 1994) and by adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

Pratt & Whitney: Docket No. 97–ANE–05. Supersedes AD 94–20–01, Amendment 39–9029.

Applicability: Pratt & Whitney (PW) JT8D–1, –1A, –1B, –7, –7A, –7B, –9, –9A, –11, –15, –15A, –17, –17A, –17R, and –17AR turbofan engines installed on but not limited to Boeing 737 and 727 series, and McDonnell Douglas DC–9 series aircraft.

Note 1: This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each engine identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For engines that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (i) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent fracture of the high pressure compressor (HPC) disks, which can result in uncontained release of engine fragments, inflight engine shutdown, and airframe damage, accomplish the following:

(a) Within four months of the effective date of this AD, determine the fleet and sub-fleet average engine utilization rate for the 12 months of operations prior to August 17, 1994, the issue date of PW Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 6038, Revision 5, in accordance with paragraph 2.A of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(1) For fleet or sub-fleet average utilization rates that are equal to or greater than 1,300 hours per year, and equal to or greater than 900 cycles per year, perform the following:

(i) For engines or stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks that were added to a fleet or subfleet after November 28,1994, and that were previously designated as low utilization disks in accordance with PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, comply with the requirements of paragraph (d) of this AD.

(ii) Designate all other stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks as high utilization disks and comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD.

(2) For fleet or sub-fleet average utilization rates that are less than 1,300 hours per year or less than 900 cycles per year, within four months after the effective date of this AD, determine the utilization rate for each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk in accordance with paragraph 2.B.(1) of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(i) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with an initial utilization rate equal to or greater than 1,300 hours per year, and equal to or greater than 900 cycles per year, designate this disk as a high utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD.

(ii) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with an initial utilization rate less than 1,300 hours per year or less than 900 cycles per year, designate this disk as a low utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

(iii) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with an unknown initial utilization rate, designate this disk as a low utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

Note 2: Once a disk is designated as low utilization, then it must retain this designation for the life of the disk or until recoated.

(iv) For recoated or new disks, designate this disk as a high utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD.

(b) For high average utilization fleets and sub-fleets, excluding those disks identified in paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this AD, perform the following for each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk in that fleet or sub-fleet:

(1) Inspect, and recoat or replace if necessary, at the next part accessibility of the disk, in accordance with paragraph 2.D.(1)(b) and Chart A of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(2) Recalculate the fleet or sub-fleet average utilization rate at 12 month intervals after the previous date of utilization determination in accordance with paragraph 2.B of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(i) For fleet or sub-fleet average utilization rates that are equal to or greater than 1,300 hours per year, and equal to or greater than 900 cycles per year, continue to designate all stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks as high utilization disks and comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD.

(ii) For fleet or sub-fleet average utilization rates that are less than 1,300 hours per year or less than 900 cycles per year, within four months of compliance with paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, determine the utilization rate for each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk in accordance with paragraph 2.B.(1) of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, as follows:

(A) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with a utilization rate equal to or greater than 1,300 hours per year, and equal to or greater than 900 cycles per year, designate this disk as a high utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD.

(B) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with a utilization rate less than 1,300 hours per year or less than 900 cycles per year, designate this disk as a low utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

(C) For each stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disk with an unknown utilization rate, designate this disk as a low utilization disk and inspect in accordance with paragraph (d) of this AD.

Note 3: Once a disk is designated as low utilization, then it must retain this designation for the life of the disk or until recoated.

(c) For high utilization stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks, perform the following:

(1) Inspect, and recoat or replace if necessary, at the next part accessibility of the disk, in accordance with paragraph 2.D.(1)(b) and Chart A of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(2) Calculate the disk utilization rate at 12 month intervals after the previous date of utilization determination, or after installation of new or recoated disks, in accordance with paragraph 2.B.(3) of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994.

(i) For stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks designated as high utilization in accordance with (c)(2), comply with the requirements of paragraph (c)(1) of this AD.

(ii) For stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks designated as low utilization in accordance with (c)(2), comply with the requirements of paragraph (d) of this AD.

(d) For low utilization stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks, perform the following:

(1) For Nickel Cadmium coated disks listed by Part Number (P/N) in Chart B of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, and Aluminide coated disks listed by P/N in Chart C of PW ASB 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, inspect, and recoat or remove from service in accordance with PW JT8D Engine Manual, P/N 481672, at the time intervals specified in Table A of this AD.

(2) For Nickel Cadmium coated disks listed by P/N in Chart C of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, inspect and recoat or remove from service in accordance with PW JT8D Engine Manual, P/N 481672, at the time intervals specified in Table B of this AD.

(3) For Aluminide coated disks listed by P/N in Chart B of PW ASB No. 6038, Revision 5, dated August 17, 1994, inspect and recoat or remove from service in accordance with PW JT8D Engine Manual, P/N 481672, at the time intervals specified in Table C of this AD.

TABLE A.—INSPECTION INTERVAL FOR LOW UTILIZATION DISKS NICAD COATED DISKS FROM CHART B OF PW ASB NO. 6038, REVISION 5, DATED AUGUST 17, 1994, AND ALUMINIDE COATED DISKS FROM CHART C OF PW ASB NO. 6038, REVISION 5, DATED AUGUST 17, 1994

Years since new, replated or corrosion inspected (YRSNRC) per engine manual	Remove to inspect and recoat or replace
Less than or equal to 5.0 YRSNRC.	By 7 YRSNRC.
Greater than 5.0 but less than or equal to 6 YRSNRC.	Within 24 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 6 but less than or equal to 7 YRSNRC.	Within 18 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 7 but less than or equal to 8 YRSNRC.	Within 15 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 8 but less than or equal to 9 YRSNC.	Within 12 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 9 but less than or equal to 10 YRSNRC.	Before reaching 10 YRSNRC.
Greater than 10 years	Before further flight.

TABLE B.—INSPECTION INTERVAL FOR LOW UTILIZATION DISKS NICAD COATED DISKS FROM CHART C OF PW ASB NO. 6038, REVISION 5, DATED AUGUST 7, 1994.

Years since new, replated or corrosion inspected (YRSNRC) per engine manual	Remove to inspect and recoat or replace
Less than or equal to 5.0 YRSNRC.	By 7 YRSNRC.
Greater than 5.0 but less than or equal to 6 YRSNRC.	Within 24 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 6 but less than or equal to 7 YRSNRC.	Within 21 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 7 but less than or equal to 8 YRSNRC.	Within 18 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 8 but less than or equal to 9 YRSNC.	Within 15 months of the effective date of this AD.

TABLE B.—INSPECTION INTERVAL FOR LOW UTILIZATION DISKS NICAD COATED DISKS FROM CHART C OF PW ASB NO. 6038, REVISION 5, DATED AUGUST 7, 1994.—Continued

Years since new, replated or corrosion inspected (YRSNRC) per engine manual	Remove to inspect and recoat or replace
Greater than 9 but less than or equal to 10 YRSNRC.	Within 12 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 10 but less than or equal to 11 YRSNRC.	Before reaching 11 YRSNRC.
Greater than 11 years	Before further flight.

TABLE C.—INSPECTION INTERVAL FOR LOW UTILIZATION DISKS ALUMINIDE COATED DISKS FROM CHART B OF PW ASB NO. 6038, REVISION 5, DATED AUGUST 17, 1994.

Years since new, replated or corrosion inspected (YRSNRC) per engine manual	Remove to inspect and recoat or replace
Less than or equal to 5.0 YRSNRC.	By 7 YRSNRC.
Greater than 5.0 but less than or equal to 6 YRSNRC.	Within 24 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 6 but less than or equal to 7 YRSNRC.	Within 18 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 7 but less than or equal to 8 YRSNRC.	Within 12 months of the effective date of this AD.
Greater than 8 but less than or equal to 9 YRSNC.	Before reaching 9 YRSNRC.
Greater than 9 years	Before further flight.

(e) For stage 7 through stage 12 HPC disks that have been recoated in accordance with paragraphs (b)(1), (c)(1), or (d)(1) of this AD, designate these disks as high utilization and perform the following:

(1) For disks installed in an engine that is part of a high utilization fleet, comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this AD.

(2) For disks installed in an engine that is part of a low utilization fleet, comply with the requirements of paragraph (c) of this AD.

(f) For the purpose of this AD, recoat of an HPC disk is defined as removal and application of new plating or coating in accordance with Sections 72–36–41, Repair 02; 72–36–42, Repair 02; 72–36–43, Repair 03; 72–36–44, Repair 03; 72–36–45, Repair 03; or 72–36–46, Repair 03, as applicable, of PW JT8D Engine Manual P/N 481672.

(g) For the purpose of this AD, part accessibility is defined as the removal of the disk from the engine and deblading of that disk.

(h) For the purpose of this AD, a sub-fleet is defined as any individual aircraft or any portion of an operator's fleet that operates in a separate and unique route structure, characterized by different flight lengths, frequencies, or geographic location.

(i) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Engine Certification Office. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Engine Certification Office.

Note 4: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Engine Certification Office.

(j) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on September 10, 1997.

Mark C. Fulmer,

Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–24799 Filed 9–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

15 CFR Part 295

[Docket No. 970822201–7201–01]

RIN 0693–AB44

Advanced Technology Program

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Technology Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology requests comments on proposed revisions to the regulations which implement the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), found at part 295 of title 15 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Major changes proposed today include an increase in the cost-sharing requirement for large companies applying as single proposers in future competitions; modification of the ATP evaluation criteria for project selection to place greater emphasis on joint ventures and consortia with a broad range of participants; and changes in the valuation of transfers between separately-owned joint venture members and applies to transfers of goods, including computer software, and services provided by the transferor related to the maintenance of those goods, when those goods or services are