

NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's request and has concluded that application of the regulation in these circumstances is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) special circumstances are present.

In addition, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

Accordingly, the Commission hereby grants the licensees an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) for PBAPS Unit Nos. 2 and 3, in that updates to the combined UFSAR for PBAPS, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, may be submitted within 6 months following completion of each PBAPS Unit 2 refueling outage, not to exceed 24 months from the previous submittal.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (66 FR 41054).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of September 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**

*Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-22866 Filed 9-11-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Meeting to Solicit Stakeholder Input on the Use of Risk Information in the Nuclear Materials and Waste Regulatory Process

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) is developing an approach for using risk information in the nuclear materials and waste regulatory process. As part of this effort, the NRC staff conducted case studies on a spectrum of activities in the nuclear materials and waste arenas to (1) determine what has been done and what could be done in NMSS to alter

the regulatory approach in a risk-informed manner and (2) establish a framework for using a risk-informed approach in the materials and waste arenas by testing a set of draft screening criteria, and determining the feasibility of safety goals.

NRC staff is in the process of completing the case studies and finalizing the screening criteria. The staff is also beginning to formulate draft safety goals for materials and waste applications. The purpose of this meeting is to: (1) Present to stakeholders the integrated outcome of the case studies, including the final screening considerations and an early draft of safety goals, and (2) solicit recommendations and comments on how NRC should proceed with incorporating risk information into its regulatory framework. The tentative outline for the meeting is as follows:

1. Poster exhibition of case studies
2. Opening remarks
3. Discuss case study insights and integrated outcome
  - a. Final screening considerations
  - b. Process improvements
  - c. Tools, data, and methods
  - d. Draft safety goals
4. Receive comments, feedback, and recommendations
5. Closing remarks

The meeting is open to the public; all interested parties may attend and provide comments. Persons who wish to attend the meeting should contact Marissa Bailey no later than October 19, 2001.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on October 25, 2001, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Auditorium, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. From 8 a.m. to 9 a.m., a poster exhibition session will be held in the Auditorium lobby so that participants can discuss specific case study results with the staff.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marissa Bailey, Mail Stop T-8-A-23, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Telephone: (301) 415-7648; Internet: MGB@NRC.GOV.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The NRC staff's case study approach, the draft screening criteria, and the case study areas under consideration are described in the "Plan for Using Risk Information in the Materials and Waste Arenas: Case Studies" which has been published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 66782, November 7, 2000). Copies of this plan are also available on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/NMSS/IMNS/>

[riskassessment.html](http://www.nrc.gov/NMSS/IMNS/riskassessment.html). Written requests for single copies of the case study plan and draft case study reports may also be submitted to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, Risk Task Group, Mail Stop T-8-A-23, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Draft reports for each of the case studies will also be available on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/NMSS/IMNS/riskassessment.html> by October 1, 2001.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 6th day of September, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Lawrence E. Kokajko,**

*Section Chief, Risk Task Group, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 01-22864 Filed 9-11-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Investment Company Act Release No. 25151; 812-12596]**

### BHF Finance (Delaware) Inc.; Notice of Application

September 6, 2001

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

**ACTION:** Notice of application for exemption under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") from all provisions of the Act.

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** Applicant, BHF Finance (Delaware) Inc. ("BHF Finance"), seeks an order to permit BHF Finance to sell securities and use the proceeds to finance the business activities of its prospective parent company, Deutsche Postbank ("Postbank"), and certain companies controlled by Postbank.

**FILING DATES:** The application was filed on July 30, 2001. Applicant has agreed to file an amendment during the notice period, the substance of which is reflected in this notice.

**HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING:** An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on September 27, 2001, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicant in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of

service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary, Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609, Applicant, 590 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John L. Sullivan, Senior Counsel, at (202) 942-0681, or Janet M. Grossnickle, Branch Chief, at (202) 942-0564 (Office of Investment Company Regulation, Division of Investment Management).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee at the Commission's Public Reference Branch, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0102 (tel. 202-942-8090).

### Applicant's Representations

1. Postbank is a commercial bank organized under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany ("Germany"). Postbank provides, directly or through its subsidiaries, a broad spectrum of financial services to corporations and private clients. Postbank has established itself as one of Germany's leading retail banks with consolidated total assets, as of December 31, 2000, of approximately DM 134 billion.

2. BHF Finance, a Delaware corporation, is the wholly-owned subsidiary of BHF (USA) Holdings, Inc. ("BHF Holdings"), a Delaware corporation, which is the wholly-owned subsidiary of BHF-Bank Aktiengesellschaft ("BHF-Bank"), BHF (USA) Capital Corporation ("BHF Capital"), a Delaware corporation that extends commercial credit to third parties, is also a wholly-owned subsidiary of BHF Holdings. Pursuant to a stock purchase agreement between BHF-Bank and Postbank, dated June 29, 2001, BHF-Bank will sell all of the issued and outstanding shares of common stock of BHF Holdings to Postbank. Upon the closing of this stock purchase agreement ("Closing"), Postbank will own all of the outstanding shares of common stock of BHF Holdings, and BHF Finance and BHF Capital will be indirect wholly-owned subsidiaries of Postbank.<sup>1</sup> Applicant anticipates the Closing to occur on September 30, 2001.

<sup>1</sup> After the Closing, BHF Finance and BHF Capital will change their names to PB Finance (Delaware) Inc. and PB (USA) Capital Corporation, respectively.

3. BHF Finance proposes to issue commercial paper in the United States pursuant to the exemption contained in section 3(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("1933 Act"). BHF Finance may also offer debt securities other than commercial paper or non-voting preferred stock in the United States. After the Closing, BHF Finance intends to lend the proceeds to or invest the proceeds in Postbank, BHF Capital, and other companies controlled by Postbank within the meaning of rule 3a-5(b)(3) under the Act ("Controlled Companies"). Rule 3a-5 generally exempts finance subsidiaries of operating companies from the definition of investment company.

4. Any issuance of debt securities or non-voting preferred stock by BHF Finance will be guaranteed unconditionally by Postbank with a guarantee that meets the requirements of rule 3a-5(a)(1) or (2), respectively ("Guarantee"). In accordance with rule 3a-5(a)(5), at least 85% of any cash or cash equivalents raised by BHF Finance will be invested in or loaned to Postbank, Controlled Companies, and after the order requested by the application has been issued, BHF Capital, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than six months after BHF Finance's receipt of such cash or cash equivalents. In accordance with rule 3a-5(a)(6), all investments by BHF Finance, including temporary investments, will be made in Government Securities (as defined in the Act), securities of Postbank or of Controlled Companies and, after the order requested by the application has been issued, BHF Capital, or debt securities that are exempted from the provisions of the 1933 Act by section 3(a)(3) of the 1993 Act.

5. In connection with BHF Finance's offering of securities guaranteed by Postbank, Postbank will submit to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of New York or the Federal court located in the County of New York, State of New York and will appoint an agent to accept any process which may be served in any action based upon Postbank's obligations to BHF Finance as described in the application. Such consent to jurisdiction and such appointment of an authorized agent to accept service of process will be irrevocable until all accounts due and to become due with respect to securities issued by BHF Finance as described in the application have been paid.

### Applicant's Legal Analysis

1. BHF Finance requests relief under section 6(c) of the Act for an exemption from all provisions of the Act. Rule 3a-

5 under the Act provides an exemption from the definition of investment company for certain companies organized primarily to finance the business operations of their parent companies or companies controlled by their parent companies.

2. Rule 3a-5(b)(3)(i) in relevant part defines a "company controlled by the parent company" to be a corporation, partnership, or joint venture that is not considered an investment company under section 3(a) of the Act or that is excepted or exempted by order from the definition of investment company by section 3(b) of the Act or by the rules and regulations under section 3(a). Certain of Postbank's subsidiaries, after the Closing, will not fit within the definition of "companies controlled by the parent company" because they derive their non-investment company status from section 3(c) of the Act. In addition, after the Closing, Postbank will engage in certain activities (including certain investment activities) through BHF Capital. BHF Capital has no outstanding securities other than those owned indirectly by Postbank (excluding short-term paper, directors' qualifying shares, and debt securities owned by the Small Business Administration). BHF Capital would be eligible for exemption under rule 3a-3 under the Act, except that Postbank is a foreign bank.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, BHF Finance requests exemptive relief to permit it to lend the proceeds of its debt offerings to certain subsidiaries of Postbank that are excluded from the definition of investment company by virtue of section 3(c) and subsidiaries that would be excluded by virtue of rule 3a-3, but for Postbank's status as their parent company. BHF Finance states that, after the Closing, neither itself, nor Postbank, nor BHF Capital will engage primarily in investment company activities.

3. Section 6(c) of the Act, in pertinent part, provides that the Commission, by order upon application, may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any person, security or transaction, or any class or classes of persons, securities or transactions, from any provision or provisions of the Act

<sup>2</sup> Rule 3a-3 generally exempts an issuer from the definition of investment company if all of its outstanding securities (other than short-term paper, directors' qualifying shares, and debt securities owned by the Small Business Administration) are owned by an eligible parent company. A parent company generally is eligible if it meets certain asset and income tests and it is (i) not an investment company as defined in section 3(a) of the Act; (ii) excluded from the definition of investment company by section 3(b) of the Act; or (iii) deemed not to be an investment company under rule 3a-1 of the Act.

to the extent that such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the Act. BHF Finance submits that its exemptive request meets the standards set out in section 6(c).

#### Applicant's Condition

BHF Finance agrees that the order granting the requested relief will be subject to the following condition:

BHF Finance will comply with all of the provisions of rule 3a-5 under the Act, except paragraph (b)(3)(i) to the extent that BHF finance will be permitted to invest in or make loans to entities that do not meet the portion of the definition of "company controlled by the parent company" solely because they are:

(1) subsidiaries of Postbank that would be excluded from the definition of investment company by virtue of rule 3a-3 under the Act, but for Postbank's status as their parent company; or

(2) corporations, partnerships, and joint ventures that are excluded from the definition of investment company by section 3(c)(1), (2), (4), (6) or (7) of the Act, provided that any such entity:

(a) if excluded from the definition of investment company pursuant to section 3(c)(1) or section 3(c)(7) of the Act, will be engaged solely in lending, leasing or related activities (such as entering into credit derivatives to manage the credit risk exposures of its lending and leasing activities) and will not be structured as means of avoiding regulation under the Act; and

(b) if excluded from the definition of investment company pursuant to section 3(c)(6) of the Act, will not be engaged primarily, directly or indirectly, in one or more of the businesses described in section 3(c)(5) of the Act.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

**Margaret H. McFarland,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-22858 Filed 9-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**Federal Register** citation of previous announcement: [to be published]

*Status:* Closed meeting.

*Place:* 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC.

*Date Previously Announced:* September 6, 2001.

*Change in the Meeting:* Time change.

The closed meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 11, 2001 at 10 a.m. time has been changed to Tuesday, September 11, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items. For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary (202) 942-7070.

Dated: September 10, 2001.

**Jonathan G. Katz,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-22979 Filed 9-10-01; 12:03 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

## OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. WTO/D-213]

### WTO Dispute Settlement Proceedings Regarding Countervailing Duties on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat products From Germany

**AGENCY:** Office of the United States Trade Representative.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that on August 8, 2001, the European Communities (EC) requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO Agreement). The request relates to countervailing duties imposed by the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce) with respect to the countervailing duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Germany (corrosion-resistant steel order), and Commerce's decision not to revoke that order. The EC alleges that the decision not to revoke the order, as well as certain aspect of Commerce's sunset review procedure which led to the decision, are inconsistent with Articles 10, 11.9, 21 (notably paragraphs 1 and 3), and 32.5 of the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement), and Article XVI:4 of the WTO Agreement. USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute.

**DATES:** Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings,

comments should be submitted on or before October 12, 2001, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments to Sandy McKinzy, Monitoring and Enforcement Unit, Office of the General Counsel, Room 122, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC, 20508, Attn: Corrosion-Resistant Steel Dispute. Telephone: (202) 395-3582.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William D. Hunter, Associate General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC, 20508. Telephone: (202) 395-3582.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 127(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)) requires that notice and opportunity for comment be provided after the United States receives a request for the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel. Consistent with this obligation, USTR is providing notice that the EC has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel pursuant to the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding. Such panel, which would hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report on its findings and recommendations within six to nine months after it is established.

#### Major Issues Raised by the EC

In its sunset review of the corrosion-resistant steel order, Commerce determined that revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of countervailable subsidies at a rate of 0.54 *ad valorem*. The EC alleges that this rate is below the 1 percent *de minimis* standard applicable to countervailing duty investigations of Article 11.9 of the SCM Agreement, which, the EC asserts, applies to sunset reviews. Accordingly, the EC alleges that Commerce's decision not to revoke the order was inconsistent with Article 11.9. In addition, the EC alleges that because Commerce did not demonstrate that subsidies would increase above the *de minimis* level if the order were revoked, Commerce acted inconsistently with Article 21.3 of the SCM Agreement.

The EC also alleges that certain provisions of U.S. countervailing duty law authorizing the self-initiation of sunset reviews by Commerce are inconsistent with Article 21.3. Specifically, the EC refers to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1675(c), and section 351.218 of Commerce's regulations, 19 C.F.R. 351.218. According to the EC,