Administrator for verification/authorization to make the change. Upon receiving verification/authorization, the IANA Functions Operator would then edit and generate a new root zone file. The Root Key Operator function would be physically collocated with the IANA Functions Operator, responsible for generation of the KSK, signing the root keyset, and publishing the public key information. The IANA Functions Operator would also generate the ZSK and sign the root zone file. After signing the root zone file, the IANA Functions Operator would send the signed root zone file to the Root Zone Distributor (formally Root Zone Maintainer), which, in turn, would distribute it to the 13 root server operators. Under this process flow, the Administrator would perform the verification/authorization functions as in the other models.

**Proposed Process Flow 5** (see diagram at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/DNS/DNSSECproposal5.pdf). This model maintains the existing roles and responsibilities with respect to the management of the authoritative root zone file.[26] That is, the existing responsibilities for editing and generating the root zone file that now reside with the Root Zone Maintainer would remain the same with the additional/new responsibility of Root Zone Signer and collocating the Root Key Operator function. The Root Zone Maintainer would continue to be responsible for distributing the now-signed root zone file to the 13 root server operators.

Thus, under this model the process would operate as follows: After receiving a change request from a TLD operator, the IANA Functions Operator would process and send a request to the Administrator for verification/authorization to make the change. Upon receiving verification/authorization, the Root Zone Maintainer would then edit and generate a new root zone file. The Root Key Operator responsibility would be physically collocated with the Root Zone Maintainer, responsible for generation of the KSK, signing the root keyset, and publishing the public key information. The Root Zone Maintainer would also generate the ZSK and sign the root zone file. After signing the root zone file, the Root Zone Maintainer would distribute it to the 13 root server operators. Under this process flow, the Administrator would perform the verification/authorization functions as in the other models.

**Proposed Process Flow 6** (see diagram at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/DNS/DNSSECproposal6.pdf). The proposed process flow models one through three illustrate the important role played by the Root Key Operator. As presented, they depict the RKO responsibilities as being discharged by a single entity. In process flows four and five, the RKO responsibilities are collocated with either the IANA Functions Operator or the Root Zone Maintainer. However, cryptographic mechanisms exist that theoretically would permit two or more entities to participate in the RKO procedures, known as multi-signature technique, no matter where the RKO responsibilities are located.[27] Such a shared key framework is commonly referred to as an ''M of N'' approach, in which ''M'' is the minimum number of those entities that must participate in order to generate and use the key in question, and ''N'' represents the number of entities that share control of the key. In an M of N approach, only a predetermined subset of the key shares is required to generate a signature. For example, a three (3) of five (5) scheme would include five parties (N) with distinct key shares, but any three (M) of the five parties are required to generate a valid signature.[28]

The M of N approach could theoretically be applied to the KSK, the ZSK, or both. However, increasing the number of participants under this approach increases the complexities of the key management process. Because the ZSK would be used much more frequently than the KSK, Process Flow 6 applies the M of N approach only to management of the KSK. It should be noted that this cryptographic approach could be applied to any of the previous process flow models.

Process Flow 6 depicts the multi-signature technique as applied to Process Flow 1. The N entities would participate in the generation of the KSK key pair, and each would retain a share of the private key. Generating a signature with the KSK, such as signing a new ZSK, would require participation of M key shares.

Process Flow 6 does not propose specific values for either M or N; however, these parameters would need to be resolved prior to implementation of such a framework. This would entail deciding, among other things, (a) how many total RKOs (N) would be technically feasible; (b) what subset of these (M) would be reasonable or appropriate to enable reconstitution of the key; and (c) what other attributes would be necessary from a technical and policy standpoint to carry out this responsibility. The Department invites comments regarding this technique and its application at the root zone level.

[FR Doc. E8–23974 Filed 10–8–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–60–S**

[26] Under the Cooperative Agreement with the Department, VeriSign submitted a proposal substantially similar to Process Flow 5 for the Department of Commerce's consideration on September 23, 2008. That proposal is pending before the Department. This proposal is available at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/DNS/VeriSignDNSSECProposal.pdf.

[27] *See* Tal Rabin, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, ''A Simplified Approach to Threshold and Proactive RSA'' (1998)(Rabin), http://www.research.ibm.com/security/prsa.ps (last checked September 24, 2008); Adi Shamir, ''How to Share a Secret,'' Communications of the ACM, Volume 22, Issue 11, 612-13 (R. Rivest, eds., Nov. 1979)(discussion of a mathematical model that facilitates dividing a set of data in a certain number pieces that allows the data set to be easily reconstructed); T. Keisler and L. Harn, ''RSA Blocking and Multisignature Schemes with No Bit Expansion,'' Electronic Letters, Volume 26, Issue 18, 1490-91 (Aug. 1990)(describes one example of a multi-signature technique).

[28] *See* Rabin, *supra* note 27; for further information on this technique *see generally*, Elaine Barker, William Barker, William Burr, William Polk, and Miles Smid, NIST, ''Recommendation for Key Management - Part 1: General (revised)'' NIST Special Publication 800–57 Part 1 (May 2006), http:/ /csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/ 800–57/SP800–57-Part1.pdf (last checked September 24, 2008) (this refers to this class of techniques as ''split knowledge procedures'').

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### United States Patent and Trademark Office

**[Docket No. PTO–C–2008–0040]**

### Performance Review Board (PRB)

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office.

**ACTION:** Notice

**SUMMARY:** In conformance with the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4), the United States Patent and Trademark Office announces the appointment of persons to serve as members of its Performance Review Board.

**ADDRESSES:** Director, Human Capital Management, Office of Human Resources, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karen Karlinchak at (571) 272–6200.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The membership of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Performance Review Board is as follows:

Margaret J. A. Peterlin, Chair, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Stephen S. Smith, Vice Chair, Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

John J. Doll, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Lynne G. Beresford, Commissioner for Trademarks, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Wendy R. Garber, Acting Chief Information Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

James A. Toupin, General Counsel, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Lois E. Boland, Director, Office of Intellectual Property Policy and Enforcement, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Barry K. Hudson, Chief Financial Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Jefferson D. Taylor, Director, Office of Governmental Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Deborah S. Cohn, Deputy Commissioner for Trademark

Operations, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Margaret A. Focarino, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Kenneth Berman, Director of Information Technology, International Broadcasting Bureau.

Dated: October 1, 2008.

**Jon W. Dudas,**

*Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[FR Doc. E8–24065 Filed 10–8–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–16–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Air Force

### Active Duty Service Determinations for Civilian or Contratual Groups

**SUMMARY:** On September 24, 2008, the Secretary of the Air Force, acting as Executive Agent of the Secretary of Defense, determined that the service of the group known as the ''Vietnamese Citizens Who Served in Vietnam Under Contract With the U.S. Armed Forces and Were Assigned to Reconnaissance Teams and Exploitation Forces Within the Military Assistance Command, Studies and Observations Group (MACVSOG), Ground Operations OP–35, Command and Control (C&C), From January 1964 to April 1972.''

Shall not be considered ''active duty'' for purposes of all laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Contact Mr. James D. Johnston at the Secretary of the Air Force Personnel Council (SAFPC); 1535 Command Drive, EE Wing, 3d Fl.; Andrews AFB, MD 20762–7002.

**Bao-Anh Trinh,**

*Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. E8–23966 Filed 10–8–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–05–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

### Notice of Partially Closed Meeting of the Secretary of the Navy Advisory Panel; Correction

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Navy originally published a document in the **Federal Register** on September 05, 2008, announcing a partially closed meeting of the Secretary of the Navy Advisory Panel (SNAP). The Department of the Navy published a correction notice in the **Federal Register** on October 1, 2008, announcing a change in the date and location of the meeting. The time of the meeting contained in the correction notice of October 1, 2008 has now changed.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Colonel Caroline Simkins-Mullins, SECNAV Advisory Panel, Office of Program and Process Assessment, 1000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350, telephone: 703–697–9154.

**Correction**

In the **Federal Register** of October 01, 2008, in FR Doc. E8–23037, make the following changes:

1. In the first column, on page 57086, correct the **DATES** caption to read as follows:

''**DATES:** The meeting will be held on October 16, 2008 from 9:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The morning sessions on Acquisition Structure from 9:45 a.m.–11:30 a.m. will be opened. The afternoon sessions will be closed.''

2. In the first column, on page 57086, correct the **ADDRESSES** caption to read as follows:

''**ADDRESSES**: The meeting will be held in Room 1E868, in the Pentagon, 1000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350. Public access is limited due to the Pentagon Security requirements. Any individual wishing to attend the meeting must contact LCDR Cary Knox, USN at 703–693–0463 or Colonel Simkins-Mullins at 703–697–9154 no later than October 9, 2008. Members of the public who do not have Pentagon access will be required to provide the following information by October 9, 2008 in order to obtain a visitor badge: Name, Date of Birth and Social Security Number. Public transportation is recommended as public parking is not available. Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting must enter through the Pentagon Metro Entrance between 9:10 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. Members of the public will need two forms of identification in order to receive a visitors badge and meet their escort. Members of the public will be escorted to Room 1E868 to attend the open sessions of the Advisory Panel and shall remain with designated escorts at all times while on the Pentagon Reservation. Members of the public will be escorted back to the Pentagon Metro Entrance at 11:30 a.m.''

Dated: October 3, 2008.

**T. M. Cruz,**

*Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate Generals Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. E8–23946 Filed 10–8–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**SUMMARY:** The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before November 10, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Education Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10222, Washington, DC 20503. Commenters are encouraged to submit responses electronically by e-mail to *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov* or via fax to (202) 395–6974. Commenters should include the following subject line in their response ''Comment: [insert OMB number], [insert abbreviated collection name, e.g., ''Upward Bound Evaluation'']. Persons submitting comments electronically should not submit paper copies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or