integrity. The individual providing the signature should know that he/she is signing the document, and the signature process should be concise enough to assure that the individual initiating the process is the same person concluding the process. Systems that produce electronic records should have provisions that inform individuals electronically signing the document that they are entering their signatures. This process should be separate from the act of opening the document because most records required by NRC are produced by other individuals and may be produced and revised over an unspecified time.

The signature process should be such that it is uniquely tied to the individual whose signature is required and the period that the signature process is open should be short enough to assure that the individual starting the process is the individual completing the process. If the signature is required to demonstrate review of specific information, then completion of the electronic signature should also block alteration of that information. Subsequent changes to the information should require a new electronic signature and not overwrite previous versions of the signed document. If the document must be dated and signed to meet the regulations, the electronic signature process should also affix the date and time to each electronic signature.

Because these electronic records are kept at the facility and not sent to the NRC they have to be electronically inspected at the facility. Printing an electronic record with an electronic signature would not constitute a complete and accurate record because critical electronic information associated with the electronic record would not be available for inspection.

B. Issues for Discussion

The following is a listing of issues regarding the use of electronic signatures on documents related to the medical use of byproduct material. Each issue is followed by one or more questions about existing practices related to standards, authentication, non-repudiation, data integrity, records inspection, and improvements to software. The questions listed below are not meant to be a complete or final list of issues to be considered but are provided to initiate comments. Stakeholders are requested to comment on and recommend additions, deletions, or modifications to the issues listed below; and propose considerations for implementation of electronic signatures regarding each issue, as appropriate. These issues, and other relevant and substantial issues identified by commenters, will serve as the basis of discussion at the public meetings, if these meetings are scheduled in the future. Public feedback will also be used in developing options for implementation.

Issue No. 1—Standards

Q1.1 What standards for electronic signatures in medical records are in use or under development?
Q1.2 How do these standards address the principles of authentication, non-repudiation, data integrity, and access for inspection, as described in Issues No. 2 through 5, below?
Q1.3 Do these standards consider any additional key principles?

Issue No. 2—Authentication

Q2.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the signature process is uniquely tied to the individual whose signature is required?

Issue No. 3—Non-Repudiation

Q3.1 For software applications currently in use, what provisions does the licensee use to inform persons electronically signing documents that they are entering their signature?

Issue No. 4—Data Integrity

Q4.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the document being electronically signed cannot be changed after it is signed?
Q4.2 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that subsequent changes to the electronically signed document require a new electronic signature and cannot overwrite previous versions of the signed document?
Q4.3 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the electronic signature process affixes the date and time to each electronic signature?

Issue No. 5—Records Inspection

Q5.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that electronically signed documents and all revisions to the electronically signed documents are accessible for inspection?
Q5.2 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that electronically signed documents and all revisions to the electronically signed documents are retained for 3 years?
Amended Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program


ACTION: Notice of final action adopting the management plan elements of the Bitterroot River Subbasin Plan into the Council’s Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 4(h) of the Northwest Power Act, the Council has amended its Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program to add the Bitterroot River Subbasin Plan. The program as amended may be found on the Council’s Web site at http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program and then, for the subbasin plan elements and relevant decision documents in particular, at http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/subbasinplanning/Default.htm. Further information and an explanation of this amendment process may be found in the documents on that page or by contacting the Northwest Power and Conservation Council at (503) 222–5161 or toll free (800) 452–5161.

Stephen L. Crow, Executive Director.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available


Extension:

Form N–CSR, SEC File No. 270–512, OMB Control No. 3235–0570.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Form N–CSR (17 CFR 249.331 and 274.128) is a combined reporting form used by management investment companies to file certified shareholder reports under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 et seq.) (“Investment Company Act”) and under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) (“Exchange Act”). Form N–CSR is to be used for reports under Section 30(b)(2) of the Investment Company Act and Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, filed pursuant to rule 30b2–1(a) under the Investment Company Act (17 CFR 270.30b2–1(a)). Reports on Form N–CSR are to be filed with the Commission not later than 10 days after the transmission to stockholders of any report that is required to be transmitted to stockholders under rule 30e–1 under the Investment Company Act (17 CFR 270.30e–1).

The Commission estimates that there are 6,640 reports filed on Form N–CSR annually and that the average number of portfolios referenced in each filing is 3.75. The Commission further estimates that the hour burden for preparing and filing a report on Form N–CSR is 7.62 hours per portfolio. Given that filings on Form N–CSR are filed semi-annually, filings on Form N–CSR require 15.24 hours per portfolio each year. The total annual hour burden for Form N–CSR, therefore, is estimated to be 154,686 hours.

The current total annual cost burden to respondents for outside professionals associated with the collection of data relating to Form N–CSR is currently $1,119,001 and the new total annual cost burden to respondents is estimated to be $1,556,401, representing an increase of $437,400.

The information collection requirements imposed by Form N–CSR are mandatory. Responses to the collection of information will not be kept confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

Please direct general comments regarding the above information to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or send an e-mail to: Shagufta Ahmed at Shagufta.Ahmed@omb.eop.gov; and (ii) Jeffrey Heslop, Acting Director/CIO, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Remi Pavlik-Simon, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312, or send an e-mail to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov. Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.


Florence E. Harmon,
Deputy Secretary.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available


Extension:

Form 5 OMB Control No. 3235–0362 SEC File No. 270–323.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget this request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Under Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial