the public to allow the Commission to discuss applications for the UNESCO Young Professionals Program. This call will be closed pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6) because it will involve discussions of information of a personal and financial nature regarding the relative merits of individual applicants where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.

For more information contact Elizabeth Kanick, Executive Director of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Washington, DC 20037. Telephone: (202) 663–0026; Fax: (202) 663–0035; E-mail: DCUNESCO@state.gov.

Dated: January 14, 2011.

Elizabeth Kanick, Executive Director, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2011–1546 Filed 1–25–11; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

AGENCY Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection(s): NAS Data Release Request

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. The Federal Register Notice for a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on September 22, 2010, vol. 75, no. 183, page 57828. The information enables the FAA to evaluate the validity of the user’s request for National Airspace (NAS) data from FAA systems and equipment.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by February 25, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carla Scott on (202) 267–9895, or by e-mail at: Carla.Scott@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 2120–0668.
Title: NAS Data Release Request.
Form Numbers: FAA Form 1200–5.
Type of Review: Renewal of an information collection.

Background: This data collection is the genesis for granting approval to release filtered NAS data. The information provided sets the criteria for the FAA Data Release Request Committee (DRRC) to approve or disapprove individual requests for NAS data. The information submitted by the requestor determines the requestor’s eligibility to use FAA NAS data. The agency currently uses the collected information to determine suitability for procuring NAS data for use in various evaluations.

Respondents: Approximately 15 data requestors.

Frequency: Information is collected on occasion.

Estimated Average Burden per Response: 3 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 45 hours.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to the attention of the Desk Officer, Department of Transportation/FAA, and sent via electronic mail to oira_submission@omb.eop.gov, or faxed to (202)395–6974, or mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA’s performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB’s clearance of this information collection.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 19, 2011.

Carla Scott,
FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, AES–200.

[FR Doc. 2011–1456 Filed 1–25–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee—Public Teleconference

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee Teleconference.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C. App. 2), notice is hereby given of a teleconference of the Space Transportation Operations Working Group (STOWG) of the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee (COMSTAC). The teleconference will take place on Thursday, February 17, 2011, starting at 11 a.m. Eastern Standard Time. Individuals who plan to participate should contact Susan Lender, DFO, (the Contact Person listed below) by phone or e-mail for the teleconference call in number.

The proposed agenda for this teleconference is to continue the discussion started during the October 6, 2010, working group meeting, and continued during the December 8, 2010, teleconference. This discussion will center on the orbital debris questions asked by the FAA; it will also include a look at responses to the Concept of Operation for Global Space Vehicle Debris Threat Management report.

Interested members of the public may submit relevant written statements for the COMSTAC working group members to consider under the advisory process. Statements may concern the issues and agenda items mentioned above or additional issues that may be relevant for the U.S. commercial space transportation industry. Interested parties wishing to submit written statements should contact Susan Lender, DFO, (the Contact Person listed below) in writing (mail or e-mail) by February 11, 2011, so that the information can be made available to COMSTAC members for their review and consideration before the February 17, 2011, teleconference. Written statements should be supplied in the following formats: One hard copy with original signature or one electronic copy via e-mail.

An agenda will be posted on the FAA Web site at http://www.faa.gov/go/ast. Individuals who plan to participate and need special assistance should inform the Contact Person listed below in advance of the meeting.
Bentley estimated that 1,115 model year 2005–2008 Bentley Arnage and Azure passenger cars manufactured between January 13, 2004 and November 9, 2007 are involved. Bentley also stated that based on its preliminary investigation it believes that only 50% of those vehicles have the subject noncompliance.

Paragraph S7.8.5.3(b) of FMVSS No. 108 requires in pertinent part:

S7.8.5.3 Visual/optical aiming. Each visually/optically aimable headlamp shall be designed to conform to the following requirements:

* * *

(b) Horizontal aim, lower beam. There shall be no adjustment of horizontal aim unless the headlamp is equipped with a horizontal VHAD. If the headlamp has a VHAD, it shall be set to zero.

Bentley explained that the noncompliance with FMVSS No. 108 is that horizontal aim adjustment of the subject lower beams is possible due to the absence of a blanking cap over the lower beam horizontal adjustment screw.

Bentley also stated that they discovered this noncompliance as a result of a special production line quality audit investigation.

Bentley further stated that it believes that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for three reasons. First, the adjustment screw is always hidden by an engine cover when the vehicle’s hood is open. Second, when the engine cover is removed the screw is still hidden down a small dark guide hole, so the screw is not immediately visible and it is not immediately obvious that a disabling cap is not present. Last, the workshop manual clearly identifies that this screw is not functional on North American specification vehicles so no vehicle repairer would ever need to try to search for and adjust the screw in question.

Bentley also has informed NHTSA that it has corrected the problem that caused this noncompliance.

In summation, Bentley states that it believes that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and that no corrective action is warranted.

NHTSA Decision

NHTSA agrees with Bentley that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. The only possible safety risk is that someone could locate and improperly adjust the lower beam horizontal adjustment mechanism. That risk is extremely small. The location of the horizontal adjuster makes it difficult to access—and there is no information in the owner’s manual or given to the dealer which indicates the location.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, NHTSA agrees with Bentley that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Therefore, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

(Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.)

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that Bentley has met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 headlamps noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, Bentley’s petition is granted and the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Further, the lamps as originally installed in the subject vehicles are properly aimed and the need for re-aiming is unlikely. In addition, it is unlikely that owners will try to adjust the headlamp aim since the owner’s manual instructs drivers to take the vehicle to the dealer if the lamps need to be re-aimed. Because dealers are generally not aware that the horizontal aim can be adjusted, they are likely to replace the lamps that may need adjustment. Moreover, to the extent this notice increases awareness on the part of owners or dealers that the horizontal adjustment mechanism is present on these vehicles, the notice will also inform them that any horizontal adjustment issue should be addressed by replacing the lamps and/or contacting Bentley.