

settlements, in excess of the avoided costs of litigation, but not for litigation expenses. The Commission rather concludes that these special rules should not apply to cost arising in other kinds of litigation. To receive recognition of its avoided costs of litigation, a carrier must make a demonstration in a request for special relief.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-24517 Filed 9-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC).

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The FDIC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). Currently, the FDIC is soliciting comments concerning an information collection titled "Dispute Resolution Neutrals Questionnaire."

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 17, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Tamara R. Manly, Management Analyst (Regulatory Analysis), Attention: Comments/OES, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 550 7th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20429. Comments may be hand-delivered to the guard station at the rear of the 17th Street Building (located on F Street), on business days between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (Fax number (202) 898-3838; Internet address: comments@fdic.gov).

A copy of the comments may also be submitted to the OMB desk officer for the FDIC: Alexander Hunt, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 3208, Washington, D.C. 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tamara R. Manly, at the address identified above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Proposal to renew the following currently approved collection of information:

Title: Dispute Resolution Neutrals Questionnaire.

OMB Number: 3064-0107.

Frequency of Response: Occasional.

Affected Public: Parties wishing to be considered for inclusion on the FDIC's Roster of Dispute Resolution Neutrals.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 100.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.5 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 50 hours.

General Description of Collection: The FDIC's Roster of Dispute Resolution Neutrals is part of its Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program. Parties wishing to be considered for inclusion on the Roster must submit a completed questionnaire containing biographical and demographic data. The information obtained from respondents is used to evaluate the candidate's qualifications to serve as neutrals in cases involving ADR.

Request for Comment

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the FDIC's functions, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimates of the burden of the information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

At the end of the comment period, the comments and recommendations received will be analyzed to determine the extent to which the collection should be modified prior to submission to OMB for review and approval. Comments submitted in response to this notice also will be summarized or included in the FDIC's requests to OMB for renewal of this collection. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 10th day of September 1997.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-24472 Filed 9-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Correction

This notice corrects a notice (FR Doc. 97-15269) published on page 31820 of the issue for Wednesday, June 11, 1997.

Under the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta heading, the entry for Susma Patel, London, England; Suketu Madhusudan Patel (Suku), London, England; Parimal Kantibhai Patel (Perry), London, England; Bharat Muljibhai Amin, London, England; and Dennis John Lloyd King, Surrey, England, collectively as the Patel Group, is revised to read as follows:

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Lois Berthaume, Vice President) 104 Marietta Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2713:

1. *Sushilaban Patel*, London, England; acting in concert, to acquire shares of First Bankshares, Inc., Longwood, Florida, and thereby indirectly acquire First National Bank of Central Florida, Longwood, Florida.

Comments on this application must be received by September 30, 1997.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, September 10, 1997.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97-24445 Filed 9-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of Banks or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than September 30, 1997.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Lois Berthaume, Vice President) 104 Marietta Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2713:

1. *MidSouth Bancorp, Inc., ESOP*, Lafayette, Louisiana; to acquire an

additional 1.51 percent, for a total of 10.57 percent, of the voting shares of MidSouth Bancorp, Inc., Lafayette, Louisiana, and thereby indirectly acquire MidSouth National Bank, Lafayette, Louisiana.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas (Genie D. Short, Vice President) 2200 North Pearl Street, Dallas, Texas 75201-2272:

1. *Rodney G. Kroll*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 23.0 percent; *Tommy G. Salome*, Crawford, Texas, to acquire 21.8 percent; *Newman E. Copeland*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 11.5 percent; *Scott J. Salmans*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 11.5 percent; *Rondy T. Gray*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 11.5 percent; *Charles B. Turner*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 11.5 percent; *James H. DuBois*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 4.6 percent; and *Time Manufacturing Company*, Waco, Texas, to acquire 4.6 percent, of the voting shares of First Riesel Corporation, Riesel, Texas, and thereby indirectly acquire First State Bank, Riesel, Texas.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, September 10, 1997.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97-24446 Filed 9-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Comment and Hearings on Joint Venture Project

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of second opportunity for comment and public hearing on Joint Venture Project.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission") is requesting public comment about issues to be addressed in the Joint Venture Project that the Commission has authorized. The Project is being undertaken by the Commission in collaboration with the Department of Justice. Comments may be provided to the Commission in writing as specified below. In addition, the Commission will hold public hearing concerning these issues in November, 1997.

The Joint Venture Project grows out of public hearings held by the FTC in the fall of 1995, at which businesses reported that global and innovation-based competition is driving firms toward ever more complex collaborative agreements that sometimes raise new competition issues. Some commenters at those hearings also requested clarification and updating of current antitrust policy toward business collaborations among competitors.

The Joint Venture Project will address whether antitrust guidance to the business community can be improved through clarifying and updating antitrust policies regarding joint ventures and other forms of competitor collaborations. As has been generally noted, businesses may find it desirable to collaborate with rivals in order to achieve a large variety of goals: Attain economies of scale; increase capacity and market access; minimize risk; avoid duplication; transfer, commercialize, or distribute technology efficiently; combine complementary or co-specialized capabilities; or better appropriate the returns of innovation. Some competitor collaborations, however, raise antitrust concerns about the degree to which competition among rivals has been curtailed. In such cases, antitrust enforcers must assess whether and to what extent competition is harmed.

Issues relevant to why and how competitors wish to collaborate with their rivals, and the impact those arrangements have on competition, are of interest to the Commission in connection with the Joint Venture Project. In order to better inform itself as to these issues, the Commission engaged in a first round of public comment and hearings regarding issues identified in a notice published on April 28, 1997, at 62 FR 22945. Now the Commission is seeking comment and testimony regarding additional issues, including some issues that the first round of comments and testimony have indicated warrant follow-up attention.

The Commission's April 28 notice sought information relating to many of the issues associated with the potential anticompetitive effects of competitor collaborations. Consequently, the factual questions in this notice deal primarily with possible efficiencies. Specifically, the FTC is seeking comment at this time on the following issues:

Factual Questions Relating to Competitor Collaborations

The Commission is interested in better understanding the efficiencies that may be generated by competitor collaborations.¹ As an aid to understanding, the Commission has included the following questions as examples of the kinds of factual information in which the Commission is interested. Those who respond should

¹ For purposes of this notice, "competitor collaborations" should be understood as including all collaborations, short of a merger, between or among entities that would have been actual or likely potential competitors in a relevant market absent that collaboration.

neither feel constrained by those questions nor compelled to answer each one, however.

Because real-world examples are usually the most informative, the Commission would prefer information concerning competitor collaborations that actually have been undertaken. However, recognizing that businesses may wish to protect confidential information about some collaborations, the Commission also encourages the use of hypothetical fact patterns to describe and discuss the efficiencies that may result from collaborations among competitors.

Questions

What kinds of efficiency benefits are most frequently attributed to competitor collaborations, e.g., economies of scale, risk reduction, or learning advantages?

To what extent are differences in assets or technology among prospective participants important to the possible efficiency benefits from a competitor collaboration?

What contractual problems do prospective competitor collaboration participants encounter in designing an arrangement to achieve efficiency gains, and how have those problems been solved? What types of agreements or mechanisms are most frequently or most successfully used to align incentives? To safeguard the value of assets or efforts that individual participants might contribute to the collaboration? To deal with possible disputes among the participants? Are particular contractual problems more pressing in certain kinds of ventures, or in certain industries, than in others?

How and under what circumstances do variations in a competitor collaboration's governance structure—such as variations in individual participants' abilities to affect the collaboration's level of output or to control portions of its productive capacity—affect the collaboration's ability to achieve efficiencies?

Under what circumstances might restrictions on the ability of participants to compete promote legitimate efficiency goals? Specifically, when and how can restrictions on price, quality, advertising, geographic scope, or other dimensions of competition contribute to legitimate efficiency ends? Are some restrictions more closely related to the formation of a competitor collaboration, while others are needed to help the collaboration run smoothly after it is formed?

Under what circumstances might various exclusivity provisions be related to the efficiency goals of the competitor collaboration? Examples could include