

certification application may request an exemption from one or more elements of the requested design certification, as provided in § 52.63(b) and Section VIII of each appendix to 10 CFR Part 52 that certifies a design. As set forth in those provisions, such a request is subject to litigation in the same manner as other issues in a COL proceeding. Since the underlying element of the design may change after the exemption request is submitted, such an exemption may ultimately become unnecessary or may need to be reconsidered or conformed to the final design certification rule. Such matters would be considered by an application-specific licensing board. A licensing board considering a COL application referencing a design certification application might conclude the proceeding and determine that the COL application is otherwise acceptable before the design certification rule becomes final. In such circumstances, the license may not issue until the design certification rule is final, unless the applicant requests that the entire application be treated as a "custom" design.

COL applicants should coordinate with vendors applying for certified designs to ensure that decisions on design certification applications do not impede decisions on COL applications. If design certification is delayed, a licensing board considering common technical issues may likewise be delayed.

3. Subsequent Applications Referencing a Design Certification Rule

If the Commission grants initial COL applications referencing a particular design certification rule, the Commission believes it likely that subsequent COL applicants will also reference that design certification rule. In this event, the Commission would expect to develop additional processes to facilitate coordination of proceedings on such applications. We observe, however, that an issue associated with such matters as operational programs or design acceptance criteria may be resolved through the design-centered review approach for initial applications containing common information, but we do not intend to impose any resolution so obtained on subsequent COL applicants. While there is no requirement to adopt a previously-approved resolution of an issue, and subsequent applicants are free to use the most recent state-of-the-art methods to resolve such issues, we nevertheless urge such applicants to consider adopting previous resolutions in order to maximize plant standardization. If a COL applicant adopts an approach to a

technical issue previously found acceptable, no further staff review of the adequacy of the approach is necessary. Rather, the staff review should be limited to verification that the applicant has indeed adopted the previously approved approach and will properly implement it, and, for technical issues that depend on site-specific factors, that the previously-approved approach applies to the applicant's proposed facility.

C. ITAAC

In first promulgating 10 CFR Part 52 in 1989, we determined that hearings on whether the acceptance criteria in a COL have been met (ITAAC-compliance hearings) would be held in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) provisions applicable to determining applications for initial licenses, but that we would specify the procedures to be followed in the Notice of Hearing. *See* 10 CFR 52.103(b)(2)(i) (1990); 54 FR 15395 (April 18, 1989). In enacting the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Congress subsequently confirmed our authority to adopt 10 CFR Part 52, and by statute accorded us additional discretion to determine procedures, whether formal or informal, for ITAAC-compliance hearings. *See* Atomic Energy Act section 189a.(1)(B)(iv), 42 U.S.C. 2239(a)(1)(B)(iv). We therefore amended § 52.103(d) to provide that we would determine, in our discretion, "appropriate hearing procedures, whether informal or formal adjudicatory, for any hearing under [§ 52.103(a)]."

While we recognize that specification of procedures for the treatment of requests for hearings on ITAAC would lend some predictability to the ITAAC compliance process, we are not yet in a position to specify such procedures, since we have not approved even one complete set of ITAAC necessary for issuing a COL. Further, ITAAC-compliance hearings are likely several years distant, and we have no experience with the type and number of hearing requests that we might receive with respect to ITAAC compliance. While it may not be necessary to consider the first requests for ITAAC-compliance hearings in order for us to determine the procedures appropriate to govern such hearings, we believe it premature to specify such procedures now. In addition, the staff is now formulating guidance on the times necessary for the staff to consider different categories of completed ITAAC, and this guidance should assist licensees in scheduling and performing ITAAC so as to minimize the critical

path for staff consideration of completed ITAAC.

In view of the above considerations, we have identified one measure to lend predictability to the ITAAC compliance process: The Commission itself will serve as the presiding officer with respect to any request for a hearing filed under § 52.103. In acting as the presiding officer under these circumstances, we will make three initial determinations. First, we will decide whether the person requesting the hearing has shown, *prima facie*, that one or more of the acceptance criteria in the COL have not been, or will not be met, and the attendant public health and safety consequences of such non-conformance that would be contrary to providing reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety. Second, if we decide to grant a request for a hearing on ITAAC compliance, we will decide, pursuant to § 52.103(c), whether there will be reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety during a period of interim operation. Third, we will designate the procedures under which the proceeding shall be conducted. We have amended § 52.103 and our Rules of Practice (10 CFR 2.309, 2.310, and 2.341) to incorporate these changes.

III. Conclusion

The Commission reiterates its long-standing commitment to ensuring that hearings are fair and produce an adequate record for decision, while at the same time being completed as expeditiously as possible. The Commission intends to monitor its proceedings to ensure that they are being concluded in a fair and timely fashion. To this end, the Commission will act in individual proceedings, as appropriate, to provide guidance to licensing boards and parties, and to decide issues in the interest of a prompt and effective resolution of the matters set for adjudication.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of April 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8-8272 Filed 4-16-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon written request, Copies available from: U.S. Securities and Exchange

Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 15g-2; SEC File No. 270-381; OMB Control No. 3235-0434.

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") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

The "Penny Stock Disclosure Rules" (Rule 15g-2, 17 CFR 240.15g-2) require broker-dealers to provide their customers with a risk disclosure document, as set forth in Schedule 15G, prior to their first non-exempt transaction in a "penny stock." As amended, the rule requires broker-dealers to obtain written acknowledgement from the customer that he or she has received the required risk disclosure document. The amended rule also requires broker-dealers to maintain a copy of the customer's written acknowledgement for at least three years following the date on which the risk disclosure document was provided to the customer, the first two years in an accessible place.

The risk disclosure documents are for the benefit of the customers, to assure that they are aware of the risks of trading in "penny stocks" before they enter into a transaction. The risk disclosure documents are maintained by the broker-dealers and may be reviewed during the course of an examination by the Commission.

The Commission estimates that there are approximately 240 broker-dealers that could potentially be subject to current Rule 15g-2, and that each one of these firms processes an average of three new customers for penny stocks per week. Thus, each respondent processes approximately 156 penny stock disclosure documents per year. If communications in tangible form alone are used to satisfy the requirements of Rule 15g-2, then (a) the copying and mailing of the penny stock disclosure document takes no more than two minutes per customer, and (b) each customer takes no more than eight minutes to review, sign and return the penny stock disclosure document. Thus, the total existing respondent burden is approximately 10 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 1,560 minutes per respondent. Since there are 240 respondents, the current annual burden

is 374,400 minutes (1,560 minutes per each of the 240 respondents) or 6,240 hours. In addition, broker-dealers incur a recordkeeping burden of approximately two minutes per response. Since there are approximately 156 responses for each respondent, the respondents incur an aggregate recordkeeping burden of 74,880 minutes (240 respondents $\times$ 156 responses for each $\times$ 2 minutes per response) or 1,248 hours, under Rule 15g-2. Accordingly, the current aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-2 (that is, assuming that all respondents provide tangible copies of the required documents) is approximately 7,488 hours (6,240 response hours + 1,248 recordkeeping hours).

The burden hours associated with Rule 15g-2 may be slightly reduced when the penny stock disclosure document required under the rule is provided through electronic means such as e-mail from the broker-dealer (*e.g.*, the broker-dealer respondent may take only one minute, instead of the two minutes estimated above, to provide the penny stock disclosure document by e-mail to its customer) and return e-mail from the customer (the customer may take only seven minutes, to review, electronically sign and electronically return the penny stock disclosure document). In this regard, if each of the customer respondents estimated above communicates with his or her broker-dealer electronically, the total ongoing respondent burden is approximately 8 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 1,248 minutes (156 customers $\times$ 8 minutes per respondent). Assuming 240 respondents, the annual burden, if electronic communications were used by all customers, is 299,520 minutes (1,248 minutes per each of the 240 respondents) or 4,992 hours. Under Rule 15g-2, the recordkeeping burden is 1,248 hours. Thus, if all broker-dealer respondents obtain and send the documents required under the rules electronically, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-2 is 6,240 (1,248 hours + 4,992 hours).

In addition, if the penny stock customer requests a paper copy of the information on the Commission's Web site regarding microcap securities, including penny stocks, from his or her broker-dealer, the printing and mailing of the document containing this information takes no more than two minutes per customer. Because many investors have access to the Commission's Web site via computers located in their homes, or in easily accessible public places such as libraries, then, at most, a quarter of customers who are required to receive

the Rule 15g-2 disclosure document request that their broker-dealer provide them with the additional microcap and penny stock information posted on the Commission's Web site. Thus, each broker-dealer respondent processes approximately 39 requests for paper copies of this information per year or an aggregate total of 78 minutes per respondent (2 minutes per customer $\times$ 39 requests per respondent). Since there are 240 respondents, the estimated annual burden is 18,720 minutes (78 minutes per each of the 240 respondents) or 312 hours.

We have no way of knowing how many broker-dealers and customers will chose to communicate electronically. Assuming that 50 percent of respondents continue to provide documents and obtain signatures in tangible form and 50 percent choose to communicate electronically to satisfy the requirements of Rule 15g-2, the total aggregate burden hours is 7,176 ((aggregate burden hours for documents and signatures in tangible form $\times$ 0.50 of the respondents = 3,744 hours) + (aggregate burden hours for electronically signed and transmitted documents $\times$ 0.50 of the respondents = 3,120 hours) + (312 burden hours for those customers making requests for a copy of the information on the Commission's Web site)).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Comments should be directed to: R. Corey Booth, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, Virginia 22312; or comments may be sent by e-mail to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov. Comments must be submitted within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: April 10, 2008.

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-8182 Filed 4-16-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon written request, Copies available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 15g-9; SEC File No. 270-325 ; OMB Control No. 3235-0385.

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") is soliciting comment on the collection of information described below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Section 15(c)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) (the "Exchange Act") authorizes the Commission to promulgate rules that prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative practices in connection with over-the-counter ("OTC") securities transactions. Pursuant to this authority, the Commission in 1989 adopted Rule 15a-6 (the "Rule"), which was subsequently redesignated as Rule 15g-9, 17 CFR 240.15g-9. The Rule requires broker-dealers to produce a written suitability determination for, and to obtain a written customer agreement to, certain recommended transactions in low-priced stocks that are not registered on a national securities exchange or authorized for trading on NASDAQ, and whose issuers do not meet certain minimum financial standards. The Rule is intended to prevent the indiscriminate use by broker-dealers of fraudulent, high pressure telephone sales campaigns to sell low-priced securities to unsophisticated customers.

The Commission staff estimates that there are approximately 240 broker-dealers subject to the Rule. The burden of the Rule on a respondent varies widely depending on the frequency with which new customers are solicited. On the average for all respondents, the staff has estimated that respondents process three new customers per week,

or approximately 156 new customer suitability determinations per year. We also estimate that a broker-dealer would expend approximately one-half hour per new customer in obtaining, reviewing, and processing (including transmitting to the customer) the information required by Rule 15g-9, and each respondent would consequently spend 78 hours annually (156 customers $\times$.5 hours) obtaining the information required in the rule. We determined, based on the estimate of 240 broker-dealer respondents, that the current annual burden of Rule 15g-9 is 18,720 hours (240 respondents $\times$ 78 hours).

In addition, we estimate that if tangible communications alone are used to transmit the documents required by Rule 15g-9, each customer should take: (1) No more than eight minutes to review, sign and return the suitability determination document; and (2) no more than two minutes to either read and return or produce the customer agreement for a particular recommended transaction in penny stocks, listing the issuer and number of shares of the particular penny stock to be purchased, and send it to the broker-dealer. Thus, the total current customer respondent burden is approximately 10 minutes per response, for an aggregate total of 1,560 minutes for each broker-dealer respondent. Since there are 240 respondents, the annual burden for customer responses is 374,400 minutes (1,560 customer minutes per each of the 240 respondents) or 6,240 hours.

In addition, we estimate that, if tangible means of communications alone are used, broker-dealers could incur a recordkeeping burden under Rule 15g-9 of approximately two minutes per response. Since there are approximately 240 broker-dealer respondents and each respondent would have approximately 156 responses annually, respondents would incur an aggregate recordkeeping burden of 74,880 minutes (240 respondents $\times$ 156 responses $\times$ 2 minutes per response), or 1,248 hours. Accordingly, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-9 is 26,208 hours (18,720 hours to prepare the suitability statement and agreement + 6,240 hours for customer review + 1,248 recordkeeping hours).

We recognize that under the amendments to Rule 15g-9, the burden hours may be slightly reduced if the transaction agreement required under the rule is provided through electronic means such as e-mail from the customer to the broker-dealer (e.g., the customer may take only one minute, instead of the two minutes estimated above, to provide the transaction agreement by e-

mail rather than regular mail). If each of the customer respondents estimated above communicates with his or her broker-dealer electronically, the total burden hours on the customers would be reduced from 10 minutes to 9 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 1,404 minutes per respondent (156 customers $\times$ 9 minutes for each customer). Since there are 240 respondents, the annual customer respondent burden, if electronic communications were used by all customers, would be approximately 336,960 minutes (240 respondents $\times$ 1,404 minutes per each respondent), or 5,616 hours. We do not believe the hour burden on broker-dealers in obtaining, reviewing, and processing the suitability determination would change through use of electronic communications. In addition, we do not believe that, based on information currently available to us, recordkeeping burdens under Rule 15g-9 would change where the required documents were sent or received through means of electronic communication. Thus, if all broker-dealer respondents obtain and send the documents required under the rule electronically, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-9 would be 25,584 hours (18,720 hours to prepare the suitability statement and agreement + 5,616 hours for customer review + 1,248 recordkeeping hours).

We cannot estimate how many broker-dealers and customers will choose to communicate electronically. If we assume that 50 percent of respondents would continue to provide documents and obtain signatures in tangible form, and 50 percent would choose to communicate electronically in satisfaction of the requirements of Rule 15g-9, the total aggregate hour burden would be 25,896 burden hours ((26,208 aggregate burden hours for documents and signatures in tangible form $\times$ 0.50 of the respondents = 13,104 hours) + (25,584 aggregate burden hours for electronically signed and transmitted documents $\times$ 0.50 of the respondents = 12,792 hours)).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimates of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or