

United States with respect to the CCC export credit guarantee programs, including SCGP. The WTO dispute panel's ruling requires CCC to charge premia that are adequate to cover the long-term operating costs and losses of the programs as a whole. In response, on July 1, 2005, CCC revised the premia for the export credit guarantee programs to reflect program default risk and operating costs. CCC is interested in exploring potential revisions to the structure, design, or operation of SCGP that can contribute to meeting this "break-even" goal, particularly by incurring fewer program losses.

We request interested parties to comment on the following specific questions under consideration for the SCGP. Interested parties may choose to address any or all of the questions listed or provide other comment. CCC's aim is to improve upon the SCGP's integrity, effectiveness, flexibility, and continued viability.

1. *Transaction Size Considerations:* What limit, if any, should be imposed on the value of transactions or the amount of exposure that CCC should take on the importer that would be consistent with commercial practices?

2. *Level of Guarantee Coverage:*

- Is the current level of guarantee coverage at 65 percent appropriate?
- If a higher level of guarantee coverage is desired, what measures should CCC adopt to better ensure that importers are capable of meeting their credit obligations?
- If CCC offered a lower level of guarantee coverage, at what point would one the SCGP no longer be a viable program for U.S. exporters?

3. *Assignments of Payment Guarantees:*

- Should CCC require assignment of the SCGP payment guarantee and risk?
- Should CCC permit, but not require the exporter to assign the SCGP payment guarantee risk?
- Should CCC not permit the exporter to assign the SCGP payment guarantee and risk?

4. *Alternative Payment Obligations:*

- Should CCC permit alternative forms of payment obligations that would change the obligor risk from the importer to a foreign bank? (Examples of such alternative payment obligation are: A banker's acceptance from an eligible foreign bank, a guarantee of an eligible foreign bank of the importer's obligation to pay, or a bank aval (obligation to pay) added to the importer's promissory note.)

• What are the estimated costs of requiring a foreign bank guarantee mechanism on the importer's obligation as stated in the question above?

5. *Collection Experiences on Foreign Bank Obligations:* What are U.S. exporters' or U.S. financial institutions' collection experiences in using banker's acceptances or avalized promissory notes?

6. *Risk Mitigation Techniques:*

- Should CCC permit the U.S. exporter or financial institution to mitigate their risk on the portion of the transaction value not covered by the SCGP payment guarantee?
- If CCC permits risk mitigation, what should CCC do to ensure that the risk-sharing principal is maintained and that all monies are shared, on a pro-rata basis, between CCC and the exporter/assignee?

7. *Standby Letters of Credit:*

- Should CCC require that the importer open a standby letter of credit to the exporter for a portion of the export value that could be drawn upon by the exporter and shared with CCC on a pro-rata basis in the event of the default?

- What costs might be expected if the importer were required to maintain a standby letter of credit associated with the SCGP transaction?

8. *Creditworthiness Assessment of Importers:*

- What are exporters' and U.S. financial institutions' experiences in their attempts to assess the creditworthiness of the importer using commercial credit reference services?
- Are there countries and regions where credit assessments on agricultural importers cannot be performed readily and reliably?

9. *Collections and Recoveries:*

- How can CCC best partner with the exporter and/or the financial institution that has accepted assignment of a SCGP payment guarantee in order to effect a collection?
- What other means should CCC employ in its recovery efforts on SCGP defaults?

10. *Other Concerns:* What other concerns, comments, or interests relating to the program regulations, mechanisms, and operations of the SCGP are important?

Consideration of Comments

Additional comments on other program modifications to the SCGP that are responsive to the principles outlined herein are encouraged. CCC will carefully consider all comments submitted by interested parties. After consideration of the comments received, CCC will consider what changes, if any, should be made to the SCGP. Some of the above-described changes would require additional notice and consideration of comments from

interested parties via the rulemaking process. Other changes might be adopted by changing internal policies and procedures. Comments received will help the Department determine that extent and scope of any future rulemaking.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 5602, 5622, 5661, 5662, 5663, 5664, 5676; 15 U.S.C. 714b(d), 714c(f).

Signed at Washington, DC, on December 16, 2005.

W. Kirk Miller,

General Sales Manager and Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. 06-610 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 73

RIN 3150-AH60

Design Basis Threat; Reopening of Comment Period

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule: Reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: On November 7, 2005 (70 FR 67380), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published for public comment a proposed rule consolidating the supplemental requirements established by the April 29, 2003, design basis threat (DBT) orders with the existing DBT requirements in 10 CFR 73.1(a). Specific details of the attributes of the DBT to be protected against, which include both safeguards information (SGI) and classified information, are consolidated in adversary characteristics documents (ACDs) and Regulatory Guides (RGs). The proposed rule would revise the DBT requirements both for radiological sabotage and for theft or diversion of Strategic Special Nuclear Material (SSNM). ACDs and RGs provide guidance to licensees concerning the DBT for radiological sabotage, theft and diversion. They contain the specific details of the attributes of the threat which licensees need to know in order to evaluate what is necessary to comply with the proposed rule. On December 21, 2005, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) requested a 30 day extension to the public comment period. Their request was based on the fact that though the proposed rule was published on November 7, 2005, the RGs and the ACDs were not available at that time. NEI requested copies of these documents. The NRC staff agreed to

provide these documents to the properly cleared individuals with a need to know, and NEI received the draft RGs and ACDs for power reactors on December 19, 2005. In view of the delay in providing the documents to the cleared personnel and in the interests of obtaining public comment from the broadest range of stakeholders, the comment period on the proposed rule is being extended for an additional 30 days from the original January 23, 2006, deadline to February 22, 2006.

DATES: The comment period has been extended and now expires on February 22, 2006. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received before this date.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

Hand delivered comments should also be addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and delivered to 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays.

You may also provide comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking Web site: <http://ruleforum.llnl.gov>. This site also provides the availability to upload comments as files (any format), if your Web browser supports that function. For information about the interactive rulemaking site, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905; e-mail: CAG@nrc.gov.

Certain documents relating to this rulemaking, including comments received, may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O1-F21, Rockville, MD. The same documents may also be viewed and downloaded electronically via the rulemaking Web site: <http://ruleforum.llnl.gov>.

Documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999 are also available electronically at the NRC's Public Electronic Reading room on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html>. From this site, the public can gain entry into the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. For more information, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 202-634-3273 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Manash K. Bagchi, Office of the Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone (301) 415-2905; e-mail MKB2@nrc.gov or Mr. Richard Rasmussen, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone (301) 415-8380; e-mail RAR@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of January, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 06-676 Filed 1-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA-2006-23659; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-236-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 airplanes. This proposed AD would require revising the Limitations section of the airplane flight manual regarding the use of continuous ignition, fuel filter heating, and resetting circuit breakers during flight in certain conditions such as icing. This proposed AD results from reports of power loss on one or both engines in icing conditions. We are proposing this AD to advise the flightcrew that continuous ignition will not reduce the probability of power loss, and what action they must take to avoid this hazard. Loss of power in one or more engines during flight, if not prevented, could result in loss of control of the airplane.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by February 23, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Use one of the following addresses to submit comments on this proposed AD.

- **DOT Docket Web site:** Go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- **Government-wide rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>

and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- **Mail:** Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW., Nassif Building, room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590.

- **Fax:** (202) 493-2251.

- **Hand Delivery:** Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Contact Fokker Services B.V., P.O. Box 231, 2150 AE Nieuw-Vennep, the Netherlands, for service information identified in this proposed AD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Rodriguez, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-1137; fax (425) 227-1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to submit any relevant written data, views, or arguments regarding this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. Include the docket number "FAA-2006-23659; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-236-AD" at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend the proposed AD in light of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact with FAA personnel concerning this proposed AD. Using the search function of that Web site, anyone can find and read the comments in any of our dockets, including the name of the individual who sent the comment (or signed the comment on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78), or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Examining the Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>, or in person at the Docket Management Facility office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket