process as a valid replacement for a military or Federal specification or standard cited in a solicitation.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

Annual Burden Hours: 540.

Number of Respondents: 180.

Responses Per Respondent: 3.

Annual Responses: 540.

Average Burden Per Response: 1 hour.

Frequency: On occasion.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Respondents are offerors responding to DoD solicitations for previously developed items that cite military or Federal specifications or standards, when the offeror has a management or manufacturing process that has been previously accepted by DoD, under SPI, as a valid replacement for a military or Federal specification or standard.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 211, 242, and 252

Government procurement.

Michele P. Peterson,

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

Therefore, 48 CFR Parts 211, 242, and 252 are amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 48 CFR Parts 211, 242, and 252 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 41 U.S.C. 421 and 48 CFR Chapter 1.

PART 211—DESCRIBING AGENCY NEEDS

2. Sections 211.273 through 211.273–4 are added to read as follows:

211.273 Substitutions for military or Federal specifications and standards.

211.273–1 Definition.

''SPI process,'' as used in this section, is defined in the clause at 252.211–7005, Substitutions for Military or Federal Specifications and Standards.

211.273–2 Policy.

(a) Under the Single Process Initiative (SPI), DoD accepts SPI processes in lieu of specific military or Federal specifications or standards that specify a management or manufacturing process.

(b) DoD acceptance of an SPI process follows the decision of a Management Council, which includes representatives from the Defense Contract Management Command, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the military departments.

(c) In procurements of previously developed items, SPI processes that previously were accepted by the Management Council shall be considered valid replacements for military or Federal specifications or standards, absent a specific determination to the contrary (see 211.273–3(c)).

211.273–3 Procedures.

(a) Solicitations for previously developed items shall encourage offerors to identify SPI processes for use in lieu of military or Federal specifications and standards cited in the solicitation. The solicitation shall require an offeror proposing to use an SPI process to include, in its response to the solicitation, documentation of the Government acceptance of the process.

(b) Contracting officers shall ensure that—

(1) Concurrence of the requiring activity has been or will be obtained for any proposed substitutions prior to contract award; and

(2) Any necessary additional information regarding the SPI process identified in the proposal is obtained from the cognizant administrative contracting officer.

(c) Any determination that an SPI process is not acceptable for a specific procurement shall be made at the head of the contracting activity or program executive officer level. This authority may not be delegated.

211.273–4 Contract clause.

Use the clause at 252.211–7005, Substitutions for Military or Federal Specifications and Standards, in solicitations and contracts exceeding the micro-purchase threshold, when procuring previously developed items.

PART 242—CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

3. Section 242.302 is amended by adding paragraph (a) (S–70) to read as follows:

242.302 Contract administration functions.

(a) * * *

(S–70) Serve as the single point of contact for all Single Process Initiative (SPI) Management Council activities. The ACO shall negotiate and execute facilitywide class modifications and agreements for SPI processes, when authorized by the affected components.

* * * * *

PART 252—SOLICITATION PROVISIONS AND CONTRACT CLAUSES

4. Section 252.211–7005 is added to read as follows:

252.211–7005 Substitutions for Military or Federal Specifications and Standards.

As prescribed in 211.273–4, use the following clause:

SUBSTITUTIONS FOR MILITARY OR FEDERAL SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS (AUG 1997)

(a) *Definition.* ''SPI process,'' as used in this clause, means a management or manufacturing process that has been accepted previously by the Department of Defense under the Single Process Initiative (SPI) for use in lieu of a specific military or Federal specification or standard. Under SPI, these processes are reviewed and accepted by a Management Council, which includes representatives from the Defense Contract Management Command, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the military departments.

(b) Offerors are encouraged to propose SPI processes in lieu of military or Federal specifications and standards cited in the solicitation.

(c) An offeror proposing to use an SPI process shall—

(1) Identify the specific military or Federal specification or standard for which the SPI process has been accepted, and the specific paragraph or other location in the solicitation where the military or Federal specification or standard is required;

(2) Provide a copy of the Department of Defense acceptance of the SPI process;

(3) Identify each facility at which the offeror proposes to use the specific SPI process; and

(4) Unless provided in response to paragraph (c)(2) of this clause, provide the name and telephone number of the cognizant Administrative Contracting Officers for each facility where the SPI process is proposed for use.

(d) Absent a determination at the head of the contracting activity or program executive officer level that an SPI process is not acceptable for this procurement, the Contractor shall use the following SPI processes in lieu of military or Federal specifications and standards:

(Offeror Insert Information for Each SPI Process)

SPI Process: _____

Facility: _____

Military or Federal Specification or Standard:

_____

Affected Contract Line Item and Subline Item Number and Requirement Citation:

_____

_____

Cognizant Administrative Contracting Officer:

_____

(End of clause)

[FR Doc. 97–21887 Filed 8–19–97–8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

48 CFR Part 225

[DFARS Case 96–D023]

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Foreign Machine Tools and Powered and Non-Powered Valves

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Correction.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is issuing a correction to the final rule published at 61 FR 58488, November 15, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Ms. Michele Peterson, PDUSD (A&T) DP (DAR), IMPD 3D139, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–3062. Telephone (703) 602–0131; telefax (703) 602–0350.

Correction

In the issue of Friday, November 15, 1996, on page 58489, in the first column, amendatory instruction 5 is corrected to read as follows: ''Section 225.7005 is added to read as follows:''.

Michele P. Peterson,

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

[FR Doc. 97–21890 Filed 8–19–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 572

[Docket No. 97–047, Notice 01]

RIN 2127–AG44

Anthropomorphic Test Dummy; Six-Year-Old Child Dummy

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Final rule; technical amendment.

SUMMARY: This document corrects NHTSA's regulation specifying the characteristics of the test dummy representing a six-year-old child. It revises the specification for locating the center of gravity (cg) of the thorax by moving it forward 0.4 inches from the location currently specified in part 572. This document also amends the dummy's specifications to show that thorax ballast mass, if used, is mounted on the inside of the anterior wall of the spine box rather than to its sides. Both of these changes bring the drawing specifications in line with the actual construction of the dummy. They are intended to ensure that there is no confusion among dummy manufacturers and users as to whether a particular dummy meets the specifications of NHTSA's regulation.

DATES: The changes made in this rule are effective August 20, 1997. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in this rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of August 20, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *For nonlegal issues:* Stan Backaitis, Office of Crashworthiness Standards (*telephone:* 202–366–4912). *For legal issues:* Deirdre Fujita, Office of the Chief Counsel (202–366–2992). Both can be reached at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 14, 1991, NHTSA published a rule that added specifications for a 6-year-old child test dummy to NHTSA's set of regulations for ''Anthropomorphic Test Dummies'' (49 CFR part 572). The dummy was adopted to test child restraint systems for older children. The specifications for the dummy are set forth in subpart I of 49 CFR part 572.

The dummy is instrumented with accelerometers for measuring accelerations in the thorax during dynamic testing. NHTSA was very specific in describing, in drawings referenced in part 572, subpart I, the location of the center of gravity (cg) of the dummy's thorax. However, location descriptions for the cg in the specifications do not reflect where the cg is actually located in the dummy.

This discrepancy was brought to the agency's attention by First Technology Safety Systems, Inc. (FTSS), a manufacturer of test dummies. On January 23, 1996, FTSS petitioned the agency to move the shown location of the cg of the thorax of the dummy forward 0.4 inches from the current location specified in drawings that are incorporated into part 572. Currently, these drawings specify that the cg is 0.9 ± 0.5 inches back from the dummy's shoulder yoke center. The petitioner requested that the cg be located 0.5 ± .5 inches back from the shoulder yoke, ''to fit within the design proportions and put the cg in line with its current production value.''

NHTSA has examined FTSS's concerns and agrees that the specification for the cg of the dummy's thorax should be amended. Accordingly, this document corrects the specification for locating the cg of the thorax by moving the specified location forward 0.4 inches.

The discrepancy in the current specification usually results when ballast is used in the dummy's thorax to achieve the required thorax weight.[1] NHTSA had found that in some tests of the dummy, the screws that affix the ballast firmly to the lateral sides of the thoracic spine box loosen during dynamic testing. This causes the ballast to vibrate, resulting in extraneous accelerometer responses. To prevent the ballast retaining screws from loosening, NHTSA moved the ballast forward from the lateral sides of the thoracic spine box to the inside anterior wall of the box, where the ballast could not load the screws with high dynamic forces. FTSS estimates that the repositioned ballast could result in the accumulation of the various weight tolerances within the thorax such that it could put the cg location up to 0.6 inches forward from its current specification. However, FTSS believes that relocating the cg 0.4 inches forward from the current position would be a more representative mean location for all of the dummy population.

NHTSA has decided to revise Subpart I as requested by FTSS to avoid potential sources of complaint and confusion caused by a discrepancy in the cg location of the dummy's thorax. Dummy manufacturers have asked NHTSA on different occasions to correct inconsistencies between the part 572 specifications and the actual design and manufacture of the test dummies, to avoid potential customer complaints that a particular dummy does not meet the specifications of NHTSA's regulation, even when the problems are relatively minor and are related to the specification rather than the dummy. Such conforming amendments to part 572 have been made several times, e.g., corrections of NHTSA's regulations for the side impact test dummy, 59 FR 52089; October 14, 1994; and six-year-old dummy, 60 FR 2896, January 12, 1995.) These amendments are primarily corrective in nature, and do not affect the impact response of the dummy in any significant manner.

Today's correction does not impose any additional responsibilities on any manufacturer and has virtually no effect on the performance of the dummy. To determine the importance and the effects of thorax cg location on the dummy's kinematics, a modeling study was performed for NHTSA by the National Crash Analysis Center of the George Washington University. The study used an Articulated Total Body computer model to represent the six-year-old child dummy restrained by a three-point belt system and seated on a belt-positioning booster seat. The location of the thorax cg varied over a range of one inch up, down, forward and backward. The study showed that a movement of the cg one inch forward did not change the chest g response, reduced head g response by 1 g and

[1] The amount of ballast in the thorax depends on how weight tolerances of the various parts that make up the thorax assembly accumulate.