Council, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC 20522–1003, *phone:* (202) 663–0533.

Dated: November 1, 2002.

Peter E. Bergin,

Director of the Diplomatic Security Service, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 02–28395 Filed 11–6–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4710–24–P

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## **Coast Guard**

[USCG 2002-13126]

## Information Collection Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): 2115–0141

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT. **ACTION:** Request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this request for comments announces that the Coast Guard has forwarded one Information Collection Report (ICR) abstracted below to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. Our ICR describes the information we seek to collect from the public. Review and comment by OIRA ensures that we impose only paperwork burdens commensurate with our performance of duties.

**DATES:** Please submit comments on or before December 9, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** To make sure that your comments and related material do not enter the docket [USCG 2002–13126] more than once, please submit them by only one of the following means:

(1)(a) By mail to the Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. (b) By mail to OIRA, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, to the attention of the Desk Officer for the Coast Guard. Caution: Because of recent delays in the delivery of mail, your comments may reach the Facility more quickly if you choose one of the other means described below.

(2)(a) By delivery to room PL-401 at the address given in paragraph (1)(a) above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202– 366–9329. (b) By delivery to OIRA, at the address given in paragraph (1)(b) above, to the attention of the Desk Officer for the Coast Guard.

(3) By fax to (a) the Docket Management Facility at 202–493–2251 and (b) OIRA at 202–395–5806, or email to OIRA at

*oira\_docket@omb.eop.gov* attention: Desk Officer for the Coast Guard.

(4)(a) Electronically through the Web Site for the Docket Management System at *http://dms.dot.gov.* (b) OIRA does not have a website on which you can post your comments.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents mentioned in this notice as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL–401 (Plaza level), 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket on the Internet at http:// dms.dot.gov.

Copies of the complete ICR are available for inspection and copying in public dockets. They are available in docket USCG 2002–13126 of the Docket Management Facility between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays; for inspection and printing on the internet at *http:// dms.dot.gov;* and for inspection from the Commandant (G–CIM–2), U.S. Coast Guard, room 6106, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC, between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Barbara Davis, Office of Information Management, 202–267–2326, for questions on this document; Dorothy Beard, Chief, Documentary Services Division, U.S. Department of Transportation, 202–366–5149, for questions on the docket.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

# **Regulatory History**

This request constitutes the 30-day notice required by OIRA. The Coast Guard has already published (67 FR 54009, August 20, 2002) the 60-day notice required by OIRA. That notice elicited no comments.

#### **Request for Comments**

The Coast Guard invites comments on the proposed collection of information to determine whether the collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department. In particular, the Coast Guard would appreciate comments addressing: (1) The practical utility of the collection; (2) the accuracy of the Department's estimated burden of the collection; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information that is the subject of the collection; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments, to DMS or OIRA, must contain the OMB Control Number of the ICR addressed. Comments to DMS must contain the docket number of this request, USCG 2002–13126. Comments to OIRA are best assured of having their full effect if OIRA receives them 30 or fewer days after the publication of this request.

# **Information Collection Request**

*Title:* 46 CFR Subchapter Q; Lifesaving, Electrical, and Engineering Equipment, Construction, and Materials.

*OMB Control Number:* 2115–0141. *Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Manufacturers of safety equipment and materials.

Form: C6HQ-10030.

*Abstract:* The Coast Guard needs to collect this information so it can ensure compliance with rules governing specific types of safety equipment and material installed on commercial vessels and pleasure craft. Manufacturers must submit drawings, specifications, and laboratory test reports to the Coast Guard before it grants any approval.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: The estimated burden is 16,880 hours a year.

Dated: October 31, 2002.

## J.E. Evans,

Acting Director of Info & Tech. [FR Doc. 02–28241 Filed 11–6–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

# **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

## **Federal Aviation Administration**

## Proposed Advisory Circular (AC) 43– HAB, Hot Air Balloon Inspection and Repair: Acceptable Methods, Techniques, and Practices

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of availability and request for comments on the proposed AC.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a proposed AC to be used by the Hot Air Balloon community as acceptable methods, techniques, and practices associated with the inspection and repair of Hot Air Balloons. This notice is necessary to give all interested persons the opportunity to present their views on the proposed AC. Hot air balloons derive lift from self-contained, generated heated air and are considered

by definition a lighter-than-air aircraft. The owner or operator of a hot air balloon is primarily responsible for maintaining the balloon in an airworthy condition. The persons performing maintenance are responsible for the manner of performance and the approval for return to service after work is completed.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before January 6, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed AC to: DOT/FAA, Standardization Branch, AFS–640, Attn: George Torres, 6500 S. MacArthur Boulevard, ARB Room 304A, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125, or electronically to george.torres@faa.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George Torres, AFS–640, at the address above, *by telephone*: (405) 954–6923, *by fax*: (405) 954–4104, or by *e-mail: george.torres@faa.gov.* 

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## **Comments Invited**

The proposed AC is available on the FAA Web site at *http://* 

www1.airweb.faa.gov/ Regulatory and Guidance Library/ rgDAC.nsf/MainFrame?OpenFrameSet, under AC No. 43–HAB. A copy of the proposed AC may be obtained by contacting the person named above under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION **CONTACT**. Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed AC by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Please identify AC 43–HAB, Hot Air Balloon Inspection and Repair: Acceptable Methods, Techniques, and Practices, and submit comments, either hard copy or electronically, to the appropriate address listed above. Comments may be inspected at the above address between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 1, 2002.

## Louis C. Cusimano,

Deputy Director, Flight Standards Service. [FR Doc. 02–28372 Filed 11–6–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

## Advisory Circular No. 00–62, Internet Communications of Aviation Weather and NOTAMs

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT. **ACTION:** Notice of availability and disposition of comments. **SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of Advisory Circular No. 00–62, Internet Communications of Aviation Weather and NOTAMs, and disposes of comments received on an earlier proposed draft.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Steven R. Albersheim, Aerospace Weather Policy Division, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, (202) 385–7704, or *steven.albersheim@faa.gov.* 

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## Background

On January 14, 2002 the FAA issued a draft Advisory Circular (AC) on Internet Communications of Aviation Weather and NOTAMs. The FAA requested comment on all aspects of the proposed AC. This AC sets forth the process to become a Qualified Internet Communications Provider (QICP) and addresses issues that relate to accessing aviation weather and NOTAM information from approved QICPs.

#### **Disposition of Comments**

Comments were submitted from industry, special interest groups, and private individuals. The comments covered various issues, but were principally concerned with how a vendor would meet the provisions of reliability, accessibility, and security to be approved as a QICP by the FAA. The following addresses the issues raised by the commenters:

Several commenters questioned and/ or did not support that the AC does not address the quality of a QICP's service or the quality of the QICP's data. As stated in the draft AC and reiterated here, the FAA does not intend to provide quality control of QICP data or approve the data accessed from a QICP. While the FAA requires air carriers certificated under 14 CFR parts 121 and 135 to use an FAA-approved source for weather information, the FAA does not approve the information supplied to these carriers, or to pilots conducting operations under part 91. This AC does not change the agency's current position on approving quality of data, or sources for other than part 121 and 135 carriers. A fundamental change such as approving data and/or sources for part 91 operations would require rulemaking with a public process for notice and comment. While these comments are noted, the purpose and goal of this AC are not to add these requirements. The FAA finds value in ensuring that the provider's facility, as an approved source for part 121 and 135 operators, is reliable, accessible and secure. This

value may be realized by part 91 operators utilizing QICP vendors, if they so choose. To further clarify that an approved QICP does not include FAA approval of data source or quality, the FAA has added as part of the approval process, the provider's agreement to display a label on its internet site with the following recommended language. Failure to display this label may result in losing QICP status.

This Qualified Internet Communication Provider's (QICP) servers and communication interfaces are approved by the FAA as secure, reliable, and accessible in accordance with AC 00–62.

(1) This QICP does not ensure the quality and currency of the information transmitted to you.

(2) You assume the entire risk related to the information and its use.

Several commenters questioned the nature of the Quality of Service (QOS) agreements. Each approved QICP's maintenance plan has a QOS agreement with each user that addresses how the provider will meet measures of accessibility, reliability, and security. The QOS agreement should at most, only reference the standards and provide for complaint procedures if they are not maintained, allowing the parties to freely negotiate appropriate remedies and limitations of liability in the event the standards cannot be met for some period of time.

Comments were received on the use of standard security technology to ensure site authentication/data integrity. Specifically, a commenter disagreed with the use of Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) because SLL is not a formal standard and there are known bugs in early versions of SSL that allow an attacker to defeat any authentication and integrity assurances that it might provide, with a similar effort to altering data from an unsecured HTTP session.

The FAA agrees with this comment and has changed the AC to reflect that approved QICP's should maintain a security system that is applicable to current state-of-the-art technology. This also allows the applicant greater flexibility in implementing a system that complies with the AC while serving its customers and minimizing costs. In addition, it is noted that this change assists in preventing unauthorized access to or modification of provider data, software and hardware.

One commenter states that this AC inadequately describes the disaster recovery and contingency measures. The FAA does not believe it is necessary to provide specific details on every possible incident that could occur and believes that the AC provides guidance