

Interference Proceedings, published at 49 FR 48416 on December 12, 1984. In this respect, attention is directed to Examples 3, 4 and 5 of that notice, 49 FR at 48420:

Example 3: Application E contains patentable claims 1 (engine), 2 (6-cylinder engine), and 3 (engine with a platinum piston). Application F contains patentable claims 11 (engine) and 12 (8-cylinder engine). Claims 1 and 2 of application E and claims 11 and 12 of application F define the same patentable invention. Claim 3 of application E defines a separate patentable invention from claims 1 and 2 of application E and claims 11 and 12 of application F. If an interference is declared, there would be one count (engine). Claims 1 and 2 of application E and claims 11 and 12 of application F would be designated to correspond to the count. Claim 3 of application E would not be designated to correspond to the count.

Example 4: Application G contains patentable claims 1 (engine), 2 (6-cylinder engine), and 3 (engine with a platinum piston). Application H contains patentable claims 11 (engine) and 15 (engine with a platinum piston). Claims 1 and 2 of application G and claim 11 of application H define the same patentable invention. Claim 3 of application G and claim 15 of application H define a separate patentable invention from claims 1 and 2 of application G and claim 11 of application H. If an interference is declared, there would be two counts: Count 1 (engine) and Count 2 (engine with a platinum piston). Claims 1 and 2 of application G and claim 11 of application H would be designated to correspond to Count 1. Claim 3 of application G and claim 15 of application H would be designated to correspond to Count 2.

Example 5: Application J contains patentable claims 1 (engine), 2 (combination of an engine and a carburetor) and 3 (combination of an engine, a carburetor, and a catalytic converter). Application K contains patentable claims 31 (engine), 32 (combination of an engine and a carburetor), and 33 (combination of an engine, a carburetor, and an air filter). The engine, combination of an engine and carburetor, and combination of an engine, carburetor, and air filter define the same patentable invention. The combination of an engine, carburetor, and catalytic converter define a separate patentable invention from engine. If an interference is declared, there would be one count (engine). Claims 1 and 2 of application J and claims 31, 32, and 33 of application K would be designated to correspond to the count. Claim 3 of application J would not be designated as corresponding to the count.

If the facts of Example 3 are changed so that Application E contained only claim 3 (engine with a platinum piston), no interference would be declared because there is no interference-in-fact between claim 3 of Application E and claims 1–2 of Application F. The engine or 8-cylinder engine of Application F would not anticipate or render obvious an engine with a platinum piston of

Application E. Likewise, and based on similar rationale, if the facts of Example 5 are changed so that Application J contained only claim 3 (combination of an engine, a carburetor, and a catalytic converter), no interference would be declared because there is no interference-in-fact between claim 3 of Application J and claims 31–33 of Application K.

At recent public events, it has been suggested that there may be a need to expand the situations where an interference should be declared or maintained. Any decision to expand the nature of interference proceedings will have a resource consequence for USPTO and for applicants and patentees involved in interferences. Approximately one-quarter of the resources of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences are used to resolve interferences, notwithstanding the fact that there are many more appeals than interferences. USPTO has received many reports that interferences involve considerable costs for applicants and patentees. Additionally, there is no desire on the part of USPTO, and no authority under the law, to turn interference proceedings under 35 U.S.C. 135(a) into pre-grant oppositions or post-grant cancellations. Accordingly, USPTO is reluctant, at this time, to expand the circumstances under which an interference might be declared or maintained absent a compelling reason.

This notice provides interested parties with an opportunity to comment and make out a case that the nature of interferences should be expanded beyond the current practice. If a one-way patentability analysis is sufficient to establish an interference-in-fact, would it be possible to have an interference with two counts as set out in Example 4, reproduced above? How would having an interference between claim 1 of application G and claim 15 of application H of Example 4 square with the holding of *Nitz v. Ehrenreich*, 537 F.2d 539, 543, 190 USPQ 413, 416–17 (CCPA 1976)? If a one-way patentability analysis is sufficient, what would it take to establish that there is no interference-in-fact in a given case?

Comment Format

Comments should be submitted in electronic form if possible, either via the Internet or on a 3¼-inch diskette. Comments submitted in electronic form should be submitted as ASCII text. Special characters, proprietary formats, and encryption should not be used.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(A), 3(a)(2), 135(a).

Dated: December 14, 2000.

Q. Todd Dickinson,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 00–32374 Filed 12–19–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton, Wool, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textiles and Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Taiwan

December 15, 2000.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 20, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Unger, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port, call (202) 927–5850, or refer to the U.S. Customs website at <http://www.customs.gov>. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482–3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The current limits for certain categories are being increased for carryforward.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 64 FR 71982, published on December 22, 1999). Also see 64 FR 60796, published on November 8, 1999.

Richard B. Steinkamp,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

December 15, 2000.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

¹⁶Category 647-W: only HTS numbers
 6203.23.0060, 6203.23.0070, 6203.29.2030,
 6203.29.2035, 6203.43.2500, 6203.43.3500,
 6203.43.4010, 6203.43.4020, 6203.43.4030,
 6203.43.4040, 6203.49.1500, 6203.49.2015,
 6203.49.2030, 6203.49.2045, 6203.49.2060,
 6203.49.8030, 6210.40.5030, 6211.20.1525,
 6211.20.3820, and 6211.33.0030; Category
 648-W: only HTS numbers 6204.23.0040,
 6204.23.0045, 6204.29.2020, 6204.29.2025,
 6204.29.4038, 6204.63.2000, 6204.63.3000,
 6204.63.3510, 6204.63.3530, 6204.63.3532,
 6204.63.3540, 6204.69.2510, 6204.69.2530,
 6204.69.2540, 6204.69.2560, 6204.69.6030,
 6204.69.9030, 6210.50.5035, 6211.20.1555,
 6211.20.6820, 6211.43.0040 and
 6217.90.9060.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Richard B. Steinkamp,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 00-32509 Filed 12-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before January 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Lauren Wittenberg, Acting Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the internet address Lauren_Wittenberg@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its

statutory obligations. The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

Dated: December 14, 2000.

John Tressler,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.

Title: Reading Excellence Act (REA) State-District-School Study.

Frequency: Semi-Annually; Annually.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 1,623.

Burden Hours: 8,592.

Abstract: REA provides competitive reading and literacy grants to state education agencies (SEA) to help high-poverty schools and those in Title I improvement status to: (1) Teach every child to read by the end of the third grade; (2) provide children in early childhood with the readiness skills and support they need to learn to read once they enter school; (3) expand the number of high-quality family literacy programs; (4) provide early intervention to children who are at risk of being identified for special education inappropriately; and (5) base instruction, including tutoring, on scientifically-based reading research. The first cohort of 17 states was funded in the summer of 1999. The REA State-District-School Study fulfills the states' performance reporting requirements. In addition, the study will (1) collect and analyze demographic and descriptive information on REA states, districts and schools in order to provide a contextual backdrop and sampling for two national evaluations—the School and Classroom Implementation and Impact (SCII) study and the Children's Reading Gains (Gains) study; (2) compare eligible but not funded with funded districts and schools; (3) augment the agency's REA monitoring within each SEA, local

education agencies (LEA), and school; (4) track performance over time; (5) inform the states' development of indicators of program quality; and (6) provide data for the National Institute for Literacy's effort to disseminate information on effective subgrantee projects.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, or should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the internet address OCIO_IMG_Issues@ed.gov or faxed to 202-708-9346. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Kathy Axt at her internet address Kathy_Axt@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 00-32356 Filed 12-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Determination To Establish the Commission on Fire Safety and Preparedness

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, and title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, subpart 101-6, Final Rule on Federal Advisory Committee Management), I hereby certify that the Commission on Fire Safety and Preparedness is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department of Energy by law. This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat of the General Services Administration, pursuant to 41 CFR subpart 101-6.10.

The purpose of the Commission is to provide the Secretary of Energy and the Assistant Secretary of Environment, Safety and Health, with advice, information, and recommendations on the readiness of the Department of Energy complex for the threat of wildland and facility fires. The Commission will provide an organized forum to evaluate the nature of the risk of fire and concomitant risk of loss, the state of the Department's fire protection programs, and emergency response systems. The Commission will also