

Affected Public: Primarily business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 160,004 responses per year.

Estimated Time per Response: The USPTO estimates that it takes the public approximately 3 minutes (0.05 hours) to 15 minutes (0.25 hours) to complete this information, depending on the application. This includes the time to

gather the necessary information, prepare the applications, and submit the completed application to the USPTO. The time estimates shown for the electronic forms in this collection are based on the average amount of time needed to complete and electronically file the associated form.

Estimated Total Annual Respondent Burden Hours: 12,491 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Respondent Cost Burden: \$3,797,264. The USPTO believes that associate attorneys will complete these submissions. The professional hourly rate for associate attorneys in private firms is \$304. Using this hourly rate, the USPTO estimates that the total respondent cost burden for this collection is \$3,797,264.

Item	Estimated time for response (min)	Estimated annual responses	Estimated annual burden hours
Revocation of Attorney/Domestic Representative and/or Appointment of Attorney/Domestic Representative	6	13,128	1,313
TEAS Revocation of Attorney/Domestic Representative and/or Appointment of Attorney/Domestic Representative (PTO Form 2196)	5	105,023	8,402
Request for Permission to Withdraw as Attorney of Record	15	427	107
TEAS Request for Permission to Withdraw as Attorney of Record (PTO Form 2201) ..	12	3,419	684
Change of Owner's Address	4	4,223	296
TEAS Change of Owner's Address (PTO Form 2197)	3	33,784	1,689
Total	160,004	12,491	

Estimated Total Annual Non-hour Respondent Cost Burden: \$7,317. There are postage costs associated with this information collection. This collection does not have any capital start-up, operating, maintenance, or recordkeeping costs, nor does it have filing fees.

Customers incur postage costs when submitting the non-electronic information to the USPTO by mail through the United States Postal Service. The USPTO estimates that the majority (98%) of the paper forms are submitted to the USPTO via first class mail. Out of 17,778 paper forms, the

USPTO estimates that 17,422 forms will be mailed, with a first class postage cost of 42 cents (as of May 12, 2008). Therefore, the USPTO estimates that the total non-hour respondent cost burden for this collection, in the form of postage costs, is \$7,317 per year.

Item	Responses (yr) (a)	Postage costs (b)	Total cost (yr) (a) × (b)
Revocation of Attorney/Domestic Representative and/or Appointment of Attorney/Domestic Representative	12,865	\$0.42	\$5,403.00
Request for Permission to Withdraw as Attorney of Record	418	0.42	176.00
Change of Owner's Address Form	4,139	0.42	1,738.00
Total	17,422		7,317.00

IV. Request for Comments

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 estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be 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.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection;

they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: April 8, 2008.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Customer Information Services Group, Public Information Services Division.

[FR Doc. E8-7980 Filed 4-14-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 08-40]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Department of Defense, Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104-164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. B. English, DSCA/DBO/CFM, (703) 601-3740.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittals 08-40 with attached transmittal, policy justification, and Sensitivity of Technology.

Dated: April 7, 2008.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5001-06-p



DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-2800

APR 02 2008
In reply refer to:
USP002356-08


The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6501

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 08-40, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letters(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Turkey for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$227 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of this proposed sale.

You will also find attached a certification as required by Section 620C(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that this action is consistent with the principles set forth in subsection 620C(b) of that Act as codified in section 2373 of title 22, United States Code.

Sincerely,


Jeffrey A. Wieringa
Vice Admiral, USN
Director

Enclosures:

1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification
3. Sensitivity of Technology
4. Section 620C(d)

Same ltr to:

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs
Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations
Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations

Transmittal No. 08-40

**Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended**

- (i) **Prospective Purchaser:** Turkey
- (ii) **Total Estimated Value:**
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Major Defense Equipment* | \$ 50 million |
| Other | \$ <u>177 million</u> |
| TOTAL | \$ 227 million |
- (iii) **Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:** six MK 41 Vertical Launch System (VLS) Baseline VII tactical modules and two sets of MK 41 VLS upgrade kits to modernize two MEKO Track IIA frigates, four ex-Perry Class FFG Frigates and to upgrade two MEKO Track IIB MK-41 VLS from baseline IV to baseline VII configuration. Included with the MK 41 VLS are the ship's fire control system upgrades to allow for Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile capability, installation and testing, U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services, equipment operation and maintenance, personnel training and training equipment, support and test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, launch system software development and maintenance and other related elements of logistics support.
- (iv) **Military Department:** Navy (SDA, Amendment 1)
- (v) **Prior Related Cases, if any:**
FMS case LID - \$32 million – 15Jul94
FMS case SDA - \$62 million - 5Jul07
- (vi) **Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:** none
- (vii) **Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Articles or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:** See Annex attached
- (viii) **Date Report Delivered to Congress:** APR 02 2008

* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Turkey – MK 41 Vertical Launch Systems

The Government of Turkey has requested a possible sale of six MK 41 Vertical Launch System (VLS) Baseline VII tactical modules and two sets of MK 41 VLS upgrade kits to modernize two MEKO Track IIA frigates, four ex-Perry Class FFG Frigates and to upgrade two MEKO Track IIB MK-41 VLS from baseline IV to baseline VII configuration. Included with the MK 41 VLS are the ship's fire control system upgrades to allow for Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile capability, installation and testing, U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services, equipment operation and maintenance, personnel training and training equipment, support and test equipment, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, launch system software development and maintenance and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is \$227 million.

Turkey is a partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability in the region. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability that will contribute to an acceptable military balance in the area. This proposed sale is consistent with those objectives.

The proposed sale of Vertical Launch Systems to Turkey will contribute to U.S. security objectives by improving the Turkish Navy's ability to contribute to coalition and NATO operations and the Global War on Terrorism, and coalition operations such as United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and BLACKSEAFOR in the Black Sea and Eastern Mediterranean regions. The proven reliability and compatibility of like systems in association with numerous platforms will foster increased interoperability with U.S., NATO and coalition forces, and expand regional defenses to counter common threats to border and shipping assets in the region. The Turkish Navy can easily integrate this system capability into its concept of operations and will have no difficulty absorbing these systems into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The principle contractor will be Lockheed Martin Maritime Systems and Sensors of Baltimore, Maryland, and Moorestown, New Jersey. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government representatives or contractor representatives to Turkey.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

Transmittal No. 08-40**Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act****Annex
Item No. vii****(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:**

1. The MK-41 Vertical Launch Systems (VLS) contain sensitive technology and are Unclassified. The Launch Control Computer Program (LCCP), which also contains missile launch rates, is classified Confidential. The LCCP provides the control and processing to interface the Weapon Control System with the VLS. Sections of the MK-41 technical documentation, which disclose launcher vulnerabilities, are classified Confidential.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

[FR Doc. E8-7860 Filed 4-14-08; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001-06-C

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Office of the Secretary of Defense****Renewal of Department of Defense
Federal Advisory Committees**

AGENCY: DoD.

ACTION: Amendment of Federal
Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, (5 U.S.C. Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102-3.65, the Department of Defense gives notice that it is amending the charter for the Board of Visitors National Defense University (hereafter referred to as the Board).

The Board is a discretionary federal advisory committee established by the Secretary of Defense to provide the Department of Defense independent advice and recommendations on organization management, curricula, instructional methods, facilities and

other matters of interest to the National Defense University.

The Board shall be composed of approximately twenty-one members, who are eminent authorities in the fields of national defense, academia, business, national security affairs, and the defense industry. Three of the twenty-one Board members are Federal ex officio members: (a) The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; (b) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration; and (c) the Department of State Director General.

Board Members appointed by the Secretary of Defense, who are not federal officers or employees, shall serve as Special Government Employees under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 3109. With the exception of the federal ex officio members, Board members shall be appointed on an annual basis by the Secretary of Defense, and shall serve no more than fifteen years on the Board. Board members shall, with the exception of travel and per diem for official travel, serve without compensation.

The Board Membership shall select the Board's Chairperson and the Co-

Chairperson from the total Board Membership, and this individual shall serve at the discretion of the Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff or designee. In addition, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or designated representative may invite other distinguished Government officers to serve as non-voting observers of the Board, and appoint consultants, with special expertise, to assist the Board on an ad hoc basis.

The Board shall be authorized to establish subcommittees, as necessary and consistent with its mission, and these subcommittees or working groups shall operate under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976, and other appropriate Federal regulations.

Such subcommittees or workgroups shall not work independently of the chartered Board, and shall report all their recommendations and advice to the Board for full deliberation and discussion. Subcommittees or workgroups have no authority to make decisions on behalf of the chartered Board nor can they report directly to the