

information or analysis regarding the effect of its NRTL approval requirements or the NRTL Program on trade.

OSHA believes that its current system facilitates trade. The NRTL Program has optional procedures in place to avoid duplicating conformity-assessment of products. These options permit the NRTLs to accept test results from other parties (including certain product manufacturers) if the NRTL determines that these parties are qualified. Through these options, if an EU manufacturer has the qualifications to do the testing or uses testing performed by a qualified test laboratory, the NRTL can rely on the testing submitted by the manufacturer and avoid retesting products. In Europe, there are 250 laboratories or manufacturers that provide testing to NRTLs. In addition, NRTLs that are members of the internationally recognized International Electrotechnical Commission Certification Body (IEC-CB) system may use testing performed by organizations accredited under that scheme. The IEC-CB system was established in large part to facilitate trade (both export and import) of electrical products. Under this system, a manufacturer in one country has its product tested by one of its country's member laboratories. This laboratory issues a test report that the manufacturer can submit to a member laboratory in another country, which will use the report to determine whether to approve the manufacturer's product for export to that country.

These various options allow NRTLs to rely on other qualified entities to perform testing and certification. These options can reduce the cost and time required to obtain product approvals by NRTLs, which in turn reduces the cost and time to market for products. A NRTL's responsibility is to ensure the accuracy of the data provided by these qualified entities. NRTLs work closely with qualified manufacturers, both large and small, to avoid any unnecessary delays and costs.

Through the following questions, OSHA seeks information on how its NRTL Program and the EU's system of conformity assessment hinders or facilitates trade.

VI.35. In considering impacts on trade, how should OSHA compare SDoC and third-party certification (in particular OSHA's NRTL Program) to determine if one system adds more value to trade than the other system? If such comparisons have been made, what is the increase in value?

VI.36. When comparing SDoC and third-party certification (in particular OSHA's NRTL Program), is there any

reduction in product time to market for one system compared to other systems? If so, how much time is saved? Does the time saved vary by product? Is SDoC faster than third-party certification for some products and slower for others?

VI.37. Please provide specific examples of how each system impacts trade. Provide any data, if available, on how each system may be a barrier or a help to trade by affecting product time to market, reduced profits, or other effects.

G. Implementation Suggestions by Certain Industries

In August 2008, OSHA received a submission from three industry associations advocating that OSHA permit "safety approvals for a limited scope of information and communication technology products to include the use of Supplier's Declaration of Conformity (SDoC) as an option to (not a replacement for) third-party certification." (Ex. OSHA-2008-0032-0019.) This submission compliments the EC's proposal by providing specific suggestions on how OSHA should permit and implement SDoC. While the focus of this RFI is the EC's proposal, OSHA seeks, through the following question, comments on the issues and approach outlined in this industry submission.

VI.38. If OSHA were to implement SDoC, should it follow the approach in the industry submission, either partially or completely? If partially, which industry suggestions should OSHA consider? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the industry approach? Would the industry approach affect your response to any of the other questions in this section, and, if yes, how would your response differ? In addition, please provide any comments you want on issues raised by the industry submission that are not covered by the questions in this RFI.

VII. Responding to This RFI

OSHA welcomes information, data, and comment on SDoC generally, and the EC's proposal specifically. OSHA has provided a number of questions above to provide a framework for the public to respond to this RFI. However, you can provide comment or information on any aspect of the broad areas mentioned above, and not limit your answers to the specific questions posed. In responding to the questions in this RFI, please explain the reasons supporting your views, and identify and provide the relevant information on which you rely, including data, studies, articles, and other materials. Respondents are encouraged to address

any aspect of the issue on which they believe they can contribute. Please identify any organization you represent and your position with that organization, and you may describe any qualifications which you believe are relevant to your comment. You are free to provide any information that you believe would be useful to OSHA, including any data or supporting documentation. However, as noted in section I, OSHA particularly seeks comments that include specific, detailed, and credible scientific, technical, statistical, and similar data and studies that support claims made by commenters.

OSHA will review all timely comments and determine whether to initiate rulemaking or take other action with respect to SDoC, or to take no further action.

VIII. Authority and Signature

This document was prepared under the direction of Edwin G. Foulke, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. This action is taken pursuant to sections 4, 6, and 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 657), Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5-2007 (72 FR 31159), and 29 CFR Part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC, on October 14, 2008.

Edwin G. Foulke, Jr.

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. E8-24826 Filed 10-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION, THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Agency Information Collection Activities; Extension of Currently Approved Information Collection; Comment Request; U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Application for the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals

AGENCY: Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act and

supporting regulations, this document announces that the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (the Institute), part of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, is submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for an extension for the currently approved information collection (ICR), OMB control Number 3320-0008: Application for the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building, currently operating pursuant to OMB clearance issued October 25, 2005 and which expires January 31, 2009 (OMB granted extension from previous expiration date of October 31, 2008). The U.S. Institute published a **Federal Register** Notice on July 30, 2008 (73 FR 44289-44290), to solicit public comments for a 60-day period. The U.S. Institute received no comments. Thus, no changes were made to the application. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments regarding this information collection. *Comments are invited on:* (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the time spent completing the application (burden of the proposed collection of information), including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 19, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Direct comments to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *Attention:* Heidi King, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Desk Officer for The Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, *Heidi_R_King@omb.eop.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Docherty, Roster Manager, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Ave., Tucson, Arizona 85701. *Fax:* 520-670-5530. *Phone:* 520-901-8501. *E-mail:* *docherty@ecr.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Abstract: The U.S. Institute is a federal program established by Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource, and public lands conflicts. The U.S. Institute serves as an impartial, non-partisan institution, and accomplishes much of its work by partnering, contracting with, or referral to, experienced practitioners. In addition, the U.S. Institute maintains the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals (National ECR Roster or roster). The Application for the National Roster of Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals (application) compiles data available from the resumes of environmental neutrals (mediators, facilitators, etc.) into a format that is standardized for efficient and fair eligibility review, database searches, and retrievals. The roster, the application and the related entry criteria, were developed collaboratively and with the support of the Environmental Protection Agency. A professional needs complete the application form one time. Once an application is approved, the roster member has access to update information online. The proposed collection is necessary to support ongoing maintenance of the roster and a continuous, open application process. The application and supplementary information are available from the U.S. Institute's Web site. From <http://www.ecr.gov/Resources/Roster/Roster.aspx>, choose the right-hand navigation bar link to "Roster Application: Info and Log In".

Burden Statement: Burden for potentially affected public: environmental dispute resolution and consensus building professionals (new respondents); existing roster members (for updating).

Proposed Frequency of Response: One initial, with voluntary updates approximately once per year.

Annual Number of Respondents: 30 (new response); 125 (update).

Time per Respondent: 2.5 hours (new response); 15 minutes (update).

Total Annual Hours Burden: 106 (new response and update combined).

Annual Cost Burden: \$3,359 (new response); \$1,399 (update).

Total Annual Cost Burden: \$4,758 (new response and update combined); labor costs exclusively; no capital or start-up costs.

Changes in the Estimates: There are no changes in the labor hours in this ICR compared to the previous ICR. The reduction in cost figures from the previous ICR are due to use of current

Bureau of Labor Statistics reports for valuing time (civilian workers category of "professionals and related occupations": \$44.78 per hour) rather than estimated contractor rates.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 5601-5609)

Dated the 9th day of October 2008.

Ellen Wheeler,

Executive Director, Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation, and Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. E8-24835 Filed 10-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-FN-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Temporary Change in Hours at Central Plains Regional Archives, Kansas City, MO

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Central Plains Regional Archives will be temporarily closed to researchers on Mondays from the week of October 20, 2008, through the week of March 30, 2009, to prepare for relocation to the new Central Plains Regional Headquarters and Regional Archives.

DATES: October 20, 2008 through March 30, 2009.

ADDRESSES: The current address is NARA Central Plains Regional Archives, 2312 East Bannister Road, Kansas City, MO 64131. The new address will be Central Plains Regional Headquarters and Regional Archives, 400 West Pershing Road, Kansas City, MO.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diana Duff at 816-268-8013.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In April 2009, the Central Plains Regional Archives will move to a new facility at the Union Station complex in Kansas City. The new facility will greatly improve public access to archival records and ensure that the archival records are stored under proper environmental conditions. In addition, some of the Region's less frequently used archival holdings are being moved to NARA's Lee's Summit, MO, facility. The temporary, once-weekly closure will allow staff to complete activities necessary for the move, such as reboxing, description, and holdings maintenance. The actual shipping of records will take place through March 2009. During the move, there may be delays in retrieving records that are in transit. A listing of records in transit is