

is there to show that the existing advertising disclosure requirements are or are not conspicuous or prominent or otherwise effective or ineffective?

Enforceability of the Regulations

8. Many of the substantive provisions of the regulations are stated in terms of safe harbors, or displays that will be deemed to be in conformance with the Smokeless Tobacco Act, rather than as specific mandatory requirements. Are the regulations in this form sufficiently enforceable? Does this make it more difficult to prove that displays that do not conform to the safe harbors are not sufficiently conspicuous to conform to the requirements of the Smokeless Tobacco Act? Should the safe harbor approach be abandoned?

Smokeless Tobacco Dispensers

9. Should the regulations be revised to provide that any dispenser of individual smokeless tobacco packages that can be used as a retail display carry the advertising warning on its principal display panel?

Can Rolls

10. Should the regulations be amended to provide that a can roll of individual smokeless tobacco packages can consist of as few as two cans?

11. Are there any other provisions of the regulations that need to be amended? If so, which provisions require change and how should they be changed?

12. What is the likely effect of any changes in the regulations suggested in response to questions 6 through 11 on costs, profitability, competitiveness, or employment in small business entities?

13. The Smokeless Tobacco Act requires that smokeless tobacco companies submit plans to the Commission specifying the method they will use to rotate, display, and distribute the required health warnings on their packaging and advertising. Making changes suggested in the regulations in response to questions 6 through 11 may require the smokeless tobacco companies to amend their plans for the display and rotation of the warning statements. What paperwork or other burdens would be imposed by any changes suggested in response to questions 6 through 11?

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 307

Health warnings, Smokeless tobacco, Trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 1401–1410.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–5506 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 312

Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed “Safe Harbor” Guidelines and Request for Public Comment.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission publishes this notice and request for public comment concerning proposed self-regulatory guidelines under the safe harbor provision of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule, 16 CFR 312.10(a).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before April 6, 2000. Comments will be posted on the Commission's website: <http://www.ftc.gov>.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H–159, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. The Commission requests that commenters submit the original plus five copies, if feasible. To enable prompt review and public access, comments also should be submitted, if possible, in electronic form, on either a 5¼ or a 3½ inch computer disk, with a disk label stating the name of the commenter and the name and version of the word processing program used to create the document. (Programs based on DOS or Windows are preferred. Files from other operating systems should be submitted in ASCII text format.) Alternatively, the Commission will accept comments submitted to the following e-mail address, safeharbor@ftc.gov. Individual members of the public filing comments need not submit multiple copies or comments in electronic form. All submissions should be captioned: “PrivacyBot.com Safe Harbor Proposal—Comment, P004504.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Loren G. Thompson, (202) 326–2049, Abbe Goldstein, (202) 326–3423, or Elizabeth Delaney, (202) 326–2903, Division of Advertising Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, 601 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Section A. Background

On October 20, 1999, the Commission issued its final Rule pursuant to the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.¹ The Rule requires certain website operators to post privacy policies, provide notice, and obtain parental consent prior to collecting certain personal information from children. The Rule contains a “safe harbor” provision enabling industry groups or others to submit self-regulatory guidelines that would implement the protections of the Rule to the Commission for approval.²

Pursuant to § 312.10 of the Rule, PrivacyBot.com has submitted proposed self-regulatory guidelines to the Commission for approval. The full text of the proposed guidelines is available on the Commission's website, www.ftc.gov.

Section B. Questions on the Proposed Guidelines

The Commission is seeking comment on various aspects of the proposed guidelines, and is particularly interested in receiving comment on the questions that follow. These questions are designed to assist the public and should not be construed as a limitation on the issues on which public comment may be submitted. Responses to these questions should cite the numbers and subsection of the questions being answered. For all comments submitted, please provide any relevant data, statistics, or any other evidence, upon which those comments are based.

1. Please provide comment on any or all of the provisions in the proposed guidelines. For each provision commented on please describe (a) the impact of the provision(s) (including any benefits and costs), if any, and (b) what alternatives, if any, PrivacyBot.com should consider, as well as the costs and benefits of those alternatives.

2. Do the provisions of the proposed guidelines governing operators' information practices provide “the same or greater protection for children” as those contained in §§ 312.2–312.8 of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule? Where possible, please cite the relevant sections of both the Rule and the proposed guidelines.

3. Are the mechanisms used to assess operators' compliance with the guidelines effective? See Rule § 312.10(b)(2).³ If not, please describe (a) how the proposed guidelines could be

¹ 64 FR 59888 (Nov. 3, 1999).

² See 16 CFR 312.10; 64 FR at 59906–59908; 59915.

³ 64 FR at 59915.

modified to satisfy the Rule's requirements, and (b) the costs and benefits of those modifications.

4. Are the incentives for operators' compliance with the guidelines effective? *See* Rule § 312.10(b)(3).⁴ If not, please describe (a) how the proposed guidelines could be modified to satisfy the Rule's requirements, and (b) the costs and benefits of those modifications.

5. Do the guidelines provide adequate means for resolving consumer complaints? If not, please describe (a) how the proposed guidelines could be modified to resolve consumer complaints adequately, and (b) the costs and benefits of those modifications.

6. Please comment on the effectiveness of automation in the proposed guidelines and describe other means or mechanisms, if any, PrivacyBot.com should consider for its safe harbor program.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-5505 Filed 3-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

29 CFR Part 1910

[Docket No. S-777]

RIN 1218-AB36

Ergonomics Program

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), U.S. Department of Labor.

ACTION: Proposed rule; procedures for informal public hearing; rescheduling of informal public hearing; additional information and clarifications.

SUMMARY: OSHA is setting hearing and post-hearing procedures for its proposed Ergonomics Program standard published in the **Federal Register** on November 23, 1999. These procedures, which are provided as an alternative to the procedures the Agency usually uses, address: the hearing schedule, the nature of the hearing, availability of hearing testimony, the conduct of the rulemaking hearing, and post-hearing submissions. OSHA is issuing these procedures to ensure that the hearings proceed in a fair, orderly, and timely manner even though a very large number of parties have filed notices of

intent to appear at them. This document will enable the hearing participants to plan their activities in advance. This document also specifies the dates and locations of the hearings.

DATES: The hearing will begin on Monday, March 13, 2000, in Washington, D.C. The hearing in Washington will run for 4 weeks through April 7. The hearing will resume on April 11, in Chicago, Illinois, and will continue there until April 21. The hearing will then resume in Portland, Oregon on April 24 and run until May 3. The final week of the hearing will be May 8 through 12 at a location to be determined in Washington, D.C. The hearing will begin at 9:30 a.m. on March 13; on subsequent days, the starting time will be 8:30 a.m. The hearing will ordinarily conclude by 6:00 p.m. each day; however, in order to assure orderly development of the record on any particular day, the Administrative Law Judge may extend the hearing that day. All questioning of public participants will be completed on the day the participants testify.

ADDRESSES: The March 13 through April 7 hearing in Washington will be in the Frances Perkins Building Auditorium in the U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210. The hearing in Chicago will be held at the State of Illinois Building, James R. Thompson Center (Assembly Hall), 100 W. Randolph Street, in Chicago, Illinois. The hearing in Portland will be held at the Mark Hatfield Federal Court House, Courtroom #16, 1000 Southwest 3rd Avenue, in Portland, Oregon.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: OSHA's Ergonomics Team at (202) 693-2116, or visit the OSHA Homepage at www.osha.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The procedures for the hearings on the Ergonomics Program Standard follow:

Hearing and Post-Hearing Procedures

I. General Information

1. *Authority.* The following procedures will be utilized in the public hearing on OSHA's proposed Ergonomics Program Standard (64 FR 65768; 65 FR 4795). OSHA rulemaking hearings are conducted in accord with Section 6(b)(3) of the OSH Act, 29 U.S.C. 655(b)(3), and the Secretary of Labor's procedural regulations in 29 CFR Part 1911. As noted in the Proposal, 64 FR 66065-66066, § 1911.4 allows the Assistant Secretary, upon reasonable notice, to specify additional or alternative procedures for good cause.

This document provides notice that the Assistant Secretary is exercising that

authority in this case. In light of the very large number of parties who have filed notices of intent to appear at the hearings, the Assistant Secretary finds that good cause exists to establish additional procedures in advance to assure that the hearing proceeds in a fair, orderly, and timely manner.

2. *Hearing Dates.* As stated in the **Federal Register** document of February 1, 2000 (65 FR 4795), the hearing will begin on Monday, March 13, 2000 in the Frances Perkins Building Auditorium in the U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. The hearing in Washington will run for 4 weeks through April 7. The hearing will resume on April 11 at the State of Illinois Building, James R. Thompson Center (Assembly Hall), 100 W. Randolph Street, in Chicago, Illinois, and will continue there until April 21. The hearing will then resume at the Mark Hatfield Federal Court House, Courtroom #16, 1000 Southwest 3rd Avenue, in Portland, Oregon on April 24 and run until May 3. The final week of the hearing will be May 8 through 12 at a location to be determined in Washington, DC. The hearing will begin at 9:30 a.m. on March 13; on subsequent days, the starting time will be 8:30 a.m. The hearing will ordinarily conclude by 6:00 p.m. each day; however, in order to assure orderly development of the record on any particular day, the Administrative Law Judge may extend the hearing that day. All questioning of public participants will be completed on the day the participants testify.

3. *Nature of Hearing.* This OSHA rulemaking hearing is a legislative-type hearing, not an adjudicative one. It is an informal administrative proceeding, intended for information gathering and clarification. This informal hearing is an adjunct to the written comment period, and is intended to provide interested persons with an additional opportunity to address the Agency and provide testimony and evidence for the rulemaking record. These procedural rules governing the hearing are intended to facilitate the development of a clear, accurate and complete record, while assuring fairness and due process. The rules of evidence and other procedural rules governing adjudications do not apply. Participants who have filed Notices of Intention to Appear may testify and question witnesses in accordance with these procedures (see Section II), but may not issue subpoenas or call to testify any person other than the persons who have agreed to testify for them. Motions to strike evidence will not be considered. The intent is to provide an opportunity for effective oral presentation by interested persons, and

⁴ *Id.*