

principles-based rule? If yes, what primary disclosure principles should the Commission consider? If the Commission were to adopt a principles-based reserves disclosure framework, how could it affect disclosure quality, consistency and comparability?

2. Should the Commission consider allowing companies to disclose reserves other than proved reserves in filings with the SEC? If we were to allow companies to include reserves other than proved reserves, what reserves disclosure should we consider? Should we specify categories of reserves? If so, how should we define those categories?

3. Should the Commission adopt all or part of the Society of Petroleum Engineers—Petroleum Resources Management System? If so, what portions should we consider adopting? Are there other classification frameworks the Commission should consider? If the Commission were to adopt a different classification framework, how should the Commission respond if that framework is later changed?

4. Should we consider revising the current definition of proved reserves, proved developed reserves and proved undeveloped reserves? If so, how? Is there a way to revise the definition or the elements of the definition, to accommodate future technological innovations?

5. Should we specify the tests companies must undertake to estimate reserves? If so, what tests should we require? Should we specify the data companies must produce to support reserves conclusions? If so, what data should we require? Should we specify the process a company must follow to assess that data in estimating its reserves?

6. Should we reconsider the concept of reasonable certainty? If we were to replace it, what should we replace it with? How could that affect disclosure quality? Should we consider requiring companies to make certain assumptions? Should we prohibit others?

7. Should we reconsider the concept of certainty with regard to proved undeveloped reserves? Should we allow companies to indefinitely classify undeveloped reserves as proved?

8. Should we reconsider the concept of economic producibility? If we were to replace it, what should we replace it with? How could that affect disclosure quality? Should we consider requiring companies to make certain assumptions? Should we prohibit others?

9. Should we reconsider the concept of existing operating conditions? If we

were to replace it, what should we replace it with? How could that affect disclosure quality? Should we consider requiring companies to make certain assumptions? Should we prohibit others?

10. Should we reconsider requiring companies to use a sale price in estimating reserves? If so, how should we establish the price framework? Should we require or allow companies to use an average price instead of a fixed price or a futures price instead of a spot price? Should we allow companies to determine the price framework? How would allowing companies to use different prices affect disclosure quality and consistency? Regardless of the pricing method that is used, should we allow or require companies to present a sensitivity analysis that would quantify the effect of price changes on the level of proved reserves?

11. Should we consider eliminating any of the current exclusions from proved reserves? How could removing these exclusions affect disclosure quality?

12. Should we consider eliminating any of the current exclusions from oil and gas activities? How could removing these exclusions affect disclosure quality?

13. Should we consider eliminating the current restrictions on including oil and gas reserves from sources that require further processing, e.g., tar sands? If we were to eliminate the current restrictions, how should we consider a disclosure framework for those reserves? What physical form of those reserves should we consider in evaluating such a framework? Is there a way to establish a disclosure framework that accommodates unforeseen resource discoveries and processing methods?

14. What aspects of technology should we consider in evaluating a disclosure framework? Is there a way to establish a disclosure framework that accommodates technological advances?

15. Should we consider requiring companies to engage an independent third party to evaluate their reserves estimates in the filings they make with us? If yes, what should that party's role be? Should we specify who would qualify to perform this function? If so, who should be permitted to perform this function and what professional standards should they follow? Are there professional organizations that the Commission can look to set and enforce adherence to those standards?

In addition to the areas for comment identified above, we are interested in any other issues that commenters may wish to address and the benefits and costs relating to investors, issuers and

other market participants of the possibility of revising disclosure rules pertaining to petroleum reserves included in Commission filings. Please be as specific as possible in your discussion and analysis of any additional issues. Where possible, please provide empirical data or observations to support or illustrate your comments.

By the Commission.

Dated: December 12, 2007.

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-24384 Filed 12-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

36 CFR Parts 1193 and 1194

RIN 3014-AA22

Telecommunications Act Accessibility Guidelines; Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards

AGENCY: Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) has established a Telecommunications and Electronic and Information Technology Advisory Committee (Committee) to assist it in revising and updating accessibility guidelines for telecommunications products and accessibility standards for electronic and information technology. This notice announces the dates, times, and location of two upcoming committee meetings, one of which will be a conference call and the other will be an in-person meeting.

DATES: The conference call is scheduled for January 2, 2008 (beginning at 1 p.m. and ending at 4 p.m. Eastern time). The in-person meeting will take place on January 7–9, 2008 (beginning at 8:30 a.m. and ending at 6 p.m. each day).

ADDRESSES: Individuals can participate in the conference call on January 2, 2008 by dialing the teleconference numbers which will be posted on the Access Board's Web site at <http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/update-index.htm>. The in-person meeting on January 7–9, 2008 will be held at the National Science Foundation. All attendees should go to 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230 to pick up security passes and then go to 4121 Wilson Boulevard, Stafford Place II,

Room 555, Arlington, VA 22230 for the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy Creagan, Office of Technical and Information Services, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, 1331 F Street, NW., suite 1000, Washington, DC 20004-1111.

Telephone number: 202-272-0016

(Voice); 202-272-0082 (TTY).

Electronic mail address:

creagan@access-board.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) established the Telecommunications and Electronic and Information Technology Advisory Committee (Committee) to assist it in revising and updating accessibility guidelines for telecommunications products and accessibility standards for electronic and information technology. The next committee meetings will focus on outstanding issues which have not yet been resolved. The agendas,

instructions (including information on captioning), and dial in telephone numbers for the in-person meeting, as well as for the conference call are available at <http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/update-index.htm>. Notices of future meetings will be published in the **Federal Register**.

The committee may cancel the conference call before it is scheduled to take place depending on the needs of the committee and its progress in discussing and resolving outstanding issues. If the conference call is canceled, a notice will be posted at <http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/update-index.htm>. The conference call is open to the public and interested persons can dial in and communicate their views during public comment periods scheduled during the conference call. Participants may call in from any location of their choosing.

The in-person meeting on January 7-9, 2008 is open to the public and interested persons can attend the meeting and communicate their views

during public comment periods scheduled on each day of the meeting. The in-person meeting site is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Sign language interpreters, an assistive listening system, and real-time captioning will be provided. For the comfort of other participants, persons attending committee meetings are requested to refrain from using perfume, cologne, and other fragrances. Due to security measures at the National Science Foundation, all attendees must notify the Access Board's receptionist at (202) 272-0007 or receptionist@access-board.gov by December 21, 2007 of their intent to attend the in-person meeting. This notification is required for expeditious entry into the facility and will enable the Access Board to provide additional information as needed.

Lawrence W. Roffee,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. E7-24506 Filed 12-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8150-01-P