use of customer records and information?

c. Insuring Security and Confidentiality

In addition to requiring protection against anticipated threats and hazards and against unauthorized access and use, section 501(b) requires that the safeguards standards ''insure the security and confidentiality of customer records and information'' Section 501(b)(1). Does this requirement mean something more than protecting against anticipated threats and hazards and unauthorized access and use? In particular, what should insuring ''confidentiality'' of information mean? What measures should the Safeguards Rule require a financial institution to take to maintain the confidentiality and security of customer records and information that it discloses? Where applicable, should the Safeguards Rule require a financial institution that discloses customer records and information to notify the recipients of the limitations on reuse and redisclosure of the information imposed by the Privacy Rule?

d. Consideration of Other Agencies' Safeguards Standards

The proposed Interagency Guidelines and the NCUA's proposed Guidelines (collectively, ''the proposed Guidelines'') both require regulated financial institutions to implement an ''Information Security Program'' that is developed by following certain procedures outlined by the respective proposed Guidelines. In their respective section III.A., the proposed Guidelines require each financial institution to involve its board of directors and management in various aspects of developing, implementing, and assessing an information security program. Under both proposals, a financial institution must take four basic steps to develop an information security program: (1) Identify and assess the risks that may threaten protected information; (2) develop a written plan containing policies and procedures to manage and control these risks; (3) implement and test the plan; and (4) adjust the plan on a continuing basis to account for changes in technology, the sensitivity of the protected information, and internal or external threats to information security. Similarly, in their respective sections III.C., both proposals provide a list of factors that a financial institution should consider in developing its information security program. The factors include specific potential elements of a security plan that should be considered, such as ''contract provisions and oversight mechanisms'' to protect the security of information handled by service providers (respective III.C.(g)), as well as broader issues that the security plan should address, such as ''[a]ccess rights to [covered] information,'' (respective III.C.(a)). Using the procedures provided by the proposed Guidelines, each covered financial institution is to develop a comprehensive information security program, the adequacy of which will be reviewed by the relevant agency through established oversight procedures, such as safety and soundness reviews. Finally, in their respective sections III.D., the proposed Guidelines require financial institutions to exercise due diligence in managing and monitoring outsourcing arrangements, in order to make sure that its service providers have implemented an effective information security program.

The proposed guidelines focus on the procedures that should be followed to develop a written information security program, and do not specify particular security measures that must be adopted. They do provide, however, that the Board of Directors must oversee efforts to develop, implement, and maintain an ''effective'' information security program. Should the Commission's Safeguards Rule be similar to the proposed Guidelines, and if so, how? Does the Act's requirement that the Commission issue a rule, rather than guidelines, warrant a different approach? Does the fact that the Commission does not conduct regular examination of financial institutions warrant more specific security measures? What, if any, features of the more general approach to safeguards taken by the SEC in its Privacy of Consumer Financial Information Final Rule (described in Section A, *supra*) are suitable for the Commission's Safeguards Rule?

By direction of the Commission.

C. Landis Plummer,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–22945 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Parts 210 and 240

[Release No. 33–7883, 34–43219; File No. S7–13–00]

Revision of the Commission's Auditor Independence Requirements

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of time period to submit materials for public hearing on September 20, 2000; location of hearings.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission is extending the time period by which participants must submit written materials for the public hearing on September 20, 2000, on the proposed rule Revision of the Commission's Auditor Independence Requirements (65 FR 43148 July 12, 2000). On August 10, 2000, the Commission issued a Notice announcing public hearings on September 13, 2000 in New York and September 20, 2000 in Washington, DC (65 FR 49954 8/16/2000). The original submission date for materials was September 5, 2000. The new submission date for those testifying on September 20, 2000 is September 12, 2000.

DATES: Written submissions for the September 20, 2000 hearing are due on September 12, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Oral statements or summaries of testimony, and other written testimony or comments, should be mailed to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20459–0609 or filed electronically at the following e-mail address: rule-comments@sec.gov. All oral statements or summaries of testimony, and other written testimony or comments, should refer to Comment File No. S7–13–00. Electronic submissions should include ''Comment File No. S7–13–00'' and ''Testimony'' in the subject line. Copies of all requests and other submissions and transcripts of the hearings will be available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room at 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Electronically submitted requests and other materials will be posted on the Commission's internet web site (www.sec.gov) following the hearings.

The hearing on September 13 will be held at Pace Downtown Theatre at Pace University, Spruce Street between Park Row and Gold Street, New York, New York (across from City Hall Park). The hearing on September 20 will be held in the William O. Douglas Room at the Commission's headquarters at 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John M. Morrissey, Deputy Chief Accountant, Office of the Chief Accountant, at (202) 942–4400.

Dated: August 29, 2000.

By the Commission.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–22716 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

36 CFR Part 293

Wilderness—Primitive Areas; Fixed Anchors in Wilderness

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Negotiated rulemaking committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Agriculture has established a negotiated rulemaking committee to develop recommendations for a proposed rule addressing the placement, use, and removal of fixed anchors used for recreational rock climbing purposes in congressionally designated wilderness areas administered by the Forest Service. The Fixed Anchors in Wilderness Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee is composed of individuals representing a cross section of interests with a definable stake in the outcome of the proposed rule. The Committee has been established in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and is engaged in the process of rulemaking pursuant to the provisions of the Negotiated Rulemaking Act. The Committee has held meetings in June, July, and August and will hold a fourth meeting in September. All meetings of the committee are open to public attendance.

DATES: The next meeting of the advisory committee will be held in Golden, Colorado, on September 19–20. The meeting is scheduled from 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on the first day and from 8 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. on the second day.

ADDRESSES: The advisory committee meeting will be held in the auditorium of the Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Forest Service, USDA, 740 Simms St., Golden, Colorado on September 19 and next door to the Regional Office at the Best Western—Denver West Motel conference room, located at 11595 W. 6th Avenue, Lakewood, CO, on September 20.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Stokes, Wilderness Program Manager, Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resources Staff, (202) 205–0925.

Dated: August 25, 2000.

Sally D. Collins,

Deputy Chief, National Forest System.

[FR Doc. 00–22911 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL–6865–3]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of intent to delete the White Farm Equipment Site (Site) from the National Priorities List (NPL).

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region VII announces the intent to delete the White Farm Equipment site from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this proposed action. The NPL constitutes appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which EPA promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended. The EPA and the state of Iowa have determined that the site poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, as defined by CERCLA. Five-year review reports will continue to be conducted.

DATES: Comments concerning the proposed deletion of this site from the NPL may be submitted on or before October 10, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Catherine Barrett, Remedial Project Manager, Superfund Division, Missouri/Kansas Remedial Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, KS 66101. Comprehensive information on this site is available through the public docket which is available for viewing at the U.S. EPA Region VII, Superfund Records Center, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, KS 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine Barrett, Remedial Project Manager, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, KS 66101, phone (913) 551–7704, fax (913) 551–7063.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The EPA Region VII announces the intent to delete the White Farm Equipment site, Charles City, Iowa, from the NPL, and requests public comments on this proposed action. The NPL constitutes appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) which EPA promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA). The EPA identifies sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health, welfare, or the environment and maintains the NPL as the list of these sites. The EPA and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) have determined that the remedial action for the site has been successfully executed.

The EPA will accept comments on the proposal to delete this site thirty (30) days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**.

Section II of this document explains the criteria for deleting sites from the NPL. Section III discusses the procedures that EPA is using for this action. Section IV discusses the White Farm Equipment site and explains how the site meets the deletion criteria.

II. NPL Deletion Criteria

Section 300.425(e) of the NCP provides that sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate. In making a determination to delete a site from the NPL, EPA in consultation with the state, shall consider whether any of the following criteria has been met:

(i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required;

(ii) All appropriate Fund-financed response under CERCLA has been implemented, and no further response action by responsible parties is appropriate; or

(iii) The remedial investigation has shown that the release of hazardous substances poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, remedial measures are not appropriate.

Even when a site is deleted from the NPL, where hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain at the site above levels that allow for