

on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and that it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866. It has been determined further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it, if filed, may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 USC 106(g), 40101, 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

95-18-52 LOCKHEED: Amendment 39-9366. Docket 95-NM-153-AD.

Applicability: All Model L-1011-385 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (f) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe

condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent fatigue cracking which could lead to failure of the fittings that attach the aft pressure bulkhead to the fuselage stringers, and could result in rapid decompression of the airplane during flight, accomplish the following:

(a) Perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracking of the fittings that attach the aft pressure bulkhead to the fuselage stringers (hereinafter referred to as "fittings") at stringers 1 through 10 (right side) and at stringers 64 through 56 (left side), at the later of the times specified in either paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD.

(1) Prior to the accumulation of 20,000 total flight cycles; or

(2) Within the next 25 flight cycles or 10 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs earlier.

(b) If cracking is detected in the fitting at either stringer 10 or stringer 56, prior to further flight, perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracking of the next adjacent fitting (i.e., at stringer 11 or 55). If cracking is detected in that fitting, prior to further flight, perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracking of the next adjacent fitting (i.e., at stringer 12 or 54). If cracking is detected in that fitting, prior to further flight, continue to perform detailed visual inspections to detect cracking of the next adjacent fitting(s) until such a fitting is found to be free of cracks.

(c) If any cracked fitting is detected during the inspections required by either paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish the requirements of paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this AD.

(1) Replace the cracked fitting with a new fitting, or with a serviceable fitting on which a detailed visual inspection has been performed previously to detect cracking and has been found to be free of cracks; and

(2) Perform a detailed visual inspection to detect cracking in the radius at the lower end of the vertical leg of the bulkhead T-shaped frame between the stringer locations on either side of the stringer having the cracked fitting. If any cracked T-shaped frame is detected, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate.

(d) Repeat the inspections and other necessary actions required by paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this AD at intervals not to exceed 1,800 flight cycles or 3,000 flight hours, whichever occurs earlier.

(e) Within 10 days after accomplishing the initial inspections required by paragraphs (a) and (c) of this AD, submit a report of the inspection results (both positive and negative findings) to the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Campus Building, 1701

Columbia Avenue, suite 2-160, College Park, Georgia 30337-2748; telephone (404) 305-7340; fax (404) 305-7348. The report must include, at a minimum, the total number of flight cycles accumulated on the airplane having the cracked fitting or cracked T-shaped frame, and identification of the location on the airplane where the cracked fitting or T-shaped frame was found, if any. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

(f) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office (ACO). Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Atlanta ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Atlanta ACO.

(g) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(h) This amendment becomes effective on September 28, 1995, to all persons except those persons to whom it was made immediately effective by telegraphic AD T95-18-52, issued on August 29, 1995, which contained the requirements of this amendment.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on September 6, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-22591 Filed 9-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

RIN 1515-AB78

19 CFR PART 12

[T.D. 95-71]

UNESCO Cultural Property Convention Signatories

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Customs Regulations by republishing the list of signatory nations to the 1970 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and

Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. Because of the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. and other political changes in Europe, there have been many changes to the list in recent years. Rather than noting each change, Customs is publishing a new list which replaces the existing list.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 13, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donnette Rimmer, Intellectual Property Rights Branch, 202-482-6960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In 1983, the United States enacted the "Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act" (19 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*) which accepted the 1970 United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (823 U.N.T.S. 231 (1972)). As a party to the Convention, the U.S. actively participates in efforts to eliminate illicit traffic in cultural property, that is, items of importance for archaeology, prehistory, history, literature, art or science.

When a country ratifies, accepts or accedes to the Convention, Customs accords that country all rights and privileges under the Convention and adds its name to the list of signatory countries to provide the public notification of this fact.

There have been numerous additions and changes to this list in recent years

with the reunification of Germany (the reunified state has not acceded to the Convention, while the former East Germany had); the dissolution of the former U.S.S.R.; and other political changes in eastern Europe. Rather than noting each change, Customs has determined to publish a new list of signatory nations which will replace the current version in the Customs Regulations.

Inapplicability of Notice and Delayed Effective Date

Because this amendment merely implements a statutory requirement and involves a matter in which a majority of the public is not particularly interested, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), no notice of proposed rulemaking or public procedure is necessary. For the same reason, a delayed effective date is inappropriate.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

This document is not subject to the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). That Act does not apply to any regulation such as this for which a notice of proposed rulemaking is not required by the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*), or any other statute.

Executive Order 12866

The amendment does not meet the criteria for a "significant regulatory action" under E.O. 12866.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is Peter T. Lynch, Regulations Branch,

Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service. However, personnel from other offices participated in its development.

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 12

Customs duties and inspections, Imports, Cultural property.

Amendment to the Regulations

Part 12 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR Part 12), is amended as set forth below:

PART 12—SPECIAL CLASSES OF MERCHANDISE

1. The general authority citation for Part 12 and the relevant specific authority citation continue to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 19 U.S.C. 66, 1202 (General Note 20, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)), 1624.

* * * * *

§§ 12.104–12.104i also issued under 19 U.S.C. 2612.

* * * * *

2. In § 12.104b, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 12.104b State Parties to the Convention.

(a) The following is a list of State Parties which have deposited an instrument of ratification, acceptance, accession or succession, the date of such deposit and the date of entry into force for each State Party:

State party	Date of deposit	Date of entry into force
Algeria	June 24, 1974 (R)	Sept. 24, 1974.
Angola	Nov. 7, 1991 (R)	Feb. 7, 1992.
Argentina	Jan. 11, 1973 (R)	Apr. 11, 1973.
Armenia, Republic of	Sept. 5, 1993 (S)	See Note 1.
Australia	Oct. 30, 1989 (Ac)	Jan. 30, 1990.
Bangladesh	Dec. 9, 1987 (R)	Mar. 9, 1988.
Belarus	Apr. 28, 1988 (R)	July 28, 1988.
Belize	Jan. 26, 1990 (R)	Apr. 26, 1990.
Bolivia	Oct. 4, 1976 (R)	Jan. 4, 1977.
Bosnia-Herzegovina	July 12, 1993 (S)	See Note 2.
Brazil	Feb. 16, 1973 (R)	May 16, 1973.
Bulgaria	Sept. 15, 1971 (R)	Apr. 24, 1972.
Burkina Faso	Apr. 7, 1987 (R)	July 7, 1987.
Cambodia	Sept. 26, 1972 (R)	Dec. 26, 1972.
Cameroon	May 24, 1972 (R)	Aug. 24, 1972.
Canada	Mar. 28, 1978 (Ac)	June 28, 1978.
Central African Republic	Feb. 1, 1972 (R)	May 1, 1972.
China, People's Republic of	Nov. 28, 1989 (Ac)	Feb. 28, 1990.
Columbia	May 24, 1988 (Ac)	Aug. 24, 1988.
Cote d'Ivoire	Oct. 30, 1990 (R)	Jan. 30, 1991.
Croatia	July 6, 1992 (S)	See Note 2.
Cuba	Jan. 30, 1980 (R)	Apr. 30, 1980.
Cyprus	Oct. 19, 1979 (R)	Jan. 19, 1980.
Czech Republic	Mar. 26, 1993 (S)	See Note 4.
Dominican Republic	Mar. 7, 1973 (R)	June 7, 1973.
Ecuador	Mar. 24, 1971 (Ac)	Apr. 24, 1972.

State party	Date of deposit	Date of entry into force
Egypt	Apr. 5, 1973 (Ac)	July 5, 1973.
El Salvador	Feb. 20, 1978 (R)	May 20, 1978.
Georgia, Republic of	Nov. 4, 1992 (S)	See Note 1.
Greece	June 5, 1981 (R)	Sept. 5, 1981.
Grenada	Sept. 10, 1992 (Ac)	Dec. 10, 1992.
Guatemala	Jan. 14, 1985 (R)	Apr. 14, 1985.
Guinea	Mar. 18, 1979 (R)	June 18, 1979.
Honduras	Mar. 19, 1979 (R)	June 19, 1979.
Hungary	Oct. 23, 1978 (R)	Jan. 23, 1979.
India	Jan. 24, 1977 (R)	Apr. 24, 1977.
Iran	Jan. 27, 1975 (Ac)	Apr. 27, 1975.
Iraq	Feb. 12, 1973 (Ac)	May 12, 1973.
Italy	Oct. 2, 1978 (R)	Jan. 2, 1979.
Jordan	Mar. 15, 1974 (R)	June 15, 1974.
Korea, Democratic People's Republic of	May 13, 1983 (R)	Aug. 13, 1983.
Korea, Republic of	Feb. 14, 1983 (Ac)	May 14, 1983.
Kuwait	June 22, 1972 (Ac)	Sept. 22, 1972.
Lebanon	Aug. 25, 1992 (R)	Nov. 25, 1992.
Libya	Jan. 9, 1973 (R)	Apr. 9, 1973.
Madagascar	June 21, 1989 (R)	Sept. 21, 1989.
Mali	Apr. 6, 1987 (R)	July 6, 1987.
Mauritania	Apr. 27, 1977 (R)	July 27, 1977.
Mauritius	Feb. 27, 1978 (Ac)	May 27, 1978.
Mexico	Oct. 4, 1972 (Ac)	Jan. 4, 1973.
Mongolia	June 23, 1991 (Ac)	Aug. 23, 1991.
Nepal	June 23, 1976 (R)	Sept. 23, 1976.
Nicaragua	Apr. 19, 1977 (R)	July 19, 1977.
Niger	Oct. 16, 1972 (R)	Jan. 16, 1973.
Nigeria	Jan. 24, 1972 (R)	Apr. 24, 1972.
Oman	June 2, 1978 (Ac)	Sept. 2, 1978.
Pakistan	Apr. 30, 1978 (R)	July 30, 1981.
Panama	Aug. 13, 1973 (Ac)	Nov. 13, 1973.
Peru	Oct. 24, 1979 (Ac)	Jan. 24, 1980.
Poland	Jan. 31, 1974 (R)	Apr. 30, 1974.
Portugal	Dec. 9, 1985 (R)	Mar. 9, 1986.
Qatar	Apr. 20, 1977 (Ac)	July 20, 1977.
Romania	Dec. 6, 1993 (R)	Mar. 6, 1994.
Russian Federation	Apr. 28, 1988 (R)	See Note 3.
Saudi Arabia	Sept. 8, 1976 (Ac)	Dec. 8, 1976.
Senegal	Dec. 9, 1984 (R)	Mar. 9, 1985.
Slovak Republic	Mar. 31, 1993 (S)	See Note 4.
Slovenia, Republic of	Oct. 10, 1992 (S)	See Note 2.
Spain	Jan. 10, 1986 (R)	Apr. 10, 1986.
Sri Lanka	Apr. 7, 1981 (Ac)	July 7, 1981.
Syria	Feb. 21, 1975 (Ac)	May 21, 1975.
Tadjikistan, Republic of	Aug. 11, 1992 (S)	See Note 1.
Tanzania	Aug. 2, 1977 (R)	Nov. 2, 1977.
Tunisia	Mar. 10, 1975 (R)	June 10, 1975.
Turkey	Apr. 21, 1981 (R)	July 21, 1981.
Ukraine	Apr. 28, 1988 (R)	July 28, 1988.
United States of America	Sept. 2, 1983 (Ac)	Dec. 2, 1983.
Uruguay	Aug. 9, 1977 (R)	Nov. 9, 1977.
Yugoslavia	Oct. 3, 1972 (R)	Jan. 3, 1973.
Zaire	Sept. 23, 1974 (R)	Dec. 23, 1974.
Zambia	June 21, 1985 (R)	Sept. 21, 1985.

Code for reading second column: Ratification (R); Acceptance (Ac); Accession (A); Succession (S).

Notes:

1. The Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Georgia, and the Republic of Tadjikistan each deposited a notification of succession in which each declared itself bound by the Convention as ratified by the USSR on April 28, 1988 and which entered into force on July 28, 1988.
2. Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and the Republic of Slovenia each deposited notification of succession in which each declared itself bound by the Convention as ratified by Yugoslavia on Oct. 3, 1972 and entered into force on January 3, 1973.
3. The Government of the Russian Federation informed the Director General of UNESCO that the Russian Federation continues without interruption the participation of the USSR in all UNESCO Conventions. The instrument of ratification was deposited by the former USSR on April 28, 1988. and entered into force on July 28, 1988.
4. The Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic each deposited a notification of succession in which each declared itself bound by the Convention as accepted by Czechoslovakia on Feb. 14, 1977 and which entered into force on May 14, 1977.

* * * * *

George J. Weise,*Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: August 21, 1995.

Dennis M. O'Connell,*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc. 95-22644 Filed 9-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**20 CFR Parts 404 and 416**

RIN 0960-AE06

**Administrative Review Process,
Testing Modifications to Prehearing
Procedures and Decisions by
Adjudication Officers****AGENCY:** Social Security Administration (SSA).**ACTION:** Final rules.

SUMMARY: We are amending our rules to establish authority to test use of an adjudication officer who, under the *Plan for a New Disability Claim Process* approved by the Commissioner of Social Security in September 1994 (the disability redesign plan), would be the focal point for all prehearing activities when a request for a hearing before an administrative law judge (ALJ) is filed. The adjudication officer position is an integral part of the disability redesign plan. We expect that our tests of this position will provide us with sufficient information to determine the effect of the position on the hearing process. These final rules add two new sections setting out, for purposes of the tests we will conduct, the responsibilities of the adjudication officer in connection with a claim for Social Security or Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits based on disability. Unless specified, all other regulations related to our administrative review process and the disability determination process remain unchanged.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 13, 1995.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Harry J. Short, Legal Assistant, Division of Regulations and Rulings, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21235, (410) 965-6243.**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The Social Security Administration (SSA) decides claims for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act (the Act) and for SSI benefits under title XVI of the Act in an

administrative review process that generally consists of four steps. Claimants who are not satisfied with the initial determination we make on a claim may request reconsideration. Claimants who are not satisfied with our reconsidered determination may request a hearing before an ALJ, and claimants who are dissatisfied with an ALJ's decision may request review by the Appeals Council. Claimants who have completed these steps and who are not satisfied with our final decision, may request judicial review of the decision in the Federal courts.

Generally, when a claim is filed for Social Security or SSI benefits based on disability, a State agency makes the initial and reconsideration disability determination for us. A hearing requested after we have made a reconsideration determination is held by an ALJ in one of the 132 hearing offices we have nationwide.

Applications for Social Security and SSI benefits based on disability have risen dramatically in recent years. The number of new disability claims SSA received in Fiscal Year (FY) 1994—3.56 million—represented a 40 percent increase over the number received in FY 1990—2.55 million. Requests for an ALJ hearing also have increased dramatically. In FY 1994, our hearing offices had almost 540,000 hearing receipts, and the overwhelming majority of these receipts were related to requests for a hearing filed by persons claiming disability benefits. In that year, the number of hearing receipts we received exceeded the number of receipts we received in FY 1990 by more than 70 percent. We expect hearing receipts to increase to more than 590,000 by the close of FY 1995.

Despite management initiatives that resulted in a record increase in ALJ productivity in FY 1994 and the hiring of more than 200 new ALJs and more than 650 new support staff in that year, the number of cases pending in our hearing offices has reached unprecedented levels—more than 480,000 at the end of FY 1994 and more than 554,000 at the end of July 1995.

In order to process this workload, the disability redesign plan contains other changes to the disability determination process by which SSA plans to decrease processing times while providing world-class service. For example, the disability redesign plan envisions a streamlined initial disability determination process which will result in more timely determinations and the elimination of the reconsideration step in the administrative review process for disability claims. We expect that one consequence of these initiatives will be

an increase in the number of requests for hearings filed over the next several years. In light of these growing workload expectations, and to process more efficiently the hearing requests now pending at our hearing offices, we are issuing these final rules establishing the authority to test having an adjudication officer conduct prehearing development and, if appropriate, issue a decision wholly favorable to the claimant.

We expect that use of an adjudication officer, as described in our disability redesign plan, will enable us to ensure development of a more complete record and to issue decisions in a more efficient manner when a request for a hearing has been filed. We anticipate that our tests of the adjudication officer position will provide us with information regarding the effect use of an adjudication officer has on the current hearing process, and how to best use an adjudication officer under the redesigned disability process. We will do this by testing the adjudication officer position alone and in combination with one or more of the tests we are conducting pursuant to the final rules "Testing Modifications to the Disability Determination Procedures," which were published in the **Federal Register** on April 24, 1995 (60 FR 20023) (to be codified at 20 CFR 404.906 and 416.1406).

We consider testing and subsequently implementing use of an adjudication officer to be a high agency priority. It is a complementary approach to the short-term disability initiatives we currently are undertaking. Our short-term initiatives are designed to process more efficiently pending requests for hearings and reduce the number of pending hearings to 375,000 at the end of calendar year 1996. One key short-term initiative is set out in the final regulations we published in the **Federal Register** on June 30, 1995 (60 FR 34126), which temporarily authorize attorney advisors in our Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) to conduct certain prehearing proceedings and, where appropriate, issue decisions which are wholly favorable to the claimant and any other party to the hearing. Our attorney advisor rules will no longer be effective on June 30, 1997, unless they are extended by the Commissioner of Social Security by publication of a final rule in the **Federal Register**. The principal aim of the final rules authorizing attorney advisors to conduct certain proceedings and issue wholly favorable decisions is to expedite decisions on pending requests for hearings. The use of an adjudication officer is focused on making better use