

**ACTION:** Stay of effective date of Order establishing final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This *Order* stays the effective date of the *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, April 18, 1994, which adopted the Commission's rules regarding privacy and other requirements for Calling Party Telephone Numbers.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 17, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert E. Kimball, (202) 634-7150, Domestic Services Branch, Domestic Facilities Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Order in CC Docket No. 91-281, FCC 95-119, adopted March 17, 1995, released March 17, 1995. The item is available for inspection and copying during normal hours in the Commission's FCC Reference Center (room 230), 1919 M St., NW., Washington, D.C., or a copy may be purchased from the duplicating contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc. (202) 857-3800, 2100 M St., NW., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037. The *Order* will be published in the FCC Record.

**Analysis of Proceeding**

In the process of reviewing petitions for reconsideration of the Commission's Rules governing passage of Calling Party Number (CPN) on interstate telephone calls, we have decided on our own motion that the public interest would best be served by temporarily staying effectiveness of 47 CFR 64.1601 and 64.1603. Interested parties have persuasively argued that no matter how the issues raised in the petition for reconsideration are resolved, and even if the Commission adheres to its original decision in every material respect, compliance will not be possible by April 12, 1995, the effective date specified in the March 29, 1994 *Report and Order Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 59 FR 18318.

**Ordering Clauses**

Accordingly, it is ordered, pursuant to Sections 1, 4(i) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. 1 and 154(i), that effectiveness of §§ 64.1601 and 64.1603 of the Commission's Rules IS STAYED until further notice.

It is further ordered that this order is effective upon adoption.

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 64**

Calling party number identification, Privacy, Telephone.

Federal Communications Commission.

**William F. Caton,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-7297 Filed 3-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

**47 CFR Part 73**

[MM Docket No. 94-15; RM-8411]

**Radio Broadcasting Services; Ravenswood and Elizabeth, West Virginia**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission, at the request of MediaCom, Inc., reallocates Channel 291A from Ravenswood to Elizabeth, West Virginia, as that community's first local aural transmission service, and modifies Station WRZZ(FM)'s license accordingly. See 59 FR 10607, March 7, 1994. Channel 291A can be allotted to Elizabeth in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements without the imposition of a site restriction. The coordinates for Channel 291A at Elizabeth are 39-03-48 and West Longitude 81-23-43. Since Elizabeth is located within 320 kilometers (200 miles) of the U.S.-Canadian border, concurrence of the Canadian government has been obtained. With this action, this proceeding is terminated.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 4, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sharon P. McDonald, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order*, MM Docket No. 94-15, adopted March 14, 1995, and released March 21, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Radio broadcasting.

Part 73 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

**PART 73—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Sections 303, 48 Stat., as amended, 1082; 47 U.S.C. 154, as amended.

**§ 73.202 [Amended]**

2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under West Virginia, is amended by removing Channel 291A at Ravenswood and adding Elizabeth, Channel 291A.

Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**

*Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 95-7299 Filed 3-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

**47 CFR Part 73**

[MM Docket No. 94-143]

**Television Broadcasting Services; Albion, Nebraska**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final Rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document allots UHF Channel 24+ to Albion, Nebraska, in order to permit Citadel Communications Co., Inc. to amend its pending application (File No. BPCT-930726KH) for Channel 18 at Albion to specify operation on Channel 24+ without loss of cut-off protection. See 60 FR 91, published January 3, 1994. The reference coordinates for Channel 24+ at Albion, Nebraska, are 41-55-58 and 98-17-23. With this action, the proceeding is terminated.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 4, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Hayne, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 776-1654.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order*, MM Docket No. 94-143, adopted March 13, 1995, and released March 21, 1995. The full text of this decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Television broadcasting.

**PART 73—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Secs. 303, 48 Stat., as amended, 1082; 47 U.S.C. 154, as amended.

**§ 73.606 [Amended]**

2. Section 73.606(b), the TV Table of Allotments under Nebraska, is amended by adding Channel 24+ at Albion.

Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**

*Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 95-7298 Filed 3-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

**NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION****48 CFR Parts 1819 and 1852**

RIN 2700-AB52

**NASA Mentor-Protege Program Policies**

**AGENCY:** Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Final rule establishes NASA's policy on its Mentor-Protege Program. With respect to prime contractors, it defines eligibility for participation, allowable developmental assistance measures that will enhance the capabilities of Socially and Economically Disadvantaged Businesses to perform NASA contracts and subcontracts, and incentives for program participation. Further, it defines the transportability of subcontracting goal credit features from the Department of Defense (DOD) Mentor-Protege Program to NASA Contractors. However, the effectiveness of a mentor under the NASA Program will be evaluated by the measurable amount of developmental assistance provided under NASA contracts. Participation in the program is voluntary.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 24, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** NASA Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, NASA Headquarters, (Code K), Washington, DC 20546.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rae C. Martel, Telephone: (202) 358-2088.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

NASA published a Proposed Rule on February 9, 1994 amending the NASA FAR Supplement to implement a Mentor-Protege Program. Having reviewed the public comments on the Proposed Rule, NASA is publishing this Final Rule with certain changes to the provisions set forth in the Proposed Rule. Many of the comments represented editorial recommendations or affirmations for the program. Also, a number of comments were duplicative on subject matter. However, the underlying Mentor-Protege policy has not been significantly altered as a result of changes made in response to comments. The most suggestive comments and their disposition are discussed in the preface of this Final Rule. This Final Rule serves as the regulatory basis for the Mentor-Protege Program provisions. For the pilot phase of the program, Mentor-Protege applications and activity are limited to cost-plus-award-fee contracts. The concept for the NASA Mentor-Protege Program includes the establishment of a Prime/Subcontractor relationship between the mentor and protege firm. In the role of subcontractor, the protege will contribute to the contract efforts; however, to enhance contractual performance, the protege will receive developmental assistance, as described in section 1819.7214, from the prime contractor mentor firm.

For consistency with Section 7105 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, Public Law 103-355, the categories of eligible entities defined in section 1819.7202 of the final rule include "Small Disadvantaged Businesses, Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions". Throughout this final rule, these categories are collectively identified by the term "protege".

NASA received two hundred and twenty-seven comments in response to the Proposed Rule. Several commenters suggested that NASA provide a definition of "high-tech." The agency high-tech definition is provided in 1819.7202 to provide clarity regarding the Mentor-Protege Program's targeted areas of contract activity. The Mentor-Protege Program, a key element of NASA's socioeconomic program, is designed to increase the participation of the entities defined as protege in the agency's core mission. Many commenters suggested that NASA modify the rule to allow reimbursement to primes for expenses incurred in providing developmental assistance to proteges. The coverage in the final rule

explains that expenses incurred by mentor firms in providing developmental assistance to their protege/subcontractors are allowable. The language in paragraph 1819.7205 states that the basic condition for Mentor-Protege requires a prime/subcontractor relationship between the mentor and protege. The costs will be recognized as part of enhancing contractor performance and are allowable consistent with the definitions and requirements in FAR Part 31. A large number of commenters requested that NASA provide clarity in the final rule regarding the fee arrangement and the earning of award fee. Future award fee plans of NASA contracts will be structured such that 15 percent of the available award fee is allocated for Small Disadvantaged Business Utilization. Mentor-Protege will be evaluated under Small Disadvantaged Utilization as a separate element and allocated a separate 5 percent of the 15 percent to evaluate the prime's performance in the Mentor-Protege Program. For purposes of earning award fee, the Mentor firm's performance will be evaluated against the measures described in the NASA FAR Supplement provisions at 1852.219-79. Many commenters recommended that while NASA explains the portability of credit features from the statute prescribing the DOD Mentor-Protege Program that are available to NASA prime contractors, no provision has been specifically made for credit against SDB goals with a multiplier similar to the DOD Mentor-Protege Program. A multiplier option is not included in Section 1819.7204 of the NASA program since no statute or legislation exists to authorize such an option. Section 1819.7204 includes only the features authorized in the statute creating the DOD program that can be extended to civilian agencies. A number of commenters commended NASA for including a provision allowing proteges to have multiple mentors. However, a number of commenters expressed concern about this provision. Some concerns centered about proteges with multiple mentors maintaining confidentiality; others were concerned with proteges receiving conflicting guidance from multiple mentors. It is recommended that Mentor-Protege agreements contain some certification regarding confidentiality and non-disclosure as is routinely utilized in business relationships. During the review of Letters of Intent and Agreements, NASA will scrutinize the intended areas of developmental assistance for duplication in certain