

## PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

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

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

### § 39.13 [Amended]

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

**Airbus:** Docket 2001–NM–301–AD.

**Applicability:** Model A319 and A320 series airplanes, as listed in Airbus Service Bulletin A320–28A1096, Revision 03, dated August 27, 2002; certificated in any category.

**Compliance:** Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent the loss of fuel quantity indication (FQI) of the center fuel tank, and to reduce the potential for an ignition source and possible explosion within the center fuel tank due to electrical arcing between the FQI probes and the adjacent structure in the event that the airplane is struck by lightning, accomplish the following:

#### Inspection

(a) Within 4,000 flight hours after the effective date of this AD, perform the actions specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD per the Accomplishment Instructions of Airbus Service Bulletin A320–28A1096, Revision 03, dated August 27, 2002. Although this service bulletin specifies to submit certain information to the manufacturer, this AD does not include such a requirement.

(1) Perform a one-time detailed inspection for proper clearance space between each FQI probe located in the center fuel tank and the adjacent structure; and a one-time detailed inspection of the position of the support bracket for each probe.

**Note 1:** For the purposes of this AD, a detailed inspection is defined as: “An intensive visual examination of a specific structural area, system, installation, or assembly to detect damage, failure, or irregularity. Available lighting is normally supplemented with a direct source of good lighting at intensity deemed appropriate by the inspector. Inspection aids such as mirror, magnifying lenses, etc., may be used. Surface cleaning and elaborate access procedures may be required.”

(2) Inspect the support bracket for each probe to determine the part number of the support bracket.

#### Corrective Action

(b) During the inspections required by paragraph (a) of this AD, if the clearance between any FQI probe and the adjacent structure is determined to be less than 6.00 millimeters (0.236 inch), or if the position or part number of any probe support bracket is not correct, before further flight, remove and re-install the probe and its support bracket in the correct position, per Airbus Service Bulletin A320–28A1096, Revision 03, dated August 27, 2002.

#### Inspections Accomplished Per Previous Issue of Service Bulletin

(c) Inspections and corrective actions accomplished before the effective date of this AD per Airbus Service Bulletin A320–28A1096, dated March 23, 2001; Revision 01, dated July 4, 2001; or Revision 02, dated October 16, 2001; are considered acceptable for compliance with the corresponding action specified in this AD.

#### Alternative Methods of Compliance

(d) In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, is authorized to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD.

**Note 2:** The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 2001–271(B), dated June 27, 2001.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 26, 2003.

**Kalene C. Yanamura,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 03–30113 Filed 12–2–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Parts 73 and 76

[MB Docket No. 02–230; FCC 03–273]

#### Digital Broadcast Content Protection

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Commission seeks comment on the mechanisms and standards by which new content protection and recording technologies can be approved for use with Covered Demodulator Products as part of an ATSC flag-based redistribution control system for digital broadcast content. The Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking also seeks comment on: whether cable operators should be allowed to encrypt the digital basic tier so that they can give effect to the ATSC flag through their conditional access systems; and the interplay between an ATSC flag-based redistribution control system for digital broadcast content and the development of open source software applications, including software demodulators, for digital broadcast television. Potential Commission action in these areas is intended to protect digital broadcast television content from indiscriminate redistribution, thereby ensuring the continued flow of high value content to broadcast outlets and preserving the nation’s broadcasting system.

**DATES:** Comments due January 14, 2004; reply comments are due February 13, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. For further filing information, see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Susan Mort, (202) 418–1043 or [Susan.Mort@fcc.gov](mailto:Susan.Mort@fcc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking portion of the Commission’s Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“Further NPRM”), FCC 03–273, adopted and released November 4, 2003. The full text of the Commission’s Further NPRM is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room CY–A257) at its headquarters, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554, or may be purchased from the Commission’s copy contractor, Qualex International, (202) 863–2893, Portals II, Room CY–B402, 445 12th St., SW., Washington, DC 20554, or may be reviewed via Internet at <http://www.fcc.gov/mb>.

#### Synopsis of the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

1. Although we believe that our adoption of a flag-based redistribution control system for digital broadcast television will further the digital transition and ensure the continued flow of high value content to broadcast outlets, further comment is needed on several issues. As an initial matter, we seek comment on whether cable operators that retransmit DTV broadcasts may encrypt the digital basic tier in order to convey the presence of the ATSC flag through their conditional access system. Section 76.630 of the Commission’s rules generally prohibits cable operators from “scrambl[ing] or encrypt[ing] signals carried on the basic service tier” without distinguishing between analog and digital service. NCTA has suggested that allowing cable operators to encrypt the digital basic tier and “virtually” convey the presence of the flag will facilitate the offering of future home networking services. We seek comment on whether cable operators should be allowed to encrypt in this manner.

2. In response to our Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, EFF questioned the impact of a flag-based regime on innovations in software demodulators and other DTV open source software applications. The Commission has actively promoted the development of

software defined radio and other software demodulators as important innovations in the digital age. We seek further comment on the interplay between a flag redistribution control system and the development of open source software applications, including software demodulators, for digital broadcast television.

3. This Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking also seeks comment on whether standards and procedures should be adopted for the approval of new content protection and recording technologies to be used with device outputs on Demodulator Products. If so, we seek comment on the various types of content protection technologies that should be considered as a part of this process, including but not limited to digital rights management, wireless and encryption-based technologies. We recognize that similar issues have been raised with respect to digital cable ready DTV receivers in the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Commission's ongoing "Plug and Play" proceeding. We seek comment on whether a unified regime should be employed in both instances.

4. With respect to the particular standards and procedures to be employed, we seek comment on whether objective criteria should be used to evaluate new content protection and recording technologies and, if so, what specific criteria should be used. For example, in our recent Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking relating to digital cable compatibility, Microsoft Corporation and Hewlett Packard Corporation submitted a detailed proposal suggesting functional requirements that could be used to evaluate digital rights management technologies for use with digital cable ready products. We seek comment on this proposal in the ATSC flag context, as well as on other proposals submitted in this proceeding relying on objective criteria, and any new proposals that commenters may submit to the Commission.

5. We also seek comment on the appropriate scope of redistribution that should be prevented. In general, we believe that a flag based system should prevent indiscriminate redistribution of digital broadcast content, however, we do not wish to foreclose use of the Internet to send digital broadcast content where robust security can adequately protect the content and the redistribution is tailored in nature. We see comment on the usefulness of defining a personal digital network environment ("PDNE") within which consumers could freely redistribute

digital broadcast television content. If so, we seek comment on the various permutations of a PDNE that were proposed in the BPDG Final Report *and* whether any modifications are needed to maintain consumer's home viewing expectations. We also seek comment on possible new formulations of a PDNE.

6. We also seek comment on whether content owners are the appropriate entities to make initial approval determinations, or whether another entity should have decision-making authority. In particular, we seek comment on whether the Commission, a qualified third party, or an independent entity representing various industry and consumer interests should make approval and revocation determinations.

7. As to the issue of how approved content protection and recording technologies may be revoked should their security be compromised, we seek comment on the appropriate standard for revocation. Specifically, we seek comment on whether revocation is appropriate where a content protection or recording technology is perceived to be insecure, or whether the appropriate standard is where security has been compromised in a significant, widespread manner. Once a content protection or recording technology has been revoked, we seek comment on the appropriate mechanism by which revocation should be effectuated. For example, should revoked content protection or recording technologies be eliminated on a going-forward basis, while preserving their functionality for existing devices? We also seek comment on whether there are technological or other means of revoking content protection or recording technologies while preserving the functionality of consumer electronics devices.

8. *Authority.* This Further NPRM is issued pursuant to authority contained in sections 1, 2, 4(i) and (j), 303, 307, 309(j), 336, 337, 396(k), 403, 601, 614(b) and 624a of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

9. *Ex Parte Rules—Non-Restricted Proceeding.* This is a non-restricted notice and comment rulemaking proceeding. Ex parte presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided that they are disclosed as provided in the Commission's rules. *See generally* 47 CFR 1.1202, 1.1203, and 1.1206(a).

10. *Accessibility Information.* Accessible formats of this Further NPRM (computer diskettes, large print, audio recording and Braille) are available to persons with disabilities by contacting Brian Millin, of the Consumer & Governmental Affairs

Bureau, at (202) 418-7426, TTY (202) 418-7365, or at [Brian.Millin@fcc.gov](mailto:Brian.Millin@fcc.gov).

11. *Comment Information.* Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before January 14, 2004, and reply comments on or before February 13, 2004. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. *See* Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, 63 FR 24121 (1998).

12. Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rulemaking numbers appear in the caption of this proceeding, however, commenters must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rulemaking number referenced in the caption. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, U.S. Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rulemaking number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments, commenters should send an e-mail to [ecfs@fcc.gov](mailto:ecfs@fcc.gov), and should include the following words in the body of the message, "get form <your e-mail address>." A sample form and directions will be sent in reply. Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appear in the caption of this proceeding, commenters must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number. Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail (although we continue to experience delays in receiving U.S. Postal Service mail). The Commission's contractor, Natek, Inc., will receive hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary at 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Suite 110, Washington, DC 20002. The filing hours at this location are 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes must be disposed of before entering the building. Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743. U.S. Postal Service first-class mail, Express Mail, and Priority Mail should be addressed to 445 12th Street, SW.,

Washington, DC 20554. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

13. *Regulatory Flexibility Act.* As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Commission has prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ("IRFA") of the possible significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities of the proposals addressed in this Further NPRM. The IRFA is set forth below. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. These comments must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines for comments on the Further NPRM, and they should have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the IRFA.

14. The Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reference Information Center, shall send a copy of this Further NPRM, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

#### Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

15. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended ("RFA") the Commission has prepared this present Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ("IRFA") of the possible significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities by the policies and rules proposed in the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking portion of this item. Written public comments are requested on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments on the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking portion of this item provided in paragraph 69 of the item. The Commission will send a copy of this entire Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("Report and Order and Further NPRM"), including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration ("SBA"). In addition, the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking of this item and the IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

16. *Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules.* Content providers have suggested that they should have the ability to make determinations about which new content protection and recording technologies may be used in connection with demodulator products under an ATSC flag-based redistribution control system. Commenters have indicated that content providers should not be the sole arbiters of such decisions. However, the record

currently before the Commission is insufficient on this matter. In order to ensure the connectivity and interoperability of Demodulator Products and peripheral devices, we are initiating the Further NPRM to seek comment on the process and criteria by which new content protection and recording technologies can be evaluated and approved for use in this context. The Further NPRM also seeks comment on whether cable operators should be allowed to encrypt the digital basic tier in order to be able to give effect to the ATSC flag through cable operators' conditional access system. The Further NPRM also seeks comment on the interplay between an ATSC flag system and open source software for DTV applications, such as software defined radio.

17. *Legal Basis.* The authority for this proposed rulemaking is contained in sections 1, 2, 4(i) and (j), 303, 307, 309(j), 336, 337, 396(k), 403, 601, 614(b) and 624a of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C 151, 152, 154(i) and (j), 303, 307, 309(j), 336, 337, 396(k), 403, 521, 534(b) and 544a.

18. *Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rules Will Apply.* The RFA directs the Commission to provide a description of and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that will be affected by the proposed rules. The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as encompassing the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental entity." In addition, the term "small Business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act. A small business concern is one which: (1) Is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the Small Business Administration ("SBA").

19. *Television Broadcasting.* The Small Business Administration defines a television broadcasting station that has no more than \$12 million in annual receipts as a small business. Business concerns included in this industry are those "primarily engaged in broadcasting images together with sound." According to Commission staff review of the BIA Publications, Inc. Master Access Television Analyzer Database as of May 16, 2003, about 814 of the 1,220 commercial television stations in the United States have revenues of \$12 million or less. We note, however, that, in assessing whether a business concern qualifies as small under the above definition, business (control) affiliations must be

included. Our estimate, therefore, likely overstates the number of small entities that might be affected by our action, because the revenue figure on which it is based does not include aggregate revenues from affiliated companies. There are also 2,127 low power television stations (LPTV). Given the nature of this service, we will presume that all LPTV licensees qualify as small entities under the SBA definition.

20. In addition, an element of the definition of "small business" is that the entity not be dominant in its field of operation. We are unable at this time to define or quantify the criteria that would establish whether a specific television station is dominant in its field of operation. Accordingly, the estimate of small businesses to which rules may apply do not exclude any television station from the definition of a small business on this basis and are therefore over-inclusive to that extent. Also as noted, an additional element of the definition of "small business" is that the entity must be independently owned and operated. We note that it is difficult at times to assess these criteria in the context of media entities and our estimates of small businesses to which they apply may be over-inclusive to this extent.

21. *Cable and Other Program Distribution.* The SBA has developed a small business size standard for cable and other program distribution services, which includes all such companies generating \$12.5 million or less in revenue annually. This category includes, among others, cable operators, direct broadcast satellite ("DBS") services, home satellite dish ("HSD") services, multipoint distribution services ("MDS"), multichannel multipoint distribution service ("MMDS"), Instructional Television Fixed Service ("ITFS"), local multipoint distribution service ("LMDS"), satellite master antenna television ("SMATV") systems, and open video systems ("OVS"). According to the Census Bureau data, there are 1,311 total cable and other pay television service firms that operate throughout the year of which 1,180 have less than \$10 million in revenue. We address below each service individually to provide a more precise estimate of small entities.

22. *Cable Operators.* The Commission has developed, with SBA's approval, our own definition of a small cable system operator for the purposes of rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving fewer than 400,000 subscribers nationwide. We last estimated that there were 1,439 cable operators that qualified as small cable companies. Since then,

some of those companies may have grown to serve over 400,000 subscribers, and others may have been involved in transactions that caused them to be combined with other cable operators. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 1,439 small entity cable system operators that may be affected by the decisions and rules proposed in this Further NPRM.

23. The Communications Act, as amended, also contains a size standard for a small cable system operator, which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than 1% of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed \$250,000,000." The Commission has determined that there are 68,500,000 subscribers in the United States. Therefore, an operator serving fewer than 685,000 subscribers shall be deemed a small operator if its annual revenues, when combined with the total annual revenues of all of its affiliates, do not exceed \$250 million in the aggregate. Based on available data, we find that the number of cable operators serving 685,000 subscribers or less totals approximately 1,450. Although it seems certain that some of these cable system operators are affiliated with entities whose gross annual revenues exceed \$250,000,000, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of cable system operators that would qualify as small cable operators under the definition in the Communications Act.

24. *Direct Broadcast Satellite ("DBS") Service.* Because DBS provides subscription services, DBS falls within the SBA-recognized definition of Cable and Other Program Distribution Services. This definition provides that a small entity is one with \$12.5 million or less in annual receipts. There are four licensees of DBS services under part 100 of the Commission's rules. Three of those licensees are currently operational. Two of the licensees that are operational have annual revenues that may be in excess of the threshold for a small business. The Commission, however, does not collect annual revenue data for DBS and, therefore, is unable to ascertain the number of small DBS licensees that could be impacted by these proposed rules. DBS service requires a great investment of capital for operation, and we acknowledge, despite the absence of specific data on this point, that there are entrants in this field that may not yet have generated \$12.5 million in annual receipts, and therefore may be categorized as a small business, if independently owned and operated.

25. *Home Satellite Dish ("HSD") Service.* Because HSD provides subscription services, HSD falls within the SBA-recognized definition of Cable and Other Program Distribution Services. This definition provides that a small entity is one with \$12.5 million or less in annual receipts. The market for HSD service is difficult to quantify. Indeed, the service itself bears little resemblance to other MVPDs. HSD owners have access to more than 265 channels of programming placed on C-band satellites by programmers for receipt and distribution by MVPDs, of which 115 channels are scrambled and approximately 150 are unscrambled. HSD owners can watch unscrambled channels without paying a subscription fee. To receive scrambled channels, however, an HSD owner must purchase an integrated receiver-decoder from an equipment dealer and pay a subscription fee to an HSD programming package. Thus, HSD users include: (1) Viewers who subscribe to a packaged programming service, which affords them access to most of the same programming provided to subscribers of other MVPDs; (2) viewers who receive only non-subscription programming; and (3) viewers who receive satellite programming services illegally without subscribing. Because scrambled packages of programming are most specifically intended for retail consumers, these are the services most relevant to this discussion.

26. *Multipoint Distribution Service ("MDS"), Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service ("MMDS") Instructional Television Fixed Service ("ITFS") and Local Multipoint Distribution Service ("LMDS").* MMDS systems, often referred to as "wireless cable," transmit video programming to subscribers using the microwave frequencies of the MDS and ITFS. LMDS is a fixed broadband point-to-multipoint microwave service that provides for two-way video telecommunications.

27. In connection with the 1996 MDS auction, the Commission defined small businesses as entities that had annual average gross revenues of less than \$40 million in the previous three calendar years. This definition of a small entity in the context of MDS auctions has been approved by the SBA. The MDS auctions resulted in 67 successful bidders obtaining licensing opportunities for 493 Basic Trading Areas ("BTAs"). Of the 67 auction winners, 61 met the definition of a small business. MDS also includes licensees of stations authorized prior to the auction. As noted, the SBA has developed a definition of small entities for pay television services, which

includes all such companies generating \$12.5 million or less in annual receipts. This definition includes multipoint distribution services, and thus applies to MDS licensees and wireless cable operators that did not participate in the MDS auction. Information available to us indicates that there are approximately 850 of these licensees and operators that do not generate revenue in excess of \$12.5 million annually. Therefore, for purposes of the IRFA, we find there are approximately 850 small MDS providers as defined by the SBA and the Commission's auction rules.

28. The SBA definition of small entities for Cable and Other Program Distribution Services, which includes such companies generating \$12.5 million in annual receipts, seems reasonably applicable to ITFS. There are presently 2,032 ITFS licensees. All but 100 of these licenses are held by educational institutions. Educational institutions are included in the definition of a small business. However, we do not collect annual revenue data for ITFS licensees, and are not able to ascertain how many of the 100 non-educational licensees would be categorized as small under the SBA definition. Thus, we tentatively conclude that at least 1,932 licensees are small businesses.

29. Additionally, the auction of the 1,030 LMDS licenses began on February 18, 1998, and closed on March 25, 1998. The Commission defined "small entity" for LMDS licenses as an entity that has average gross revenues of less than \$40 million in the three previous calendar years. An additional classification for "very small business" was added and is defined as an entity that, together with its affiliates, has average gross revenues of not more than \$15 million for the preceding calendar years. These regulations defining "small entity" in the context of LMDS auctions have been approved by the SBA. There were 93 winning bidders that qualified as small entities in the LMDS auctions. A total of 93 small and very small business bidders won approximately 277 A Block licenses and 387 B Block licenses. On March 27, 1999, the Commission re-auctioned 161 licenses; there were 40 winning bidders. Based on this information, we conclude that the number of small LMDS licenses will include the 93 winning bidders in the first auction and the 40 winning bidders in the re-auction, for a total of 133 small entity LMDS providers as defined by the SBA and the Commission's auction rules.

30. In sum, there are approximately a total of 2,000 MDS/MMDS/LMDS

stations currently licensed. Of the approximate total of 2,000 stations, we estimate that there are 1,595 MDS/MMDS/LMDS providers that are small businesses as deemed by the SBA and the Commission's auction rules.

31. *Satellite Master Antenna Television ("SMATV") Systems.* The SBA definition of small entities for Cable and Other Program Distribution Services includes SMATV services and, thus, small entities are defined as all such companies generating \$12.5 million or less in annual receipts. Industry sources estimate that approximately 5,200 SMATV operators were providing service as of December 1995. Other estimates indicate that SMATV operators serve approximately 1.5 million residential subscribers as of July 2001. The best available estimates indicate that the largest SMATV operators serve between 15,000 and 55,000 subscribers each. Most SMATV operators serve approximately 3,000–4,000 customers. Because these operators are not rate regulated, they are not required to file financial data with the Commission. Furthermore, we are not aware of any privately published financial information regarding these operators. Based on the estimated number of operators and the estimated number of units served by the largest ten SMATVs, we believe that a substantial number of SMATV operators qualify as small entities.

32. *Open Video Systems ("OVS").* Because OVS operators provide subscription services, OVS falls within the SBA-recognized definition of Cable and Other Program Distribution Services. This definition provides that a small entity is one with \$12.5 million or less in annual receipts. The Commission has certified 25 OVS operators with some now providing service. Affiliates of Residential Communications Network, Inc. ("RCN") received approval to operate OVS systems in New York City, Boston, Washington, D.C. and other areas. RCN has sufficient revenues to assure us that they do not qualify as small business entities. Little financial information is available for the other entities authorized to provide OVS that are not yet operational. Given that other entities have been authorized to provide OVS service but have not yet begun to generate revenues, we conclude that at least some of the OVS operators qualify as small entities.

33. *Electronics Equipment Manufacturers.* Rules adopted in this proceeding could apply to manufacturers of DTV receiving equipment and other types of consumer electronics equipment. The SBA has developed definitions of small entity for

manufacturers of audio and video equipment as well as radio and television broadcasting and wireless communications equipment. These categories both include all such companies employing 750 or fewer employees. The Commission has not developed a definition of small entities applicable to manufacturers of electronic equipment used by consumers, as compared to industrial use by television licensees and related businesses. Therefore, we will utilize the SBA definitions applicable to manufacturers of audio and visual equipment and radio and television broadcasting and wireless communications equipment, since these are the two closest NAICS Codes applicable to the consumer electronics equipment manufacturing industry. However, these NAICS categories are broad and specific figures are not available as to how many of these establishments manufacture consumer equipment. According to the SBA's regulations, an audio and visual equipment manufacturer must have 750 or fewer employees in order to qualify as a small business concern. Census Bureau data indicates that there are 554 U.S. establishments that manufacture audio and visual equipment, and that 542 of these establishments have fewer than 500 employees and would be classified as small entities. The remaining 12 establishments have 500 or more employees; however, we are unable to determine how many of those have fewer than 750 employees and therefore, also qualify as small entities under the SBA definition. Under the SBA's regulations, a radio and television broadcasting and wireless communications equipment manufacturer must also have 750 or fewer employees in order to qualify as a small business concern. Census Bureau data indicates that there are 1,215 U.S. establishments that manufacture radio and television broadcasting and wireless communications equipment, and that 1,150 of these establishments have fewer than 500 employees and would be classified as small entities. The remaining 65 establishments have 500 or more employees; however, we are unable to determine how many of those have fewer than 750 employees and therefore, also qualify as small entities under the SBA definition. We therefore conclude that there are no more than 542 small manufacturers of audio and visual electronics equipment and no more than 1,150 small manufacturers of radio and television broadcasting and

wireless communications equipment for consumer/household use.

34. *Computer Manufacturers.* The Commission has not developed a definition of small entities applicable to computer manufacturers. Therefore, we will utilize the SBA definition of electronic computers manufacturing. According to SBA regulations, a computer manufacturer must have 1,000 or fewer employees in order to qualify as a small entity. Census Bureau data indicates that there are 563 firms that manufacture electronic computers and of those, 544 have fewer than 1,000 employees and qualify as small entities. The remaining 19 firms have 1,000 or more employees. We conclude that there are approximately 544 small computer manufacturers.

35. *Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and other Compliance Requirements.* At this time, we do not expect that the proposed rules would impose any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements. However, compliance with the rules, if they are adopted, may require consumer electronics manufacturers to seek approval for content protection technologies and recording methods to be used in conjunction with demodulator products. These requirements will have an impact on consumer electronics manufacturers, including small entities. We seek comment on the possible burden these requirements would place on small entities. Also, we seek comment on whether a special approach toward any possible compliance burdens on small entities might be appropriate. The proposed rules would also allow cable operators to encrypt the digital basic tier, however, we do not believe that this voluntary provision would have an impact on small entities.

36. *Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered.* The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

37. As indicated above, the Further NPRM seeks comment on whether the

Commission should adopt rules establishing an approval mechanism for new content protection and recording technologies to be used with demodulator products. Consumer electronics manufacturers may be required to seek such approval prior to implementing content protection and recording technologies in demodulator products. We welcome comment on modifications of this proposal to lessen any potential impact on small entities, while still remaining consistent with our policy goals. The Further NPRM also seeks comment on whether cable operators should be allowed to encrypt the digital basic tier in order to be able to give effect to the ATSC flag through cable operators' conditional access system. While we do not believe that this rule change would have a potential impact on small entities because it would be voluntary in nature, we seek comment on whether a special approach toward any possible compliance burdens on small entities might be appropriate.

38. *Federal Rules Which Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict with the Commission's Proposals.* None.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 03-30008 Filed 12-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 216

[Docket No. 031112277-3277-01;I.D. 080603B]

RIN 0648-AR70

#### **Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Space Vehicle and Test Flight Activities from Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB), CA**

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS has received a request from the 30th Space Wing, U.S. Air Force (USAF) for the authorization for the harassment of small numbers of pinnipeds incidental to space vehicle and test flight activities from Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA (VAFB) between January 1, 2004, and December

31, 2008. By this document, NMFS is proposing regulations that govern that take. In order to issue a take authorization, NMFS must determine that the total taking will have a negligible impact on the affected species and stocks of marine mammals and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses. NMFS must also prescribe the means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on such species or stock and their habitats. NMFS invites comment on the application and proposed regulations.

**DATES:** Comments must be postmarked no later than December 18, 2003. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or the Internet.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be sent to and copy of the application may be obtained by writing to the Chief, Marine Mammal Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3226 or by telephoning the contact listed here (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). The NMFS' Administrative Record for this action will be maintained at this address. Copies of documents are available at this address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kimberly Skrupky, National Marine Fisheries Service, 301-713-2322, ext 163.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

Section 101(a)(5)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) (MMPA) directs the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional taking of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region if certain findings are made and regulations are issued.

Permission may be granted for periods of 5 years or less if the Secretary finds that the total taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s), will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses, and regulations are prescribed setting forth the permissible methods of taking, other means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on the affected species or stocks and their habitats, and the requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking.

NMFS has defined "negligible impact" in 50 CFR 216.103 as "an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival." The MMPA defines "harassment" as:

any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild [Level A harassment]; or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering [Level B harassment].

#### **Summary of Request**

On September 2, 2003, NMFS received an application from the USAF requesting authorization under section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA to harass small numbers of marine mammals incidental to space vehicle and test flight activities conducted by the USAF on Vandenberg. NMFS proposes regulations to govern these authorizations, to be effective from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2008. These regulations, if implemented, would allow NMFS to issue annual Letters of Authorization (LOAs) to the USAF. The current regulations and LOA expire on December 31, 2003. A detailed description of the operations is contained in the USAF application (USAF, 2003) which is available upon request (see **ADDRESSES**).

#### **Description of the Specified Activity**

VAFB is the main west coast launch facility for placing commercial, government, and military satellites into polar orbit on expendable (i.e. not reusable) launch vehicles, and for testing and evaluation of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and sub-orbital target and interceptor missiles. In addition to space vehicle and missile launches, there are security and search and rescue helicopter operations, as well as test and evaluation flights of fixed-wing air craft. The USAF expects to launch a total of 30 rockets and missiles from VAFB.

Currently five space launch vehicle programs use VAFB to launch satellites into polar orbit: Atlas IIAS, Delta II, Minotaur, Taurus, and Titan (II and IV). Two new programs, the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) and Space X, are scheduled to make their inaugural launches at VAFB in 2004. The EELV will use a Boeing Delta IV vehicle and a Lockheed-Martin Atlas V. Eventually, these vehicles will replace