

significant at a confidence level of 99% or higher, which equates to three or more standard deviations or a p value of 0.01 or less. A contractor must respond to a predetermination notice within 15 calendar days of receipt of the notice, which OFCCP may extend for good cause.

(b) *Notice of Violation.* If a compliance review or other review by OFCCP indicates preliminary findings of discrimination or other material violations of the equal opportunity clause, OFCCP may issue a notice of violation to provide notice to the contractor requiring corrective action and inviting conciliation through a written agreement. For discrimination violations, OFCCP may issue the notice of violation following issuance of a predetermination notice if the contractor does not respond or provide a sufficient response within 15 calendar days of receipt of the notice, unless OFCCP has extended the predetermination notice response time for good cause shown.

(c) *Conciliation Agreement.* If a compliance review, complaint investigation or other review by OFCCP or its representative indicates a material violation of the equal opportunity clause, and

(1) If the contractor, subcontractor or bidder is willing to correct the violations and/or deficiencies, and

(2) If OFCCP or its representative determines that settlement (rather than referral for consideration of formal enforcement) is appropriate, a written agreement shall be required. The agreement shall provide for such remedial action as may be necessary to correct the violations and/or deficiencies noted, including, where appropriate (but not necessarily limited to), remedies such as back pay and retroactive seniority.

(d) *Remedial benchmarks.* The remedial action referenced in paragraph (c) of this section may include the establishment of benchmarks for the contractor's outreach, recruitment, hiring, or other employment activities. The purpose of such benchmarks is to create a quantifiable method by which the contractor's progress in correcting identified violations and/or deficiencies can be measured.

(e) *Expedited Conciliation Option.* A contractor may waive the procedures set forth in paragraphs (a) and/or (b) of this section to enter directly into a conciliation agreement.

[FR Doc. 2019-27258 Filed 12-27-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-CM-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Parts 430, 433, 447, 455, and 457

[CMS-2393-N]

RIN 0938-AT50

Medicaid Program; Medicaid Fiscal Accountability Regulation; Supplement and Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule; supplement and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document extends the comment period for the proposed rule entitled "Medicaid Program; Medicaid Fiscal Accountability Regulation" that appeared in the November 18, 2019 *Federal Register*. The comment period for the proposed rule, which would end on January 17, 2020, is extended 15 days to February 1, 2020. We additionally note that based on public comments received on this proposed rule, we will adjust the effective dates of our policies to allow for adequate implementation timelines, as appropriate.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published November 18, 2019 (84 FR 63722), is extended to 5 p.m., eastern daylight time, on February 1, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as outlined in the November 18, 2019 proposed rule (84 FR 63722). Please choose only one method listed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Badaracco, (410) 786-4589, Richard Kimball, (410) 786-2278, and Daniil Yablochnikov, (410) 786-8912, for Medicaid Provider Payments, Supplemental Payments, Upper Payment Limits, Provider Categories, Intergovernmental Transfers, and Certified Public Expenditures.

Timothy Davidson, (410) 786-1167, Jonathan Endelman, (410) 786-4738, and Stuart Goldstein, (410) 786-0694, for Health Care-Related Taxes, Provider-Related Donations, and Disallowances.

Lia Adams, (410) 786-8258, Charlie Arnold, (404) 562-7425, Richard Cuno, (410) 786-1111, and Charles Hines, (410) 786-0252, for Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital Payments and Overpayments.

Jennifer Clark, (410) 786-2013 and Deborah McClure, (410) 786-3128, for Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the "Medicaid Program; Medicaid Fiscal Accountability Regulation" proposed rule that appeared in the November 18, 2019 *Federal Register* (84 FR 63722), we solicited public comments on proposed policies that aim to promote transparency by establishing new reporting requirements for states to provide CMS with certain information on supplemental payments to Medicaid providers, including supplemental payments approved under either Medicaid state plan or demonstration authority, and on applicable upper payment limits. Additionally, the proposed rule would establish requirements to ensure that state plan amendments proposing new supplemental payments are consistent with the proper and efficient operation of the state plan and with efficiency, economy, and quality of care. This proposed rule addresses the financing of supplemental and base Medicaid payments through the non-federal share, including states' uses of health care-related taxes and bona fide provider-related donations, as well as the requirements necessary to properly implement the non-federal share of any Medicaid payment.

Since the issuance of the proposed rule, we have received inquiries from a variety of stakeholders, including healthcare provider organizations and industry representatives requesting an extension to the comment period. We also recognize that the comment period for the proposed rule crosses over several federal holidays, which may hinder the ability of the public to provide meaningful comment on the proposed rule. In order to maximize the opportunity for the public to provide meaningful input to CMS, we believe that it is important to allow additional time for the public to prepare comments on the proposed rule. In addition, we believe that granting an extension to the public comment period in this instance would further our overall objective to obtain public input on the proposed provisions to promote transparency and oversight on payments made in the Medicaid program. Therefore, we are extending the comment period for the proposed rule for an additional 15 days.

While we believe it is in the best interest of the public and our proposed policies to extend the comment period for this proposed rule, we also acknowledge that stakeholders require appropriate implementation timelines that could be impacted by this extension. Therefore, we note that we will take this comment period extension into account in determining the effective date(s) of the policies in any

final rule, to allow for adequate implementation timelines as appropriate.

Dated: December 19, 2019.

Seema Verma,

Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

[FR Doc. 2019–28179 Filed 12–26–19; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket No. 17–59, WC Docket No. 17–97; DA 19–1312; FRS 16377]

Advanced Methods To Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls, Call Authentication Trust Anchor

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (Bureau), in consultation with the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) and Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (PSHSB), solicits input for the first staff report on call blocking, as directed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission). The Bureau seeks data and other information on the availability and effectiveness of call-blocking tools offered to consumers, the impact of FCC actions on illegal calls, the impact of call blocking on 911 services and public safety, and any other information that may inform the Commission's analysis of the state of deployment of advanced methods and tools to eliminate illegal and unwanted calls.

DATES: Comments are due on or before January 29, 2020, and reply comments are due on or before February 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by CG Docket No. 17–59 and WC Docket No. 17–97, by any of the following methods:

■ *FCC's website:* <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

■ *Paper Mail:* Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. Filers 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. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the

Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

■ *People with Disabilities:* Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by email: FCC504@fcc.gov or phone: 202–418–0530 or TTY: 202–418–0432.

For detailed instructions for submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen Schroeder, Consumer Policy Division, CGB, at (202) 418–0654, email: Karen.Schroeder@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Public Notice*, in CG Docket No. 17–59, WC Docket No. 17–97; document DA 19–1312, released on December 20, 2019. This matter shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. 47 CFR 1.1200 *et seq.* Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memorandum summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substance of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one or two sentence description of the views and arguments presented is generally required. See 47 CFR 1.1206(b). Other rules pertaining to oral and written *ex parte* presentations in permit-but-disclose proceedings are set forth in § 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.1206(b).

Synopsis

1. In June 2019, the FCC took action to further protect consumers from illegal and unwanted robocalls. The Commission also directed the Bureau, in consultation with WCB and PSHSB, to report on the implementation and effectiveness of blocking measures. The Commission specified that the Bureau address, among other things, the availability to consumers of call-blocking solutions, the effectiveness of various categories of call-blocking tools, and the impact of previous Commission rule changes to allow voice service providers to block calls from phone numbers on a Do-Not-Originate list and those that purport to be from invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers. The Commission also asked that the Bureau study information on the impact of call blocking on 911 and public safety.

2. In the *Public Notice*, the Bureau solicits input for the first staff report on call blocking.

3. *Availability of Call-Blocking Tools.* The Bureau seeks data and other information on the availability of call-blocking tools offered to consumers. What tools are available to consumers? Do voice service providers or others offer multiple versions of their tool from which consumers may choose? Are such tools offered on an opt-in basis or opt-out basis? Do the tools block calls at the network level, the device level, or elsewhere in the call path? Are such tools offered by a third party directly to the consumer or by the service provider? What fees, if any, do providers or third parties charge for these tools? What proportion of consumers subscribe to a provider that offers and/or enables call-blocking tools? How many subscribers avail themselves of the tools? Are new tools under development?

4. *Effectiveness of Call-Blocking Tools.* The Bureau seeks data and other information on the effectiveness of call-blocking tools offered to consumers. What are the most appropriate metrics to measure the effectiveness of call-blocking tools, e.g., by fraction of illegal calls blocked? How effective are available tools at blocking illegal and unwanted calls? What tools, if any, send an intercept message for blocked calls? How do blocking tools define false positives? What is the rate of false positives? How do the tools remedy false positives? What is the rate of false negatives (illegal or unwanted calls that reach consumers)? What is the number of illegal robocalls transiting the nation's phone system? How is that number determined?

5. *Impact of FCC Actions.* How have voice service providers responded to the Commission's actions to empower them to protect their customers from illegal calls, such as by blocking calls from phone numbers on a Do-Not-Originate list and those that purport to be from invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers? What initiatives have voice service providers implemented as a result of these and other actions by the Commission? Do voice service providers block Do-Not-Originate calls? Have consumers seen a corresponding reduction in scam calls from numbers on the Do-Not-Originate list, such as Internal Revenue Service and Social Security Administration numbers that unauthorized callers have fraudulently spoofed? Have voice service providers implemented the blocking of calls that purport to be from invalid, unallocated, or unused numbers? Do voice service providers offer opt-out call-blocking programs? If so, how many consumers have opted out? Do voice service providers offer opt-in white-list