

Title: Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98–147.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 1,750.

Estimated Time Per Response: .50–40 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement, third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 165,600 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission is submitting this information collection to OMB as an extension (no change in information collection requirements) in order to obtain the full three-year clearance from them. This collection contains 17 different information collection requirements. The Commission sought to further Congress's goal of promoting innovation and investment by all participating in the telecommunications marketplace, in order to stimulate competition for all services, including advanced telecommunications services. In furtherance of this goal, the Commission imposes certain information collection requirements on incumbent local exchange carriers (LECs) in order to ensure compliance with the incumbent LEC's collocation obligations and to assist incumbent LECs in protecting network integrity. All of the information collections will be used by the Commission and by competitive carriers to facilitate the deployment of advanced services and to implement section 251 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0076.

Title: Common Carrier Annual Employment Report.

Form No.: FCC Form 395.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 1,100.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1 hour.

Frequency of Response: Annual reporting requirement, recordkeeping requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 1,100 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission is submitting this information collection to OMB as a revision in order to obtain the full three-year clearance from them. The Commission has revised the FCC Form

395 to conform to OMB's revised standards in Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting. Additionally, the total annual burden for this information collection has been adjusted to reflect a decrease in the number of respondents since the last OMB renewal period which was three years ago. The current number of respondents is 4,000. With this submission, we are reporting 1,100 respondents; and 1,100 total annual burden hours.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0835.

Title: Ship Inspections.

Form Nos.: FCC Forms 806, 824, 827, and 829.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, not-for-profit institutions and State, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 1,210.

Estimated Time Per Response: .084 hours to complete inspection certificate; 4 hours for the ship inspection; and .25 hours to provide a summary in the ship's log.

Frequency of Response: Annual and every five year reporting requirement, recordkeeping requirement and third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 5,245 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission is seeking an extension (no change in reporting requirements) for this information collection in order to obtain the full three-year clearance from OMB.

The FCC seeks to promote efficiency in the Commission's service to the public and to encourage the use of private sector organizations to take over government operations whenever possible. The Communications Act requires the Commission to inspect the radio installation of large cargo ships and certain passenger ships at least once a year to ensure that the radio installation is in compliance with the requirements of the Communications Act. Additionally, the Communications Act requires the inspection of small passenger ships at least once every five years. The Safety Convention (which the United States is a signatory) also requires an annual inspection. However, the Safety Convention permits an Administrator to entrust the inspections to either surveyors nominated for the purpose or to organizations recognized by it. Therefore, the United States can have other parties conduct the radio inspection of vessels for compliance with the Safety Convention. The Commission allows FCC-licensed

technicians to conduct these inspections. FCC-licensed technicians certify that the ship passed an inspection and issue a safety certificate. These safety certificates (FCC Forms 806, 824, 827 and 829) indicate that the vessel complies with the Communications Act and the Safety Convention. These technicians are required to provide a summary of the results of the inspection in the ship's log. In addition, the vessel's owner, operator, or ship's master must certify in the ship's log that the inspection was satisfactory. Inspection certificates issued in accordance with the Safety Convention must be posted in a prominent place on the ship.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 06–970 Filed 2–7–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Submitted for Review to the Office of Management and Budget

December 27, 2005.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be

submitted on or before March 10, 2006. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments to Judith B. Herman, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-C804, 445 12th Street, SW., DC 20554 or via the Internet to *Judith-B.Herman@fcc.gov*. If you would like to obtain or view a copy of this information collection, you may do so by visiting the FCC PRA Web page at: <http://www.fcc.gov/omd/pra>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Judith B. Herman at 202-418-0214 or via the Internet at *Judith-B.Herman@fcc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060-0645.

Title: Section 17.4, Antenna Registration.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, not-for-profit institutions, and state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 25,600.

Estimated Time per Response: .2-1.2 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement, recordkeeping requirement and third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 40,965 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$3,200,000.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The requirements contained in Part 17 are necessary to implement a uniform registration process for owners of antenna structures. The following are the information collection requirements subject to OMB review and approval: (1) Antenna structure owners will be required to provide tenant licensees with a copy of the antenna registration; (2) display the registration number on or around the antenna structure; (3) notify of improperly function of antenna structure lights; and (4) recording of improperly function of antenna structure lights. The information will be used by the Commission during investigations related to air safety or radio frequency interference. A registration number will be issued to identify antenna structure owners in order to enforce congressionally mandated provisions related to the owners. The Commission is submitting this information collection to OMB as

an extension (no change in requirements) in order to obtain the full three year clearance.

OMB Control No.: 3060-0901.

Title: Reports of Common Carriers and Affiliates.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, not-for-profit institutions, and state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 20 respondents; 1,200 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 5 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion and one-time reporting requirements, and third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 6,000 hours.

Total Annual Cost: N/A.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission is submitting this information collection to OMB as an extension (no change in requirements) in order to obtain the full three year clearance. The rules applicable to this information collection are contained in Section 43.51(a). This rule requires, in part, that common carriers file copies of all contracts entered into with a communications entity in a foreign point for the provision of a common carriers service between the United States and that foreign point. In a Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration adopted in May 1999, the Commission amended Section 43.51 to exempt from this requirement U.S. carriers that enter into such a contract with a foreign carrier that lacks market power. The Commission also amended Section 43.51 with respect to carriers filing agreements with foreign carriers that have market power on routes for which the Commission eliminated the International Settlements Policy. It amended the rules specifically to permit these carriers to request confidential treatment of and to redact from the public view, the rates, terms and conditions that govern the settlement of international traffic.

OMB Control No.: 3060-0678.

Title: Part 25 of the Commission's Rules Governing the Licensing of, and Spectrum Usage by, Satellite Network Stations and Space Stations.

Form No.: FCC 312, Schedule S.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 3,432.

Estimated Time per Response: 1-40 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion and annual reporting requirements, and third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 42,108 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$608,401,936.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: N/A.

Needs and Uses: The Commission has revised this information collection in a Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 05-62. In this proceeding, the Commission proposed to combine power level requirements and antenna diameter requirements into one off-axis equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP) requirement. (EIRP is the product of the gain of the antenna in a given direction relative to an isotropic antenna and the power supplied to that antenna.) If this proposal is adopted, it would give earth station operators more flexibility in their operations and help expedite its review of some non-routine earth station applications. The Commission invited comments on what revisions would be necessary to its rules to provide protection from interference for earth stations in the event that it adopts an off-axis EIRP requirement for fixed satellite service (FSS) earth stations. Additionally, the Commission invited comment on what specific information should be required from earth station applicants in order to comply with the proposed off-axis EIRP requirement. The following new information collection requirements are proposed in the rulemaking: (1) Earth station applicants will provide a table showing the EIRP of the antenna at various specific off-axis angles; (2) Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) licensees will certify that they will meet any applicable requirements for contention protocols adopted in this proceeding; (3) any party questioning a license applicant's contention protocol certification will provide a technical analysis showing that the applicant's planned contention protocol usage is likely to cause harmful interference to adjacent satellites or terrestrial wireless operations; and (4) a certificate of coordination signed by an authorized representative of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory (NRAO) will be made to the Commission upon request.

If the proposals are adopted by the Commission, it is anticipated that the FCC Form 312 will be revised and/or new applications will be developed to accommodate the off-axis EIRP requirement for earth stations. Furthermore, the modification of the FCC Form 312 and/or creation of new applications would necessitate revisions to the International Bureau Filing System (IBFS) so that applicants can file the new or revised applications electronically with the Commission.

(Note: No changes to the Schedule S will be required to accommodate the off-axis EIRP requirement for earth stations.)

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 06-1058 Filed 2-7-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket Number 96-45; DA 06-55]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. 2006 Modification of Average Schedule Universal Service Formulas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document, each year, the Commission must review and approve or modify any proposed modifications to the formulas used to calculate Part 36 high-cost loop support and local switching support for average schedule companies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cara Voth, Senior Attorney, Wireline Competition Bureau, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, (202) 418-7400, TTY (202) 418-0484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order in CC Docket No. 96-45 released on January 12, 2006. The full text of this document is available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.

I. Introduction

1. In the Order, each year, the Commission must review and approve or modify any proposed modifications to the formulas used to calculate Part 36 high-cost loop support and local switching support for average schedule companies. Historically, the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. (NECA) has filed the annual average schedule company formula modifications for both Part 36 high-cost loop support and local switching support. Pursuant to § 54.301(f) of the Commission's rules, however, the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) now submits the proposed formula for local switching support. The Commission's rules require that these formulas simulate the disbursements that would be received

by a company that is representative of average schedule companies.

2. On August 30, 2005, NECA filed proposed modifications to the current high-cost loop universal service formula for average schedule companies, requesting that they take effect on January 1, 2006, and remain in effect through December 31, 2006. On September 30, 2005, USAC filed proposed modifications to the current local switching support formula for average schedule companies. On October 20, 2005, the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) issued a public notice soliciting comments on NECA's high-cost support filing. For the reasons discussed below, we approve USAC's modified local switching support formula and, with respect to Part 36 high-cost support, we adopt NECA's cost per loop (CPL) formula. As we have done previously, we direct USAC to provide support to average schedule carriers consistent with this Order retroactive to January 1, 2006.

II. Local Switching Support Formula

3. The local switching support formula is used to determine the amount of support for switching costs that will be provided to average schedule companies from the Commission's universal service high-cost support mechanism. The current interstate local switching support formula was approved on December 30, 2004. In its September 30, 2005, filing, USAC proposes a formula for 2006 that, if approved, would increase annual payments for local switching support from approximately \$83.7 million in 2005 to approximately \$85.8 million in 2006, an increase of approximately 2.5 percent. We have reviewed USAC's filing and the supporting information in *NECA's 2005 Modification of Average Schedules* and find that the method used to develop this year's proposed formula is the same method that NECA has used to develop the formula we approved during the last payment period. Consistent with the Bureau's prior orders, we approve USAC's proposed 2006 average schedule local switching support formula.

4. USAC's average schedule local switching support filing provided only its proposed 2006 formulas. Supporting documentation for the 2006 local switching support formulas was filed eight months earlier in *NECA's 2005 Modification of Average Schedules*. In average schedule local switching support filings prior to 2005, NECA provided detailed explanations, supporting documentation, and data. Such a consolidated single filing of the formulas, necessary information, and

data enables us to conduct a more efficient review of local switching support filings. Thus, beginning with the local switching support filing due in 2006, and for all subsequent filings, we require USAC to provide at least the same level of explanative detail and data that NECA had included previously with its average schedule local switching support formula filings.

III. Discussion

5. Consistent with our reasoning in our *2003 Order, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service* in CC Docket No. 96-45, DA 02-3587, released on December 27, 2002; *2004 Order, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service* in CC Docket No. 96-45, DA 03-4063, released on December 24, 2003; and *2005 Order, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service* in CC Docket No. 96-45, DA 04-4070, released on December 30, 2004, we adopt the CPL formula for purposes of calculating average schedule company expense adjustments for 2006. In previous average schedule formula filings, NECA conceded that the CPL formula better estimates cost per loop, but argued that the Bureau should instead approve NECA's EAPL formula because NECA believes it better estimates the expense adjustments that an average schedule carrier should receive. We again find, however, that we are not required to adopt a formula based on its ability to predict expense adjustments per loop, i.e., "disbursements," compared to a formula's ability to predict costs per loop. The Bureau has consistently held, and the Commission has upheld, that the appropriate high-cost loop support formula should reasonably approximate the cost per loop of the sample average schedule companies and allocate funds accurately to average schedule companies. Because the CPL formula provided by NECA in its filing better estimates the cost per loop of sample average schedule companies than the proposed EAPL formula, based on the current record, the Bureau concludes, as it did in its *2003 Order*, that the CPL formula is a more appropriate means of calculating universal service high-cost loop support for average schedule companies. Because NECA's submission of the results derived from the CPL formula appear to be accurate and complete, we therefore approve the CPL formula results provided in NECA's August 30, 2005 submission.

6. Although today, based on the current record, we approve NECA's CPL formula for 2006, which is essentially the same CPL formula filed since 2002 adjusted for changes in the sample cost data, we are concerned about yearly