

section of the preamble in the interim final rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

These final regulations do not create any information collection requirements. With the removal of §§ 690.63(h) and 690.67 and the revision of § 690.64, due to the statutory changes, the paperwork burden associated with those sections are also removed. This change results in the discontinuation of information collection 1845–0098 and, therefore, the elimination of 109,605 burden hours associated with that collection.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is not subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at: www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

You may also view this document in text or PDF at the following site: www.ifap.ed.gov.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 84.063 Federal Pell Grants)

List of Subjects in 34 CFR Part 690

Colleges and universities, Elementary and secondary education, Grant programs—education, Student aid.

Dated: June 26, 2013.

Arne Duncan,

Secretary of Education.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the interim final rule that amended 34 CFR part 690, published at 77 FR 25893 on May 2, 2012, is adopted as final without change.

[FR Doc. 2013–15709 Filed 7–1–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 51, 53, 63, and 64

[CC Docket Nos. 95–20, 98–10, WC Docket No. 10–132; FCC 13–69]

Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand: BOC Provision of Enhanced Services

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Report and Order eliminates comparably efficient interconnection (CEI) and open network architecture (ONA) narrowband reporting requirements applicable to the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs). These requirements have been in place to monitor the BOCs' compliance with access and interconnection services that they must offer to competitive enhanced service providers (ESPs). The Commission no longer relies on the reports in the course of its decision making, and there is nothing in the record indicating that the reports contain information that is useful to ESPs. Eliminating them will improve the way the Commission collects, uses, and disseminates data, including by altering or eliminating collections that are no longer useful or necessary to carry out our statutory responsibilities.

DATES: Effective August 1, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jodie May, WCB, CPD, (202) 418–1580 or Jodie.May@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In this Report and Order, we permanently eliminate annual, semi-annual, quarterly, and non-discrimination reporting requirements applicable to the BOCs' narrowband CEI and ONA services. The Commission implemented these reporting requirements under its Computer III framework to monitor the BOCs' compliance with the obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to basic network services for unaffiliated ESPs. In August 2011, the Commission Bureau waived the reporting requirements pending resolution of the issues in the Report and Order. The Report and Order furthers the Commission's efforts to modernize agency data collections and reduce reporting burdens where appropriate and consistent with the public interest.

I. Background

1. On February 8, 2011, in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (CEI/ONA Notice), the Commission proposed eliminating the legacy CEI/ONA

narrowband reporting requirements required under the Computer III safeguards “due to a lack of continuing relevance and utility.” 76 FR 11407–01 (Mar 2, 2011). The CEI/ONA Notice stated that the Commission does not rely on any of the submissions in the course of its decision making. On August 11, 2011, the Bureau granted on its own motion a waiver of the CEI/ONA narrowband reporting requirements pending resolution of the CEI/ONA Notice. The Bureau stated that, while it did not prejudice the outcome of the rulemaking, the record suggested that the reports are of limited utility and did not justify the burden and expense of preparing them. Review of Wireline Competition Bureau Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WC Docket No. 10–132, CC Docket Nos. 95–20, 98–10, 26 FCC Rcd 11280, 11280–81, para. 3 (2011). No commenter to the CEI/ONA Notice supported retaining the reporting requirements.

2. The CEI/ONA Notice sought comment on eliminating the BOCs' annual, semi-annual, quarterly, and non-discrimination reporting requirements. Prior to the waiver described above, the BOCs filed annual reports containing projected deployment schedules for ONA services by type of service and percentage of access lines and by market area; disposition of individual requests for ONA services, including action on requests deemed technically infeasible; information about ONA services that were offered through technologies that were new at the time the Commission adopted the requirements, such as Signaling System 7 and Integrated Services Digital Network systems; information about operations support services and billing; and extensive lists of services that the BOC used for its own enhanced services operations. The BOCs were also required to file semi-annual reports containing a consolidated nationwide matrix of ONA services and corresponding state and federal tariff descriptions, computer diskettes and printouts of all tariffs, information on 118 categories of network capabilities requested by ESPs, and the BOC's “ONA Services User Guide,” all on paper and diskette. They filed non-discrimination reports or affidavits, most on a quarterly basis, that published intervals for installation, repair dates, trouble reports, and timelines for BOC

operations as compared to BOC provisioning of service to competitors. For CEI, the Commission permits the BOCs to post their substantive CEI plans on the Internet and then notify the Bureau at the time of the postings. The BOCs are no longer required to obtain Commission pre-approval before posting the plans, but CEI reporting obligations required the BOCs to file paper reports demonstrating compliance with certain nondiscrimination standards.

II. Report and Order

3. In this Report and Order, we eliminate the CEI/ONA narrowband reporting requirements. The Commission no longer relies on any of the reports in the course of its decision making, and there is nothing in the record indicating that the reports contain information that remains useful to competitive ESPs. No commenter has indicated that it uses the reported data.

4. The narrowband reporting requirements are outdated in many respects. For example, the BOCs are required to report on installation and maintenance intervals for detailed categories of ONA service that the Commission established in 1990. Those reporting categories were based on service codes that were in use by the BOCs' provisioning systems during the 1980s. Recent ONA reports contain data for reporting categories that are still active, such as business and Centrex-based services, but many of the original category codes contain no provisioning data.

5. The BOCs argue that the reports increased their costs of providing service. CenturyLink states that, for each semi-annual report, which was over 500 pages and filed in older file formatting technology, it incurred internal costs plus the cost of outside consultants to prepare the reports. It further states that it incurred costs associated with having to prepare the reports jointly with other BOCs. The Commission itself has identified inefficiencies associated with requiring each BOC to file its own ONA information even though some of this information does not vary among providers. For example, each BOC reported on the network capabilities it used to provide basic narrowband services even if the capabilities did not vary in the industry. In addition, the Commission has previously inquired about whether the annual and semi-annual reports required redundant information on ONA service availability, some of which is already delineated in state and federal tariffs filed by the BOCs. Overall, the record in the CEI/ONA Notice contains no evidence that continuing the reports

would provide useful information, and we are convinced that the costs and burdens of preparing them outweigh the benefits. The Commission has stated that it must "collect the data it needs, and only the data it needs to carry out its statutory responsibilities." Reporting Requirements for U.S. Providers of International Telecommunications Services, Amendment of Part 43 of the Commission's Rules, IB Docket No. 04–112, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd 7274, 7275, para. 1 (2011). Unnecessary filing and reporting requirements impose administrative costs on carriers that can lead to increased rates for consumers and are not in the public interest.

6. In light of these conclusions, we find that continued application of the narrowband CEI and ONA reporting requirements is no longer necessary. Since the Bureau waived the requirements in 2011, no commenters have indicated that the elimination of the required reports has impeded their enhanced service offerings or otherwise prevented them from obtaining non-discriminatory access to CEI/ONA services. We find that it is more efficient to detect possible access discrimination by looking at specific, focused information in the context of an individual complaint proceeding under section 208 of the Act than through these outdated monitoring reports. 47 U.S.C. 208.

III. Procedural Matters

A. Paperwork Reduction Analysis

7. This document does not contain proposed information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

B. Congressional Review Act

8. The Commission will send a copy of this *Report and Order* to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

C. Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

9. Final Regulatory Flexibility Certification. The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., requires that a regulatory flexibility analysis be prepared for rulemaking proceedings, unless the

agency certifies that "the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities." 5 U.S.C. 605(b). The RFA generally defines "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction." 5 U.S.C. 601(6). In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act. 5 U.S.C. 601(3). 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). 15 U.S.C. 632.

10. This Report and Order eliminates CEI/ONA narrowband reporting requirements that have been in place to monitor the BOCs' compliance with access and interconnection services that they must offer to competitive ESPs. It finds that the Commission does not rely on any of the reports in the course of its decision making, and there is nothing in the record indicating that the reports contain information that is currently useful to competitive ESPs. In addition, no commenter to the proceeding indicated that we should retain the reports. The underlying substantive requirements associated with CEI and ONA with which the BOCs must comply will remain in effect.

11. SBA defines small telecommunications entities as those with 1,500 or fewer employees. 13 CFR 121.201, NAICS Code 517110, Wired Telecommunications Carriers. This proceeding pertains to the BOCs, which, because they would not be deemed a "small business concern" under the Small Business Act and have more than 1,500 employees, do not qualify as small entities under the RFA. Therefore, we certify that the requirements of this Report and Order will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Commission will send a copy of the Report and Order including a copy of this final certification in a report to Congress pursuant to the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A). In addition, the Report and Order and this certification will be sent to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and is published in the **Federal Register**. 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

IV. Ordering Clause

12. *It is ordered* that, pursuant to Sections 1, 2, 4, 11, 201–205, 251, 272, 274–276, and 303(r) of the

Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154, 161, 201–205, 251, 272, 274–276, and 303(r) this Report and Order in WC Docket No. 10–132 *is adopted*. The requirements of this Report and Order *shall be effective* 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Federal Communications Commission.

Sheryl Todd,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–15642 Filed 7–1–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 79

[MB Docket No. 11–154; FCC 13–84]

Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission affirms, modifies, and clarifies certain decisions adopted in the *Report and Order* in MB Docket No. 11–154 regarding closed captioning requirements for video programming delivered using Internet protocol (“IP”) and apparatus used by consumers to view video programming. The action is taken in response to three petitions for reconsideration of the *Report and Order*, which adopted rules governing the closed captioning requirements for the owners, providers, and distributors of IP-delivered video programming and rules governing the closed captioning capabilities of certain apparatus on which consumers view video programming.

DATES: Effective August 1, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diana Sokolow, *Diana.Sokolow@fcc.gov*, or Maria Mullarkey, *Maria.Mullarkey@fcc.gov*, of the Policy Division, Media Bureau, (202) 418–2120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s *Order on Reconsideration*, FCC 13–84, adopted on June 13, 2013 and released on June 14, 2013. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. This document will also be available via ECFS at [http://](http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/)

fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/. Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Microsoft Word, and/or Adobe Acrobat. The complete text may be purchased from the Commission’s copy contractor, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554. Alternative formats are available for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), by sending an email to fcc504@fcc.gov or calling the Commission’s Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis

This document does not contain new or modified information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Public Law 104–13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any new or modified “information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,” pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

Summary of the Order on Reconsideration

I. Introduction

1. In this *Order on Reconsideration*, we affirm, modify, and clarify certain decisions adopted in the *Report and Order* in MB Docket No. 11–154 regarding closed captioning requirements for video programming delivered using Internet protocol (“IP”) and apparatus used by consumers to view video programming. The actions we take will provide the industry and consumers with certainty about the scope of the captioning obligations before the January 1, 2014 compliance deadline for apparatus.

2. Specifically, we address three petitions for reconsideration of the *Report and Order*, which adopted rules governing the closed captioning requirements for the owners, providers, and distributors of IP-delivered video programming and rules governing the closed captioning capabilities of certain apparatus on which consumers view video programming. First, we address the Petition for Reconsideration of the Consumer Electronics Association (“CEA”) by: (1) Granting narrow class waivers for certain apparatus that are primarily designed for activities other than receiving or playing back video programming, while denying CEA’s broader request that the Commission narrow the scope of § 79.103 of its rules; (2) denying CEA’s request that

removable media players are not subject to the closed captioning requirements but, at the same time, temporarily extending the compliance deadlines for Blu-ray players as well as for those DVD players that do not currently render or pass through captions, pending resolution of the *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“FNPRM”);¹ and (3) granting CEA’s request to modify the January 1, 2014 deadline applicable to apparatus to refer only to the date of manufacture, and not to the date of importation, shipment, or sale. Second, we deny the Petition for Reconsideration of TVGuardian, LLC (“TVGuardian”), which requests that the Commission reconsider its decision to allow video programming providers and distributors to enable the rendering or pass through of captions to end users and instead to require video programming providers and distributors, and digital source devices, to pass through closed captioning data to consumer equipment. Third, we address the Petition for Reconsideration of Consumer Groups by: (1) deferring resolution of whether to reconsider the Commission’s decision to exclude video clips from the scope of the IP closed captioning rules, and directing the Media Bureau to issue a Public Notice to seek updated information on this topic within six months; and (2) issuing an FNPRM to obtain further information necessary to determine whether the Commission should impose synchronization requirements on device manufacturers. Our goal in this proceeding remains to implement Congress’s intent to better enable individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing to view video programming. In considering the requests made in the petitions for reconsideration, we have evaluated the effect on consumers who are deaf or hard of hearing as well as the cost of compliance to affected entities.

II. Background

3. On October 8, 2010, President Obama signed into law the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 (“CVAA”). The CVAA required the Commission, by January 12, 2012, to establish closed captioning rules for the owners, providers, and distributors of IP-delivered video programming, and for certain apparatus on which consumers view video programming. The CVAA also required the Commission to establish an advisory committee known as the Video Programming Accessibility

¹ The FNPRM, adopted with the *Order on Reconsideration*, is published elsewhere in this publication.