

arguing that it changed longstanding LSC policy and would have a detrimental impact on providing services to the elderly. NLADA stated “This section significantly changes longstanding guidance regarding eligibility determinations for senior citizens that would result in a reduction of services available to individuals age 60 and over.” This was mirrored by several other LSC funded commenters.

Response—To avoid confusion and unintended consequences, the LSC OIG has removed the language referring to OAA funds from this section.

Comment 2—NLADA also expressed concern relating to a suggested audit procedure for assessing the waiver of eligibility requirements. NLADA believed that the language needed revision “so that an auditor does not waste time looking for evidence of a waiver determination, but rather reviews whether the appropriate factors allowing income eligibility have been identified for households with income between 125% and 200% of the Federal Poverty Level.”

Response—The LSC OIG has modified the suggested audit procedure to provide better clarity by including the following language at the end of the suggested audit procedure: “or the recipient determined the client was eligible based on the factors set forth in 45 CFR 1611.5(a)(3) or (4).”

C. Regulatory Summary Adjustment for Part 1612—Restrictions on Lobbying and Certain Other Activities

Comment—Two commenters (NLADA, CLS) expressed concern over the regulatory summary language regarding the prohibitions contained in 45 CFR 1612.6(c), describing it as “overly broad and/or confusing.” NLADA stated “The regulation does not contain a general prohibition on providing information in connection with legislation or rulemaking.” CLS stated “This sentence omits key elements in the actual Regulation that employees are only prohibited from soliciting or arranging for a request from any official to testify or otherwise provide information in connection with legislation or rulemaking.”

Response—The LSC OIG has revised the regulatory summary language pertaining to 45 CFR 1612.6(c) to more accurately reflect the prohibitions. Also, a technical correction was made to the 45 CFR 1612.3 language contained in the regulatory summary in order to include phraseology that had been inadvertently omitted from the initial draft publication. The language added is as follows (with emphasis placed on the additions and corrections):

(5) the issuance, amendment or revocation of any executive order. *Recipients shall not use any funds to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, administrative expense, or related expense, associated with an activity prohibited in (1)–(5) detailed above (45 CFR 1612.3).*

D. Proposed Regulatory Summary for Part 1614—Private Attorney Involvement

The LSC OIG proposed revisions to update the regulatory summary for 45 CFR part 1614 in order to follow the current LSC regulation.

Comment—Two commenters (NLADA, CLS) expressed concern that the revised regulatory summary discussing § 1614.4(b)(1) omitted an important clause. NLADA stated that “The sentence in the Draft Supplement currently only references including support provided by private attorneys to the recipient” and does not mention subrecipient, an entire category of organizations that may receive private attorney support.

Response—The LSC OIG has revised the regulatory summary language as follows:

Activities undertaken by the recipient to meet the requirements of this Part may also include, but are not limited to: (1) support provided by private attorneys to the recipient or a subrecipient as part of its delivery of legal assistance. . . .

E. Audit Considerations and Proposed Suggested Audit Procedures

Comment 1—Two commenters (NLADA, CLS) expressed concern over the LSC OIG policy on high risk designation for LSC grantees, stating that it is unwarranted, could be confusing to stakeholders and be a misnomer to a specific auditee. NLADA recommended the elimination of this blanket designation by the LSC OIG.

Response—The LSC OIG will retain the policy of high risk designation at this time. If the LSC OIG accepted the requested modification to this section, it could allow IPAs to designate LSC grantees as low risk. Such a designation would result in audits not in compliance with statutory requirements.

Comment 2—NLADA also expressed concern relating to the suggested audit procedure on obtaining an understanding of internal controls in place associated with specific regulations. NLADA recommended that the LSC OIG include clarification that “. . . understanding internal controls means that the auditor has identified

that there are systems in place to assure compliance.”

Response—The LSC OIG believes that the current language is sufficiently clear to the IPA that the internal controls relate to compliance with the applicable LSC regulatory requirement. No additional changes were made.

Comments provided by all three IPAs related to non-audit questions, satisfaction with improved procedures and commentary on utilizing the suggested audit procedures. No additional changes were made.

For the reasons stated above, the Legal Services Corporation Office of Inspector General revises the Compliance Supplement for Audits of LSC Recipients. The Revised Compliance Supplement for Audits of LSC Recipients is available on the LSC OIG Web site at: https://www.oig.lsc.gov/images/pdfs/ipa_resources/April_2016_Compliance_Supplement.pdf.

Dated: March 17, 2016.

Stefanie K. Davis,
Assistant General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2016–06451 Filed 3–23–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 51

[GN Docket No. 13–5, RM–11358; WC Docket No. 05–25, RM–10593; FCC 15–97]

Technology Transitions, Policies and Rules Governing Retirement of Copper Loops by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; announcement of effective date.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission announces that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved, for a period of three years, the information collection associated with the Commission’s network change disclosure rules pertaining to copper retirement notices. This document is consistent with the *Emerging Wireline Networks and Services (EWNS) Report and Order*, *Order on Reconsideration*, and *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 15–97, which stated that the Commission would publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing the effective date of those rules.

DATES: The amendments to 47 CFR 51.325(a)(4) and (e), 51.332, and

51.333(b) and (c) published at 80 FR 63322, October 19, 2015, are effective March 24, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michele Levy Berlove, Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, at (202) 418-1477, or by email at Michele.Berlove@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document announces that, on March 17, 2016, OMB approved, for a period of three years, the information collection requirements relating to the network change disclosure rules pertaining to copper retirement notices contained in the Commission's *EWNS Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration, and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 15-97, published at 80 FR 63322, October 19, 2015.

The OMB Control Number is 3060-0741. The Commission publishes this notice as an announcement of the effective date of the rules. If you have any comments on the burden estimates listed below, or how the Commission can improve the collections and reduce any burdens caused thereby, please contact Nicole Ongele, Federal Communications Commission, Room A-C620, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. Please include the OMB Control Number, 3060-0741, in your correspondence. The Commission will also accept your comments via email at PRA@fcc.gov.

To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (voice), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

Synopsis

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507), the FCC is notifying the public that it received final OMB approval on March 17, 2016, for the information collection requirements contained in the modifications to the Commission's rules in 47 CFR part 51. Under 5 CFR part 1320, an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a current, valid OMB 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 that does not display a current, valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number is 3060-0741.

The foregoing notice is required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13, October 1, 1995, and 44 U.S.C. 3507.

The total annual reporting burdens and costs for the respondents are as follows:

OMB Control Number: 3060-0741.

OMB Approval Date: March 17, 2017.

OMB Expiration Date: March 31, 2019.

Title: Technology Transitions, GN Docket No. 13-5, et al.

Form Number: N/A.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities.

Number of Respondents and

Responses: 5,357 respondents; 573,767 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.5-8 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirements; recordkeeping; third party disclosure.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. Statutory authority is contained in 47 U.S.C. 222 and 251.

Total Annual Burden: 575,840 hours.

Total Annual Cost: No cost.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality:

The Commission is not requesting that the respondents submit confidential information to the FCC. Respondents may, however, request confidential treatment for information they believe to be confidential under 47 CFR 0.459 of the Commission's rules.

Privacy Act: No impact(s).

Needs and Uses: Section 251 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 251, is designed to accelerate private sector development and deployment of telecommunications technologies and services by spurring competition. Section 222(e) is also designed to spur competition by prescribing requirements for the sharing of subscriber list information. These OMB collections are designed to help implement certain provisions of sections 222(e) and 251, and to eliminate operational barriers to competition in the telecommunications services market. Specifically, these OMB collections will be used to implement (1) local exchange carriers' ("LECs") obligations to provide their competitors with dialing parity and non-discriminatory access to certain services and functionalities; (2) incumbent local exchange carriers' ("ILECs") duty to make network information disclosures; and (3) numbering administration. The Commission estimates that the total annual burden of the entire collection, as revised, is 575,840 hours. This revision relates to a change in one of many components of the currently approved collection—specifically, certain reporting, recordkeeping and/or third party disclosure requirements

under section 251(c)(5). In August 2015, the Commission adopted new rules concerning certain information collection requirements implemented under section 251(c)(5) of the Act, pertaining to network change disclosures. The changes to those rules apply specifically to a certain subset of network change disclosures, namely notices of planned copper retirements. The changes are designed to provide interconnecting entities adequate time to prepare their networks for the planned copper retirements and to ensure that consumers are able to make informed choices. There is also a change in the number of potential respondents to the rules promulgated under that section. The number of respondents as to the information collection requirements implemented under section 251(c)(5) of the Act, has changed from 1,300 to 750, a decrease of 550 respondents from the previous submission. Under section 251(f)(1) of the Act, rural telephone companies are exempt from the requirements of section 251(c) "until (i) such company has received a bona fide request for interconnection, services, or network elements, and (ii) the State commission determines . . . that such request is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with section 254" The Commission has determined that the number of potential respondents set forth in the previous submission inadvertently failed to take this exemption into account. There are 1,429 ILECs nationwide. Of those, 87 are non-rural ILECs and 1,342 are rural ILECs. The Commission estimates that of the 1,342 rural ILECs, 679 are entitled to the exemption and 663 are not entitled to the exemption and thus must comply with rules promulgated under section 251(c) of the Act, including the rules that are the subject of this information collection. Thus, the Commission estimates that there are 87 (non-rural) + 663 (rural) = 750 potential respondents. The Commission estimates that the revision does not result in any additional outlays of funds for hiring outside contractors or procuring equipment.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-06683 Filed 3-23-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P