

under part 1614. The Order further provided that if a section 501 complaint filed against the EEOC in the part 1614 process includes a separate section 508 claim, OEO will process the section 501 claim through the part 1614 process, and will separately process the section 508 claim pursuant to the procedures set forth in 29 CFR 1615.170(d)–(m). By this Order, the EEOC did not alter any of its existing procedures for processing complaints under section 501 or section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

**EFFECTIVE DATE.** The delegation of authority became effective on July 22, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carol R. Miaskoff, Assistant Legal Counsel, at 202–663–4689.

Dated: July 22, 2003.

**Cari M. Dominguez,**  
Chair.

[FR Doc. 03–19986 Filed 8–5–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6570–01–P**

## OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

### National Science and Technology Council Subcommittee on Research Business Models

**ACTION:** Request for information regarding National Science and Technology Council/Committee on Science/Subcommittee on Research Business Models.

**SUMMARY:** The Subcommittee on Research Business Models is undertaking a review of policies, procedures, and plans relating to the business relationship between federal agencies and research performers with the goal of improving the performance and management of federally sponsored basic and applied scientific and engineering research. As part of that effort, the Subcommittee will hold a series of regional workshops in the Fall of 2003 to solicit input and feedback from the research performer community. This notice is intended to collect data that will assist the Subcommittee in setting agendas for those regional workshops.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before September 22, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Due to potential delays in OSTP's receipt and processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we encourage respondents to submit comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. We cannot guarantee that comments sent via surface mail will be

received before the comment closing date.

*Electronic comments may be submitted to: nstc\_rbm@ostp.eop.gov.* Please include in the subject line the words "NSTC Research Business Models Comments" and a reference to the relevant items, enumerated below as A–J. Please put the full body of your comments in the text of the electronic message and as an attachment. Be certain to include your name, title, organization, postal address, telephone number, and E-mail address in the text of the message.

Comments may be mailed to Michael J. Holland; Office of Science & Technology Policy; 1650 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20502. But again, we strongly encourage respondents to submit comments electronically.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information regarding this Notice, please call Michael Holland, Office of Science & Technology Policy, (202) 456–6069 (direct) and e-mail: [mholland@ostp.eop.gov](mailto:mholland@ostp.eop.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

This notice requests data and specific examples from the general public and all interested parties regarding the activities of the Subcommittee on Research Business Models chartered under the Committee on Science of the National Science and Technology Council. The Committee on Science realizes that much has changed about the practice of scientific research over the last several years. The purpose of the Subcommittee on Research Business Models is to advise and assist the Committee on Science and the NSTC on policies, procedures, and plans relating to business models to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the Federal research and development enterprise in a manner cognizant of currently available resources. The Subcommittee will

- Facilitate a strong, coordinated effort across federal agencies to identify and address important policy implications arising from the changing nature of basic and applied research.
- Examine the concomitant influence these changes have had or should have on business models and business practices for the conduct of basic and applied research sponsored by the Federal government and carried out by academic, industrial, and government entities.
- Review the challenges to improved performance and mechanisms for more

transparent accountability of the research enterprise.

The membership of the Subcommittee includes representatives from fifteen Federal departments and agencies that support or are engaged in research activities. The Subcommittee on Research Business Models will consult and coordinate with other ongoing, relevant efforts including, but not limited to, those of the Interagency Electronic Grants Committee (IAEGC) and the CFO Grants Management Council (GMC) Public Law 106–107 Workgroups.

#### Request for Information

In order to assist the public in its response, the Subcommittee has identified the following areas in which they would like to receive comments, including how changes in these areas have impacted research costs. However, the Subcommittee welcomes comments and suggestions in other areas that may not be included in the following questions.

*A. Accountability.* What constitutes accountability for the Federally-supported research enterprise? How can performers best demonstrate results or return on Federal research investments? Please suggest mechanisms whereby research managers can more transparently demonstrate responsible use of public resources.

*B. Inconsistency of policies and practices among Federal agencies.* Can you identify specific Federal policies and practices that if simplified would improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the research enterprise? Can the impact of inconsistent policies and practices among Federal agencies on the research environment be quantified? Among the variations in policies and practices, which practices appear to be the best? Why?

*C. Inconsistency of policies and practices among universities.* Can you identify specific university policies and practices that if simplified would improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the research enterprise?

*D. State and Institutional requirements.* What is the prevalence and impact of state and institutional requirements that are added to Federal requirements for research funding?

*E. Regulatory requirements.* Is there a more efficient approach to meeting the intent of the current suite of administrative requirements and regulations? Please provide examples.

*F. Research support.* How can public funding mechanisms and policies encourage or discourage innovative approaches to research? Does the current process for research funding

encourage or discourage innovative research? How do support mechanisms influence the mix of investigators supported (e.g., principal investigators, research scientists, postdoctoral scholars, graduate students, or technicians)? How can changes in the conduct of science and engineering necessitate modified funding models? Are data available to help decide these questions?

*G. Multidisciplinary/collaborative research.* Are any funding organizations, either inside or outside of government, employing funding mechanisms or strategies that are particularly effective in encouraging multidisciplinary work, collaborative activities, and other innovative approaches? Are there any data available relevant to these questions?

*H. Research Infrastructure.* What information is available to examine policies at the Federal, State, local or institutional level that affect research infrastructure and the costs of building, maintaining and/or operating the research infrastructure? What factors influence performers' investments in research infrastructure? What data are available to demonstrate that? What information is available on the mix of sources used to finance research infrastructure?

*I. Information Technology.* How has information technology impacted the efficiency, performance, or costs of research management? Are there data to demonstrate any effect?

*J. Technology transfer optimization.* Are data available to examine whether intellectual property and patent agreements have changed relationships among universities, industry, and the government?

#### Authority

The National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) was established under Executive Order 12881 on November 23, 1993, and subsequently reestablished by President Bush. The Committee on Science is chartered under the NSTC. The purpose of the Committee on Science is to advise and assist the NSTC, with emphasis on those federally supported efforts that develop new knowledge in the sciences mathematics, and engineering.

**Kathie L. Olsen,**

*Associated Director.*

[FR Doc. 03-19935 Filed 8-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3170-01-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

July 29, 2003.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Communications Commissions, 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, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act 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 comments should be submitted on or before September 5, 2003. If you anticipate that you will be submitting 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 comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-A804, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at (202) 418-0217 or via the Internet at [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*OMB Control Number:* 3060-0519.

*Title:* Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) of 1991.

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit entities; Not-for-profit institutions.

*Number of Respondents:* 30,000.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 60 hours (avg).

*Frequency of Response:* Recordkeeping; On occasion reporting requirement; Third Party disclosure.

*Total Annual Burden:* 1,738,600 hours.

*Total Annual Costs:* \$855,000.

*Needs and Uses:* On March 11, 2003, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act (Do-Not-Call Act) was signed into law requiring the Commission to issue a final rule in its ongoing TCPA proceeding within 180 days of March 11, 2003, and to consult and coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to "maximize consistency" with the rule promulgated by the FTC in 2002. On March 25, 2003, the Commission released a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comment on the Commission's requirements under the Do-Not-Call Act. In this Report and Order, CG Docket No. 02-278, the Commission revises the current TCPA rules and adopts new rules to provide consumers with several options for avoiding unwanted telephone solicitations. The Commission establishes a national do-not-call registry for consumers who wish to avoid most unwanted telemarketing calls. This national do-not-call registry will supplement the current company-specific do-not-call rules for those consumers who wish to continue requesting that particular companies not call them. The Commission also adopts a new provision to permit consumers to provide permission to call to specific companies by an express written agreement. The TCPA rules exempt from the "do-not-call" requirements nonprofit organizations, companies with whom consumers have an established business relationship, and calls to persons with whom the telemarketer has a personal relationship. Any company, which is asked by a consumer, including an existing customer, not to call again must honor that request for five (5) years. The Commission retains the current calling time restrictions of 8 a.m. until 9 p.m.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 03-19990 Filed 8-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P