

(3) * * *
(iii) * * *

(I) *Anesthesiologist's Assistant*. An anesthesiologist's assistant may provide covered anesthesia services, if the anesthesiologist's assistant:

(1) Works under the direct supervision of an anesthesiologist, and the anesthesiologist bills for the services;

(2) Is in compliance with all applicable requirements of state law, including any licensure requirements the state imposes on nonphysician anesthetists; and

(3) Is a graduate of a Master's level medical school-based anesthesiologist's assistant educational program that:

(i) Is accredited by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation; and

(ii) Includes approximately two years of specialized basic science and clinical education in anesthesia at a level that builds on a premedical undergraduate science background.

* * * * *

Dated: March 28, 2003.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03-8014 Filed 4-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

32 CFR Part 312

Office of the Inspector General; Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Office of the Inspector General, DoD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Inspector General, DoD is proposing to exempt an existing system of records in its inventory of systems of records pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), as amended.

The exemptions are needed because during the course of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act action, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case records in the system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those "other" systems of records are entered into the Freedom of Information Act and/or Privacy Act case records, the Inspector General, DoD, hereby claims the same exemptions for the records from those "other" systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary systems of records which they are a part. Therefore, the Inspector General, DoD is

proposing to add exemptions to an existing system of records.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 2, 2003 to be considered by this agency.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Chief, Freedom of Information Act/ Privacy Act Office, 400 Army Navy Drive, Room 201, Arlington, VA 22202-4704.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joseph Caucci at (703) 604-9786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review"

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive order.

Public Law 96-354, "Regulatory Flexibility Act" (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96-511, "Paperwork Reduction Act" (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense impose no information requirements beyond the Office of the Inspector General and that the information collected within the Office of the Inspector is necessary and consistent with 5 U.S.C. 552a, known as the Privacy Act of 1974.

Section 202, Public Law 104-4, "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act"

It has been determined that the Privacy Act rulemaking for the Office of

the Inspector General of the Department of Defense does not involve a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more and that such rulemaking will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Executive Order 13132, "Federalism"

It has been determined that the Privacy Act rules for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense do not have federalism implications. The rules do not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 312

Privacy.

1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 312 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Pub. L. 93-579, 88 Stat. 1896 (5 U.S.C. 552a).

2. Section 312.3 is revised to read as follows:

§ 312.3 Procedure for requesting information.

Individuals should submit written inquiries regarding all OIG files to the Administration and Logistics Services Directorate, ATTN: FOIA/PA Office, 400 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202-4704. Individuals making a request in person must provide acceptable picture identification, such as a current driver's license.

3. Section 312.9 paragraph (a) is revised read as follows:

§ 312.9 Appeal of initial amendment decision.

(a) All appeals on an initial amendment decision should be addressed to the Administration and Logistics Services Directorate, ATTN: FOIA/PA Office, 400 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202-4704. The appeal should be concise and should specify the reasons the requester believes that the initial amendment action by the OIG was not satisfactory. Upon receipt of the appeal, the designated official will review the request and make a determination to approve or deny the appeal.

* * * * *

4. Section 312.12 is amended by adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 312.12, Exemptions.

* * * * *

(h) *System Identifier:* CIG 01.

(1) *System name*: Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act Case Files.

(2) *Exemption*: During the processing of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act (PA) request, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case record in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those other systems of records are entered into this system, the Inspector General, DoD, claims the same exemptions for the records from those other systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary system of which they are a part.

(3) *Authority*: 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (k)(1), (k)(2), (k)(3), (k)(4), (k)(5), (k)(6), and (k)(7).

(4) *Reasons*: Records are only exempt from pertinent provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a to the extent such provisions have been identified and an exemption claimed for the original record and the purposes underlying the exemption for the original record still pertain to the record which is now contained in this system of records. In general, the exemptions were claimed in order to protect properly classified information relating to national defense and foreign policy, to avoid interference during the conduct of criminal, civil, or administrative actions or investigations, to ensure protective services provided the President and others are not compromised, to protect the identity of confidential sources incident to Federal employment, military service, contract, and security clearance determinations, to preserve the confidentiality and integrity of Federal testing materials, and to safeguard evaluation materials used for military promotions when furnished by a confidential source. The exemption rule for the original records will identify the specific reasons why the records are exempt from specific provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Dated: March 25, 2003.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03-8018 Filed 4-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket No. 02-278, FCC 03-62]

Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) of 1991

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Further notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission seeks comment on The Do-Not-Call Implementation Act (Do-Not-Call Act), which requires the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) to issue final rules in the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) proceeding within 180 days, to maximize consistency with the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) rules, and to issue reports to Congress within 45 days of the promulgation of final rules, and annually thereafter.

DATES: Comments are due May 5, 2003 and reply comments are due May 19, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. See supplementary information for further filing instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Erica H. McMahon or Richard D. Smith, Policy Division, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau, (202) 418-2512.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) in CG Docket No. 02-278, FCC 03-62, released March 25, 2003. The full text of this document is available on the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System at <http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>, and for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.

Synopsis of Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

1. On March 11, 2003, the Do-Not-Call Act was signed into law requiring the Commission to issue a final rule in the above-captioned proceeding within 180 days of March 11, 2003, and to consult with the FTC to maximize consistency with the rule promulgated by the FTC in 2002. The Do-Not-Call Act also requires the Commission to issue reports to Congress within 45 days after the promulgation of final rules in this

proceeding, and annually thereafter. In this FNPRM, we seek comment on these requirements.

2. On December 20, 1991, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (TCPA) in an effort to address a growing number of telephone marketing calls and certain telemarketing practices thought to be an invasion of consumer privacy and even a risk to public safety. The statute restricts the use of automatic telephone dialing systems, artificial and prerecorded messages, and telephone facsimile machines to send unsolicited advertisements. The TCPA specifically authorizes the Commission to "require the establishment and operation of a single national database to compile a list of telephone numbers of residential subscribers who object to receiving telephone solicitations." In 1992, the Commission adopted rules implementing the TCPA but declined to create a national database of telephone subscribers who do not wish to receive calls from telemarketers. The Commission opted instead to implement an alternative scheme—one involving company-specific do-not-call lists. In 1995 and 1997, the Commission released orders (60 FR 42068, August 15, 1995; 62 FR 19686, April 23, 1997) addressing petitions for reconsideration of the *TCPA Order* (57 FR 48333, October 23, 1992).

3. On September 18, 2002, the Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) and Memorandum Opinion and Order (67 FR 62667, October 8, 2002) seeking comment on whether the Commission's rules need to be revised in order to carry out more effectively Congress's directives in the TCPA. Specifically, we sought comment on whether to revise or clarify our rules governing unwanted telephone solicitations and the use of automatic telephone dialing systems, prerecorded or artificial voice messages, and telephone facsimile machines. We also sought comment on the effectiveness of company-specific do-not-call lists. In addition, we sought comment on whether to revisit the option of establishing a national do-not-call list and, if so, how such action might be taken in conjunction with the FTC's proposal to adopt a national do-not-call list and with various state do-not-call lists. In considering ways in which we might improve our TCPA rules, our goal is to enhance consumer privacy protections while avoiding imposing unnecessary burdens on the telemarketing industry, consumers, and regulators. Lastly, we sought comment on the effect proposed policies and rules would have on small business entities,