

“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). The Commission will publish the required summary of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings, pursuant to The Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, see 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(4).

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all ex parte contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible ex parte contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio, Radio broadcasting. Federal Communications Commission. Nazifa Sawez, Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rules

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

- 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 155, 301, 303, 307, 309, 310, 334, 336, 339.

- 2. In § 73.202, in paragraph (b), amend the Table of FM Allotments under Illinois by adding in alphabetical an entry for “Mattoon” to read as follows:

§ 73.202 Table of Allotments.

* * * * * (b) * * *

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (b)

Table with 2 columns: [U.S. States] and Channel No. Row 1: Illinois, Mattoon, 245B1

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (b)— Continued

Table with 2 columns: [U.S. States] and Channel No. Row 1: * * * * *

[FR Doc. 2024–06616 Filed 3–27–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket No. 98–204; FCC 24–18; FR ID 207778]

Review of the Commission’s Broadcast and Cable Equal Employment Opportunity Rules and Policies

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) refreshes the existing record regarding the statutorily mandated collection of workforce composition data for multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) on FCC Form 395–A.

DATES: Comments due on or before April 29, 2024; reply comments due on or before May 13, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by MB Docket No. 98–204, by any of the following methods:

- Electronic Filers: Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the ECF’s: http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/.

- Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.

Filings can be sent by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

- Effective March 19, 2020, and until further notice, the Commission no longer accepts any hand or messenger delivered filings. This is a temporary

measure taken to help protect the health and safety of individuals, and to mitigate the transmission of COVID–19. See FCC Announces Closure of FCC Headquarters Open Window and Change in Hand-Delivery Policy, Public Notice, DA 20–304 (March 19, 2020). https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-closes-headquarters-open-window-and-changes-hand-delivery-policy.

People with Disabilities: To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to fcc504@fcc.gov (mailto: fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the FCC’s Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information on this proceeding, please contact Christopher Sova of the Media Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, christopher.sova@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Second FNPRM) FCC 24–18, in MB Docket No. 98–204, adopted on February 7, 2024, and released on February 22, 2024. The complete text of this document is available electronically via the search function on the FCC’s website at https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-24-18A1.pdf.

Synopsis

1. Having addressed the issues concerning the reinstatement of the Form 395–B data collection, we now seek, by this Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Second FNPRM), to refresh the existing record regarding the statutorily mandated collection of Form 395–A data pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 554(d)(3)(A)–(B). Since 1984 the Commission has required MVPDs with six or more full-time employees to file the FCC Form 395–A. Similar to the Form 395–B collected from broadcasters, Form 395–A seeks to gather workforce composition data from multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) on an annual basis. The Commission suspended the filing of Form 395–A in 2001 in the wake of the decision by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Associations v. FCC (MD/DC/DE Broadcasters), which vacated certain aspects of the Commission’s EEO requirements for broadcasters. While the similar requirements for MVPDs have never been challenged, the Commission suspended the collection of both Forms 395–A and B, along with various EEO

requirements, in order to analyze the impact of the *MD/DC/DE* Broadcasters decision. In the Third Report and Order and Fourth Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (*Third Report and Order and Fourth NPRM*), the Commission reinstated Forms 395–A and B pending resolution of questions about confidential collection and use. As the Commission had not resolved those questions until its adoption of the Fourth Report and Order in MB Docket No. 98–204 (*Fourth R&O*), the collection of the Form 395–A remained suspended along with the Form 395–B. Despite that suspension, the Commission continued to seek OMB approval for the information collection, and during that time, OMB approved both Forms 395–A and B, subject to the Commission’s resolution of confidentiality issues regarding the forms’ collection and use. Although the filing of the Form 395–A has been suspended since 2001, OMB has most recently approved the information collection through January 31, 2026.

Discussion

2. We now seek by this *Second FNPRM* to refresh the record stemming from the *Third Report and Order and Fourth NPRM* regarding the collection of MVPD workforce composition data. Consistent with the analysis provided in the *Fourth R&O* for making Form 395–B data public, we tentatively conclude that the collection of Form 395–A also should be reinstated and made available for public review. We seek comment as to whether Congress’s directive that MVPD operators make Form 395–A available for public inspection at their own facilities would be consistent with our amending our rules to require that MVPD operators instead make Form 395–A publicly available through the Commission-hosted Online Public Inspection File (OPIF). While section 634(d)(3)(B) of the Act states that an MVPD should make Form 395–A available for public inspection at the MVPD’s central office and at every office where five or more full-time employees are regularly assigned to work, section 634(d)(4) of the Act permits the Commission to amend the requirements associated with Form 395–A as needed. We tentatively conclude that requiring the Form 395–A to be placed in the OPIF would be more efficient for the public that wishes to review such reports, as OPIF provides one online site for such review. We also tentatively conclude that hosting the reports in OPIF will reduce the burdens placed on MVPDs, as this will relieve the MVPDs of maintaining such reports at individual central offices, including

providing sufficient staffing for such offices. We also tentatively conclude that our proposal to change the location of where the Form 395–A data will be housed from the MVPD’s central office to the OPIF website is consistent with the basic intent of section 634(d)(3)(B) of the Act, which is to ensure that the public has access to the Form 395–A data. We seek comment on these tentative conclusions. Alternatively, if section 634(d)(3)(B) of the Act were to be read to compel availability of Form 395–A at MVPD offices, would it be within our authority and consistent with sound policy to additionally require availability through OPIF?

3. In the *Order on Reconsideration*, we modified § 73.3612 of our rules to specifically state that the Form 395–B data will not be used in assessing any aspect of an individual broadcast licensee’s or permittee’s compliance with both the nondiscrimination and equal employment opportunity requirements of § 73.2080. Despite the slight variation in the underlying statutory authority for the collection of the workforce employment data from MVPDs versus broadcasters, the Commission traditionally has treated both data collections in a similar manner. In this regard, the Commission has imposed the same restrictions on the use of workforce composition data stemming from both Forms 395–A and B. Consequently, we tentatively conclude that § 76.1802 of our rules concerning the MVPD annual employment report should be modified so as to align with the modifications made to § 73.3612 of our rules for broadcasters in the *Order on Reconsideration*. In the *Order on Reconsideration*, we incorporated what appears as a Note to § 73.3612 into the rule itself to conform to the publishing conventions of the National Archives and Records Administration’s Office of the Federal Register. We seek comment on our tentative conclusion to do the same with regard to the language that currently appears as a Note to § 76.1802, to read as follows:

Each employment unit with six or more full-time employees shall file an annual employment report on the FCC Form 395–A with the Commission on or before September 30 of each year. Data concerning the gender, race and ethnicity of an employment unit’s workforce collected in the annual employment report will be used only for purposes of analyzing industry trends and making reports to Congress. Such data will not be used for the purpose of assessing any aspect of an individual employment unit’s compliance with our nondiscrimination or EEO rules for

multi-channel video program distributors.

4. As stated in the *Fourth R&O*, the Form 395–B will include a mechanism to provide further specificity about broadcaster employees’ gender identities. We seek comment on whether we should adopt a similar mechanism for the Form 395–A.

5. We also seek comment on the attendant costs and benefits of any proposals advanced in response to this item.

6. Digital Equity and Inclusion.

Finally, the Commission, as part of its continuing effort to advance digital equity for all under 47 U.S.C. 151, including people of color, persons with disabilities, persons who live in rural or Tribal areas, and others who are or have been historically underserved, marginalized, or adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality, invites comment on any equity-related considerations and benefits (if any) that may be associated with the proposals and issues discussed herein. Specifically, we seek comment on how our proposals may promote or inhibit advances in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, as well the scope of the Commission’s relevant legal authority.

Procedural Matters

7. *Ex Parte Rules—Permit-But-Disclose*. With respect to the *Second FNPRM*, this proceeding shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules at 47 CFR 1.1200 *et seq.* Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter’s written comments, memoranda, or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing

them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

8. *Filing Requirements—Comments and Replies.* Pursuant to §§ 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.145 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated on the first page of this document. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS). See *Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, (63 FR 24121).

9. *Regulatory Flexibility Act.* The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA) requires that an agency prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for notice and comment rulemakings, unless the agency certifies that "the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities." Accordingly, we have prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) concerning the potential impact of rule and policy change proposals on small entities in the *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*.

10. *Initial Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis for Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MB Docket No. 98–204.* This *Second FNPRM* may contain proposed new or modified information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on these information collection requirements, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, see 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4), we seek specific comment on how we might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

11. *Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act.* The Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2023 requires each agency, in providing notice of a rulemaking, to post online a brief plain-language summary of the proposed rule. Accordingly, the Commission will publish the required summary of this *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* on <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

12. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Commission has prepared this Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) concerning the possible significant economic impact on small entities of the policies and rules proposed in this *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Second FNPRM)*. The Commission requests written public comments on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments specified in the *Second FNPRM*. The Commission will send a copy of the *Second FNPRM*, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA). In addition, the *Second FNPRM* and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules

13. The *Second FNPRM* seeks to refresh the record regarding the Commission's annual collection of broadcaster multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) composition data by race and gender on FCC Form 395–A. In 2001, the Commission suspended the filing of Form 395–A after a federal court decision vacated certain aspects of the Commission's equal employment opportunity (EEO) requirements for broadcasters. Although the similar requirements for MVPDs have never been challenged, the Commission suspended the collection of both the broadcasters' Form 395–B and the MVPDs' Form 395–A, along with various EEO requirements, in order to analyze the impact of the federal court decision. In 2004, the Commission reinstated Forms 395–A and B pending resolution of questions about confidential collection and use of the forms' data. Today, having resolved the issues related to the confidentiality of the Form 395–B data in the *Fourth Report and Order*, the Commission now seeks public comment on the legal

issues pertaining to availability and confidentiality of Form 395–A data.

14. Consistent with the decision in the *Fourth Report and Order* to make Form 395–B data public, the Commission tentatively concludes in the *Second FNPRM* that the collection of Form 395–A should also be reinstated in the same manner as it was previously with regard to public availability. The Communications Act requires an MVPD to make its Form 395–A available for public inspection at the MVPD's central office and at every office where five or more full-time employees are regularly assigned to work. The Commission has traditionally treated Form 395–A and B data in the same manner with regard to confidentiality. Consequently, the *Second FNPRM* seeks comment on whether instead of (or in addition to) maintaining the Form 395–A at a MVPD's central office, the form should now be maintained on the Commission's website similar to the requirement now established in the *Fourth Report and Order* for broadcasters' Form 395–B. Other than a proposal to include a mechanism in the Form 395–A that would enable MVPDs to account for those employees who identify as gender non-binary, the proposed reinstatement of this collection does not change the form's reporting requirements. We predict that inclusion of this mechanism, which would allow for accurate data gathering, would incur only a minimal economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

B. Legal Basis

15. The proposed action is authorized under sections 1, 2(a), 4(i), 4(j), 4(k), 303, 403, and 634(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended 47 U.S.C. 151, 152(a), 154(i), 154(k), 303, 403, and 554(d).

C. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rules Will Apply

16. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of, and where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed revisions, if adopted. The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction." In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act (SBA). A small business concern is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operations; and (3) satisfies any

additional criteria established by the SBA. Below, we provide a description of such small entities, as well as an estimate of the number of such small entities, where feasible.

17. Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation). The Commission has developed its own small business size standard for the purpose of cable rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving 400,000 or fewer subscribers nationwide. Based on industry data, there are about 420 cable companies in the U.S. Of these, only seven have more than 400,000 subscribers. In addition, under the Commission's rules, a "small system" is a cable system serving 15,000 or fewer subscribers. Based on industry data, there are about 4,139 cable systems (headends) in the U.S. Of these, about 639 have more than 15,000 subscribers. Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable companies and cable systems are small.

18. Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard). The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, contains a size standard for a "small cable operator," which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than one percent of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed \$250,000,000." For purposes of the Telecom Act Standard, the Commission determined that a cable system operator that serves fewer than 498,000 subscribers, either directly or through affiliates, will meet the definition of a small cable operator. Based on industry data, only six cable system operators have more than 498,000 subscribers. Accordingly, the Commission estimates that the majority of cable system operators are small under this size standard. We note however, that the Commission neither requests nor collects information on whether cable system operators are affiliated with entities whose gross annual revenues exceed \$250 million. Therefore, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of cable system operators that would qualify as small cable operators under the definition in the Communications Act.

19. Open Video Systems. The open video system (OVS) framework was established in 1996 and is one of four statutorily recognized options for the provision of video programming services by local exchange carriers. The OVS framework provides opportunities for the distribution of video programming other than through cable systems. OVS operators provide

subscription services and therefore fall within the SBA small business size standard for the cable services industry, which is "Wired Telecommunications Carriers." The SBA small business size standard for this industry classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Thus, under the SBA size standard the majority of firms in this industry can be considered small. Additionally, we note that the Commission has certified some OVS operators who are now providing service and broadband service providers (BSPs) are currently the only significant holders of OVS certifications or local OVS franchises. The Commission does not have financial or employment information for the entities authorized to provide OVS however, the Commission believes some of the OVS operators may qualify as small entities.

20. Satellite Master Antenna Television (SMATV) Systems, also known as Private Cable Operators (PCOs). SMATV systems or PCOs are video distribution facilities that use closed transmission paths without using any public right-of-way. They acquire video programming and distribute it via terrestrial wiring in urban and suburban multiple dwelling units such as apartments and condominiums, and commercial multiple tenant units such as hotels and office buildings. SMATV systems or PCOs are included in the Wired Telecommunications Carriers' industry which includes wireline telecommunications businesses. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that there were 3,054 firms in this industry that operated for the entire year. Of this total, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Thus under the SBA size standard, the majority of firms in this industry can be considered small.

21. Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) Service. DBS service is a nationally distributed subscription service that delivers video and audio programming via satellite to a small parabolic "dish" antenna at the subscriber's location. DBS is included in the Wired Telecommunications Carriers industry which comprises establishments primarily engaged in operating and/or providing access to transmission facilities and infrastructure that they own and/or lease for the transmission of voice, data, text, sound, and video using

wired telecommunications networks. Transmission facilities may be based on a single technology or combination of technologies. Establishments in this industry use the wired telecommunications network facilities that they operate to provide a variety of services, such as wired telephony services, including VoIP services, wired (cable) audio and video programming distribution; and wired broadband internet services. By exception, establishments providing satellite television distribution services using facilities and infrastructure that they operate are included in this industry.

22. The SBA small business size standard for Wired Telecommunications Carriers classifies firms having 1,500 or fewer employees as small. U.S. Census Bureau data for 2017 show that 3,054 firms operated in this industry for the entire year. Of this number, 2,964 firms operated with fewer than 250 employees. Based on this data, the majority of firms in this industry can be considered small under the SBA small business size standard. According to Commission data however, only two entities provide DBS service—DIRECTV (owned by AT&T) and DISH Network, which require a great deal of capital for operation. DIRECTV and DISH Network both exceed the SBA size standard for classification as a small business. Therefore, we must conclude based on internally developed Commission data, in general DBS service is provided only by large firms.

D. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements

23. In this section, we identify the reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements contained in the Second FNPRM and consider whether small entities are affected disproportionately by any such requirements. To a large degree, the Second FNPRM only seeks to reinstitute the previous reporting, recordkeeping, or compliance requirements for collection of MVPD workforce composition data on Form 395–A, as this collection was previously suspended in 2001. The Second FNPRM, does, however, seek comment on whether to replace the existing requirement that a MVPD maintain a copy of the Form 395–A at its central office with a requirement that a MVPD instead upload a copy of its Form 395–A to the Commission's website. Alternatively, if the statute were read to compel availability of Form 395–A at MVPD offices, the Second FNPRM seeks comment on whether it is within our authority and consistent with sound

policy to additionally require availability through the OPIF. So as to harmonize the MVPD requirements with those imposed on broadcasters, the Second FNPRM also seeks comment on whether to modify the Commission's rules so as to include a statement that the Commission will not use the Form 395-A data when assessing compliance with both the nondiscrimination and EEO requirements of its rules. Currently, the prohibition contained in the Commission's rules only references a restriction on the use of the Form 395-A data for assessing compliance with the EEO rules. Because the only proposed modification in the Second FNPRM with regard to reporting or recordkeeping obligations is merely a change in the location of where the Form 395-A will be housed (*i.e.*, on the Commission's website rather than (or in addition to) the MVPDs' central office), we do not anticipate a significant change in the compliance burden for small entities. Additionally, MVPD employment units with less than six full-time employees are exempt from filing the statistical data requested on the form. Hence, the Commission concludes that small entities will not be disproportionately affected by the Second FNPRM.

E. Steps Taken To Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

24. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification,

consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

25. The Second FNPRM seeks to refresh the record regarding the Commission's annual collection of MVPD workforce composition data by race and gender on Form 395-A. It would lead to a resumption of this data collection and would propose only to modify one of the locations where the Form 395-A should be retained, by seeking comment on whether an MVPD should retain a copy on the Commission's website in lieu of (or in addition to) at the MVPDs' central office. To the extent MVPDs were maintaining hard copies of the Form 395-A at their central offices, we anticipate that storing an electronic copy on the Commission's website will minimize the economic burdens on MVPDs. Where maintenance of a hard copy necessitates the use of MVPD staff time to monitor public access to the Form 395-A, retention of an electronic copy on the Commission's website presents itself as a simple and straightforward process, requiring only a minimal degree of navigating the Commission's database system to upload the information. Further, as detailed in the Second FNPRM, the collection of MVPD workforce composition data and providing the data for public inspection are required by section 634(d) of the Act.

F. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Second FNPRM

26. None.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 76

Radio; Reporting and recordkeeping requirements; Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,
Secretary.

Proposed Rules

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 76 as follows:

PART 76—MULTICHANNEL VIDEO AND CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 76 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 153, 154, 301, 302, 302a, 303, 303a, 307, 308, 309, 312, 315, 317, 325, 338, 339, 340, 341, 503, 521, 522, 531, 532, 534, 535, 536, 537, 543, 544, 544a, 545, 548, 549, 552, 554, 556, 558, 560, 561, 571, 572, 573.

■ 2. Revise § 76.1802 to read as follows:

§ 76.1802 Annual employment report.

Each employment unit with six or more full-time employees shall file an annual employment report on the FCC Form 395-A with the Commission on or before September 30 of each year. Data concerning the gender, race and ethnicity of an employment unit's workforce collected in the annual employment report will be used only for purposes of analyzing industry trends and making reports to Congress. Such data will not be used for the purpose of assessing any aspect of an individual employment unit's compliance with our nondiscrimination or EEO rules for multi-channel video program distributors.

[FR Doc. 2024-05940 Filed 3-27-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P