

laws that require written notice to consumers for cancellation of telephone, water, gas, or electric utility services.

3. Discuss state and municipal utility regulations, laws, or ordinances that allow utilities to send electronic notices to consumers for cancellation or termination of telephone, water, gas or electric utility services.

4. How would the removal of the utility cancellation notices exception to ESIGN affect consumers? How would the removal of the exception affect the provision of notice by utility companies to their customers? Please discuss.

5. What effect would the removal of the exception have on the current municipal, state, and federal policies concerning notice of utility service cancellations?

6. If the ESIGN Act is amended to eliminate the utility cancellation notice exception, what other changes, if any, are required to maintain consumer protection laws? What changes would be necessary, if any, to maintain current state and Federal policies concerning the content and timing of utility cancellation notices?

7. What are the benefits for utility customers, and utility companies that may result from electronic notice of cancellation of utility services? For example, would electronic notice provide customers with additional time to correct conditions or circumstances that led to the cancellation?

8. List any unique issues surrounding the delivery, timing, authentication, privacy, of utility cancellation notices that can and should be resolved prior to removal of the exception from the Act.

9. State whether municipalities, states, or utility companies have developed electronic notification procedures for the transmission of utility service information.

10. Discuss current electronic methods that are used to provide information to consumers regarding utility services (e.g., conditions of service or rate information). In these instances, discuss the consumer protection mechanisms that are employed by utility companies to transmit service or rate information to customers. Also discuss the following:

- a. receipt verification procedures;
- b. updated regulations that reflect electronic signature technologies; and
- c. regulations that require the retention of paper copies of the notice.

Please provide copies of studies, reports, opinions, research or other empirical data referenced in the responses.

Dated: January 23, 2003.

**Kathy D. Smith,**

*Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03-1921 Filed 1-27-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-60-S**

## **COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS**

### **Establishment of Import Limits for Certain Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Belarus**

January 21, 2003.

**AGENCY:** Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

**ACTION:** Issuing a directive to the commissioner of customs establishing limits.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 28, 2003.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Naomi Freeman, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port, call (202) 927-5850, or refer to the U.S. Customs Web site at <http://www.customs.gov>. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, refer to the Office of Textiles and Apparel website at <http://otexa.ita.doc.gov>.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Authority:** Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The Bilateral Textile Memorandum of Understanding dated January 10, 2003 between the Governments of the United States and Belarus establishes limits for the period January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003. This notice cancels and supercedes the notice published on December 30, 2002 (67 FR 79571).

These limits may be revised if Belarus becomes a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United States applies the WTO agreement to Belarus.

In the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to establish the limits.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the **CORRELATION:** Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see

Federal Register notice 68 FR 1599, published on January 13, 2003).

**James C. Leonard III,**

*Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

## **Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements**

January 21, 2003.

Commissioner of Customs,  
*Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.*

Dear Commissioner: Pursuant to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; this directive cancels and supercedes the directive issued to you on December 23, 2002. You are directed to prohibit, effective on January 28, 2003, entry into the United States for consumption and withdrawal from warehouse for consumption of textiles and textile products in the following categories, produced or manufactured in Belarus and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 2003 and extending through December 31, 2003:

Category	Twelve-month restraint limit
622 .....	9,100,000 square meters of which not more than 1,500,000 square meters shall be in Category 622-L <sup>1</sup> .
435 .....	66,000 dozen.
448 .....	34,000 dozen.

<sup>1</sup>Category 622-L: only HTS numbers 7019.51.9010, 7019.52.4010, 7019.52.9010, 7019.59.4010, and 7019.59.9010.

Products in Categories 622 and 622-L exported during 2002 shall be charged to the applicable category limit and sublimit for that year (see directive dated October 19, 2001) to the extent of any unfilled balance. In the event the limit and sublimit established for that period have been exhausted by previous entries, such products shall be charged to the limit and sublimit set forth in this directive.

The limits set forth above are subject to adjustment pursuant to the current bilateral agreement between the Governments of the United States and Belarus.

This limits may be revised if Belarus becomes a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United States applies the WTO agreement to Belarus.

In carrying out the above directions, the Commissioner of Customs should construe entry into the United States for consumption to include entry for consumption into the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,  
James C. Leonard III,