

may choose to use their DTV spectrum; whether the current preemption rules for core educational programming should be revised or adapted for the digital environment; and whether steps should be taken to ensure that programs designed for children or families do not contain age-inappropriate product promotions that are unsuitable for children to watch.

63. To date, the Commission has not issued any decisions in the DTV Public Interest Form *NPRM*, the Children's DTV Public Interest *NPRM*, or the NOI. Given the significant time that has passed since the comment periods in these proceedings were closed, we invite additional comment in those dockets in order to reflect more recent developments. We are particularly interested in those issues relating to the application of public interest obligations to broadcasters that choose to multicast (e.g., the application of our children's television rules or the statutory political broadcasting rules in a multicast environment). We are also interested in whether our approach to multicast public interest obligations should vary with the scope of whatever final digital must-carry obligation the Commission adopts. Our goal is to bring these proceedings concerning the public interest obligations of broadcasters in the digital environment to conclusion promptly in order to provide certainty to broadcasters and the public as the digital television transition continues.

Other Issues

1. ATSC Standards

64. We hereby seek comment on whether our rules should be further changed to reflect any revisions to the ATSC DTV standard A/53B since the August 7, 2001, version.

2. PSIP

65. We seek comment on both whether to require use of PSIP and which aspects of PSIP should be adopted into our rules. If we decide not to require use of PSIP, it is, nevertheless, important to decide if some or all of the PSIP information set forth in ATSC A/65A must be used by those who voluntarily use PSIP. Likewise, are there certain aspects of the PSIP standard that should not be used or required?

3. Closed Captioning

66. We seek comment on whether there are additional actions the Commission should take to ensure the accessibility and functioning of closed captioning service for digital television.

4. V-Chip

67. We seek comment on whether the Commission needs to do more to ensure that v-chip functionality is available in the digital world. We seek comment on whether the Commission should adopt the provisions of the ATSC A/65A standard that requires all digital television broadcasters to place v-chip rating information in the PSIP.

5. TV Translators

68. We request comment on how the proper PSIP information is to be provided on TV translator rebroadcasts and who will be responsible for ensuring that that information is so provided. We also request comment regarding the costs of providing PSIP information on TV translators as well as any other concerns that translator operators might have in implementing PSIP on their DTV operations.

6. DTV Station Identification

69. In general, we propose to require digital television stations to follow the same rules for station identification as analog television stations. Recognizing that channel number identification is not currently required for all television stations by our rules, we ask whether channel identification should be required for DTV stations? If station identification announcements include channel numbers, we request comment on whether our rules should specify which channel number stations should use: the major (analog) channel number, minor (digital) channel number, or over-the-air channel number. Stations considering multicasting have raised concerns about separate identification of their separate digital programming streams for purposes of obtaining audience ratings. While we are not inclined to assign separate call signs for additional program streams for stations that choose to multicast, we propose to permit such stations to include additional information in their station announcements identifying each program stream.

7. Satellite Stations

70. Because satellite stations, by definition, operate in small or sparsely populated areas which have insufficient economic bases to support full-service operations, we seek comment on whether the public interest would be served by allowing such stations to turn in their digital authorization and "flash-cut" to DTV transmission at the end of the transition period. We request comment on the advantages and disadvantages of granting this special designated status to satellite stations, specifically whether it will hinder the

overall transition to digital television and harm viewers by delaying their access to digital signals, or whether disallowing such status will overly burden satellite stations financially.

71. We also invite comment on whether allowing satellite stations to "flash-cut" to digital would present legal impediments to satisfying section 309(j)(14).

Procedural Matters

72. *Ex Parte Rules.* This is a permit-but-disclose notice and comment rulemaking proceeding. Ex parte presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided that they are disclosed as provided in the Commission's rules. See 47 CFR 1.1202, 1.1203, and 1.1206(a).

73. *Comment Information.* Pursuant to § 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before April 14, 2003, and reply comments on or before May 14, 2003. Comments filed addressing issues in the *DTV Public Interest Form NPRM*, *Children's DTV Public Interest NPRM*, and NOI proceedings should also be filed by these dates and should reference the docket numbers in those proceedings, not the docket number of this DTV periodic review proceeding. Commenters wishing to address both public interest issues and other issues raised in the DTV periodic review should put their public interest comments in a separate document to be filed in the appropriate public interest docket(s) and file their comments on other issues raised in the periodic review in the docket number of this proceeding (MB 03-15; RM 9832).

Paperwork Reduction Act

74. *Initial Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis.* This *NPRM* may contain proposed information collections subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. As part of our continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, we invite OMB, the general public, and other federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the information collections contained in this *NPRM*, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Public and agency comments are due at the same time as other comments on the *NPRM*. Comments should address: (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) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (c) ways to minimize the burden of the