

administrator with true and adequate data necessary to determine TRS fund revenue requirements and payments. Pursuant to section 64.604(c)(iii)(5)(E), in addition to the data required under paragraph (c)(5)(ii)(C) all TRS providers, including providers who are not interexchange carriers, local exchange carriers, or certified state relay providers, must submit reports of interstate TRS minutes of use to the administrator in order to receive payments. Section 64.604(c)(iii)(5)(F) lists TRS providers who are eligible for receiving payments from the TRS fund. These providers must notify the administrator of their intent to participate in the TRS Fund thirty days prior to submitting reports of TRS interstate minutes of use in order to receive payment settlements for interstate TRS. Section 64.604(c)(6)(v)(3) requires TRS providers to file with the Commission a statement designating an agent or agents whose principal responsibility will be to receive all complaints, inquiries, orders, decisions, and notices and other pronouncements forwarded by the Commission. Section 64.604(c)(7) requires that all future contracts between the TRS administrator and the TRS vendor shall provide for the transfer of TRS customer profile data from the outgoing TRS vendor to the incoming TRS vendor. Such data must be disclosed in usable form at least 60 days prior to the provider's last day of service provision. Section 64.604(c)(6) establishes complaint procedures for TRS. All the collections of information are promulgated pursuant to section 225 of the ADA which requires that the Commission ensures that telecommunications relay services are available to persons with hearing and speech disabilities in the United States.

OMB Control No.: 3060-0972.

Title: Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 8,059.

Estimated Time Per Response: 4.81 hours (average hours per response), burden hour range per response is .13 hours to 93 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion, quarterly, annual and one-time reporting requirements; and third party disclosure requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 38,760 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$228,000.

Needs and Uses: In the Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 00-256, Fifteenth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-45, and Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 98-77 and 98-166, the Commission modified its rules to reform the interstate access charge and universal service support system for incumbent local exchange carriers subject to rate-of-return regulation (non-price cap or rate of return carriers). Following are brief summaries of the collections imposed on telecommunications carriers based on rules adopted in the Report and Order. Certain carriers are required to file projected common line revenue requirements for each study area they operate; rate of return carriers will be required to submit interstate common line cost data annually and updated cost data on a quarterly basis; rate of return carriers will be required to file line counts by disaggregation zone and customer class; competitive eligible telecommunication carriers will file their line counts by disaggregation zone and customer class on a quarterly basis; rate of return carriers that elect to disaggregate and target support will be required to submit maps; carriers electing Path One must submit a copy of certifications to a state commission or appropriate regulatory authority that they will not disaggregate and target support; carriers selecting Path Two must submit a copy of the order by the state commission or appropriate regulatory authority approving the disaggregation plan submitted, along with a copy of the disaggregation plan itself; carriers receiving Interstate Common Line Support and LTS must file a certification annually indicating that they will use that support in a manner consistent with section 254(e); all rate of return carriers are required to modify their access tariffs to comply with the new Subscriber Line Charge caps; rate of return carriers must also file tariffs to recover through a separate end-user charge the costs of ISDN line ports and line ports associated with other services that exceed the costs of a line port used for basis analog service; rate of return carriers may use 30 percent of local switching costs as a proxy in shifting line port costs to the common line category, or may conduct a cost study; each carrier that was not in the NECA pool during the tariff year ending on June 30, 2001 must determine its TIC limit and report it to NECA; rate-of-return carriers may, at their option, establish the following local switching and transport rate elements: A flat

charge for dedicated trunk port costs, a flat charge for the costs of DS1/voice grade multiplexers associated with terminating dedicated trunks at analog switches, a per-minute charge for shared trunk ports and any associated DS1/voice grade multiplexer costs, a flat charge for the costs of trunk ports used to terminate dedicated trunks on the serving wire center side of the tandem switch; individual charges for multiplexer costs associated with tandem switches, and a per-message call setup charge; and, rate-of-return carriers that use general purpose computers to provide non-regulated billing and collection services are required to allocate a portion of their general purpose computer costs to the billing and collection category, which will require them to determine general purpose computer investment. The Commission will use the information collected to determine whether and to what extent non-price cap or rate-of-return carriers providing the data are eligible to receive universal service support. The Commission will use the tariff data to make sure that rates are just and reasonable, as required by section 201(b) of the Act.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-6378 Filed 3-15-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[WT Docket No. 02-28; FCC 02-36]

Alee Cellular Communications

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; petition for reconsideration of application for block A cellular authorization.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (the Commission) grants, in part, a petition for reconsideration filed by Alee Cellular Communications (Alee) of an application for the block A cellular authorization in the Texas 21 RSA, Market 672; reinstates that same application; and designates the application for hearing, for the purpose of determining whether the applicant is currently qualified to hold the authorization in light of its disqualification for the New Mexico 3 RSA (NM 3) cellular authorization.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathy Harris, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau,

Commercial Wireless Division, at (202) 418-0609.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the *Memorandum Opinion and Order, Hearing Designation Order and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing* (MO&O and HDO) in WT Docket No. 02-28, FCC 02-36, adopted February 8, 2002 and released February 22, 2002. The complete text is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554. The document is also available via the Internet at <http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wireless/Orders/2002/fcc02-36.pdf>.

Paperwork Reduction Act

1. This MO&O and HDO contains no proposed information collection.

Synopsis of the Memorandum Opinion and Order and Hearing Designation Order

I. Introduction

2. On March 16, 2000, Alee Cellular Communications (Alee) filed a petition for reconsideration of the dismissal of an application for the block A cellular authorization in the Texas 21 RSA, Market 672.¹ As discussed herein, there are substantial and material questions of fact as to whether Alee is qualified to hold the subject cellular authorization. The Commission previously held that Alee made false statements to the Commission, lacked the candor required of licensees, and accordingly was not qualified to hold a cellular license for the New Mexico 3 RSA (NM 3), block A, call sign KNKN271.² For the reasons discussed, the Commission is granting the petition for reconsideration in part, reinstating the above-referenced application, and designating the application for hearing, for the limited purpose of determining whether the

applicant is currently qualified to hold the Texas 21 authorization in light of its disqualification for the NM 3 cellular authorization.

II. Background

3. The issue in this proceeding arises from the Commission's previous holding in the so-called *Algreg* proceeding. Specifically, Alee's NM 3 authorization was designated for hearing and possible revocation, along with additional RSA applications and licenses, in connection with participation in a risk-sharing arrangement at the time of filing of the applications.³ In addition, the NM 3 license was designated due to alien ownership concerns and for lack of candor.⁴ The Commission concluded that Alee's lack of candor in connection with the NM 3 authorization warranted revocation of the license.⁵

4. The Commission observed that Alee's NM 3 application was filed on August 12, 1988, and included a listing for Shafi M. Sharifan, a four percent general partner who was an alien. Under the policies then in effect, having a non-U.S. citizen or entity holding any general partnership interest was absolutely disqualifying.⁶ Less than two months later, on September 23, 1988, Sharifan's interest was transferred to Amir R. Riahi-Shiraz (a U.S. citizen). Alee won the NM 3 lottery a few months later, and filed a section 1.65 amendment on January 9, 1989. That amendment, signed by Robert Bernstein (Alee's signing partner and largest equity holder at the time) and prepared by Alee's attorney, William Franklin, listed Sharifan (not Riahi-Shiraz) as a partner *and* inaccurately stated that all partners were U.S. citizens. More than a year later, on April 30, 1990, Alee filed a letter disclosing the errors in the application and a section 1.65 amendment—stating that Sharifan was not a U.S. citizen and that his partnership interest had been sold to a U.S. citizen several months before the section 1.65 amendment was signed and

filed. All of Alee's applications and the NM 3 amendment were signed by Bernstein. The Commission further concluded, based on its independent review of the record,⁷ that "[a] preponderance of the evidence establishes that Alee, understanding that this was a matter that could adversely affect the grant of the construction permit, intentionally concealed the presence of the alien partner."⁸ The Commission further explained that "[t]he record in this case * * * reflects that Alee, aware that it had an alien partner, filed an amendment representing that all of its partners were United States citizens. Whether it did so on the advice of counsel, or its own initiative, and whether it understood the precise legal consequences of reporting false information (i.e., that lack of candor is absolutely disqualifying), Alee did not need to consult an attorney, let alone communications counsel, in order to appreciate that information filed with a federal agency should be truthful."⁹ The Commission found that "the record establishes a sufficient likelihood of intentional concealment of relevant information * * *."¹⁰

5. Finally, the Commission was "unimpressed" by "Alee's 'voluntary' reporting of this matter to the Commission in its April 30, 1990 letter to the FCC Secretary."¹¹ While the Commission acknowledged that Alee's letter was the basis for the specification of lack of candor and alien ownership issues against it, the Commission concluded that Alee both delayed reporting the matter and failed to make a full disclosure of the facts related to Mr. Sharifan and his replacement in the partnership.¹² The Commission found that "[t]he failure to fully disclose the facts involving Sharifan's participation in a timely manner, together with Bernstein's dubious testimony on this matter, significantly undercuts the claim that the 'voluntary' reporting of these matters belies any intent to deceive the Commission."¹³

6. The Commission rejected Alee's request for reconsideration regarding the finding of lack of candor and the revocation of Alee's NM 3 cellular license.¹⁴ In addressing the request for reconsideration, the Commission found that Alee had presented no new

¹ Alee Cellular Communications Petition for Reconsideration, File No. 11025-CL-P-672-A-89 (filed Mar. 16, 2000) ("Alee TX21 Petition for Reconsideration"); see also In the Matter of Application of Alee Cellular Communications for Authorization to Construct Nonwireline Cellular System in Texas RSA 21 Market 672, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 15 FCC Rcd 2831 (2000) ("Texas 21 Dismissal Order").

² In re Applications of ALGREG Cellular Engineering, et al., *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 8148, 8172-8181 (1997) (*Algreg I*), pet. for recon. denied, *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, 14 FCC Rcd 18524, 18533-18535 (1999) (*Algreg II*), aff'd, *Alee Cellular Communications v. FCC*, No. 99-1460 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 30, 2001), pet. for rehearing denied (D.C. Cir. Apr. 5, 2001), pet. for writ of cert. denied (S.Ct. Oct. 9, 2001).

³ In re Applications of ALGREG Cellular Engineering, et al., *Hearing Designation Order*, 6 FCC Rcd 2921, 2928 (Com. Car. Bur. 1991).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Algreg I*, 12 FCC Rcd at 8172-8181. The Commission also concluded that participation in the risk-sharing arrangement was not a basis for the denial of pending applications or the revocation of licenses, including that held by Alee in NM 3. *Id.* at 8157-8169. The foreign ownership issue also was determined not to provide a basis for revoking Alee's authorization in light of changes made to Section 310(b) by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. *Id.* at 8170-8171.

⁶ In addition, the Commission's rules at that time explicitly prohibited precisely the type of transaction undertaken by Alee to replace its non-U.S. partner. See *id.* at 8175.

⁷ *Id.* at 8175.

⁸ *Id.* at 8176; see *id.* at 8176-8181.

⁹ *Id.* at 8176.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 8175.

¹¹ *Id.* at 8180-8181.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ See *Algreg II*, 14 FCC Rcd at 18533-18535.

evidence that would warrant any reconsideration.¹⁵ The Commission also distinguished Alee's situation from those of NextWave and PCS 2000, where the Commission did not revoke any licenses but allowed the applicant to undertake remedial action.¹⁶

7. Alee appealed the Commission's action to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. After briefing and oral argument, the Court affirmed the Commission's action, "essentially for the reasons stated by the Commission."¹⁷ The Court stated:

Substantial evidence supported the Commission's determination that Alee Cellular Communications lacked candor in failing to reveal that it had an alien general partner and that there had been a change in its partnership structure. The Commission independently reviewed the record of the evidentiary hearing, examining both the testimony of the Alee witnesses and the significant documentary evidence. This evidence was sufficient to support the Commission's conclusion that Alee's partners knowingly and intentionally withheld relevant information from the Commission. *Algreg Cellular Eng'g*, 12 F.C.C.R. 8148, 8172-80 (1997). The Commission thus had ample basis to sanction Alee for its misconduct. The Commission's decision to revoke Alee's license for its lack of candor lies well within the agency's broad discretion to apply an appropriate sanction to licensee misconduct. *West Coast Media, Inc. v. FCC*, 695 F.2d 617, 622 (D.C. Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 816 (1983).¹⁸

The DC Circuit denied Alee's petition for rehearing on April 5, 2001, and the Supreme Court denied Alee's petition for writ of certiorari on October 9, 2001.¹⁹

III. Discussion

8. Alee filed the application for the Texas 21 RSA on October 8, 1988, and was chosen as the tentative selectee on April 8, 1992, during a re-lottery of the market applications.²⁰ In the *Texas 21*

Dismissal Order, the Policy and Rules Branch of the Commercial Wireless Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau denied Alee's application, finding that, "[b]ecause the Commission determined in *ALGREG* that Alee lacks the character qualifications required of licensees, we deny Alee's instant application for the same reasons."²¹ The Branch also dismissed the petition to deny filed by Applicants Against Lottery Abuse as moot.²²

9. Alee then filed the pending petition for reconsideration of the February 15, 2000 *Memorandum Opinion and Order*. Alee argued that: (1) Denial of the Texas 21 application was premature, since the *Algreg* finding is still subject to the appellate review process;²³ (2) the *Algreg* determination is limited to the NM3 license and should not be applied to the Texas 21 application;²⁴ and (3) "Alee is entitled to an opportunity to present any mitigating factors in support of the grant of the Texas 21 application before the Commission makes a final determination."²⁵

10. Alee's first argument is moot, since the *Algreg* finding is no longer subject to appellate review and thus is a final order.²⁶ Regarding its second claim, Alee is incorrect that the *Algreg* findings are not applicable to the Commission's consideration of the Texas 21 application. The Commission has made clear that applicant and licensee candor is a fundamental character quality that goes to the overall qualifications of an entity to hold a license; it is not limited to the merits of a single application.²⁷ In *Algreg I and II*, the Commission conclusively determined that Alee lacked candor with respect to its application and related filings for the NM 3 authorization,²⁸ and the Commission is entitled to take that finding into account when assessing Alee's qualifications to hold another Commission license. Regarding Alee's third claim, however, the Commission grant Alee's TX21 Petition for Reconsideration in part and

the subject application was filed. The amendment also advised the Commission of the pending show cause proceeding (*ALGREG*) concerning Alee's NM 3 authorization and made other corrections.

²¹ *Texas 21 Dismissal Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 2831-2832.

²² *Id.* at 2831 n.3.

²³ Alee TX21 Petition for Reconsideration at 4.

²⁴ *Id.* at 4-7.

²⁵ *Id.* at 7.

²⁶ See *supra*, ¶ 7.

²⁷ See, e.g., *Pass Word, Inc.*, 76 FCC Rcd 465 (1980), *aff'd per curiam Pass Word, Inc. v. FCC*, 673 F.2d 1363 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

²⁸ *Algreg I*, 12 FCC Rcd at 8172-8181; *Algreg II*, 14 FCC Rcd at 18533-18535.[29]; 12 FCC Rcd at 8172-8181.

reinstates its application for the Texas 21 authorization, File No. 11025-CL-P-672-A-89, to pending status. Given that the Commission is unable to make the public interest determination required by Section 309(e) of the Act based on Alee's prior disqualification in a proceeding that did not involve Texas 21, the Commission designates Alee's application for an evidentiary hearing. This hearing will be limited to determining whether the finding of disqualifying lack of candor on the part of Alee in the *Algreg* proceeding also disqualifies Alee from being granted the Texas 21 authorization, or whether there has been subsequent and sufficient rehabilitation on the part of Alee in the interim to support grant of its Texas 21 application. The Commission underscores that this hearing shall not be used by Alee to relitigate the Commission's findings in *Algreg* concerning Alee's lack of candor, since those findings are fully binding on Alee at this time.

IV. Ordering Clauses

11. Pursuant to § 1.106 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.106, Alee's petition for reconsideration is GRANTED IN PART and OTHERWISE DENIED, to the extent explained above.

12. Alee's application for the Texas 21 RSA cellular authorization, File No. 11025-CL-P-672-A-89, is RETURNED to pending status.

13. Pursuant to Section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 309(e), Alee's application for the Texas 21 RSA cellular authorization, File No. 11025-CL-P-672-A-89 is designated for hearing in a proceeding before an FCC Administrative Law Judge, at a time and place to be specified in a subsequent order, upon the following issues:

a. To determine, based on previously adjudicated lack of candor on the part of Alee in *Algreg I*,²⁹ whether Alee is qualified to be a Commission licensee in Texas RSA 21—Market 672A.

b. To determine, in light of the foregoing, whether Alee's pending application for an authorization to construct a nonwireline cellular system in Texas RSA 21—Market 672A should be granted.

14. To avail itself of the opportunity to be heard and to avail itself of the right to present evidence at a hearing in these proceedings, pursuant to § 1.221(c) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.221(c), Alee shall, in person or by its attorneys, file, within 20 days of the mailing of this Hearing Designation Order, a written appearance stating that

²⁹ 12 FCC Rcd at 8172-8181.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 18534.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 18535. See also NextWave Personal Communications, Inc., *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 2030 (1997); PCS 2000, L.P., *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 1681 (1997); PCS 2000, L.P., *Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture*, 12 FCC Rcd 1703 (1997).

¹⁷ *Alee Cellular Communications v. FCC*, No. 99-1460, slip op. at 1 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 31, 2001).

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ Alee Cellular Communications, No. 01-15, pet. for writ of cert. denied (S.Ct. Oct. 9, 2001).

²⁰ See FCC Public Notice, *Common Carrier Mobile Services Information, Results of Cellular Lottery*, Rpt. No. CL-92-76 (rel. Apr. 9, 1992). The application, which was signed on August 6, 1988, identified Shafi M. Sharifan, who was not in 1988 a U.S. citizen, as a general partner in Alee. Alee's section 1.65 amendment, submitted following its selection as the tentative selectee in the 1992 re-lottery, indicated that Sharifan's interest in Alee had been assigned to a U.S. citizen as of September 23, 1988, and thus he was not a partner in Alee when

it will appear at the hearing and present evidence on matters specified in this Order. If a written notice of appearance is not timely filed on behalf of Alee within 20 days of the mailing of this Hearing Designation Order, the captioned application will be dismissed with prejudice. See 47 CFR 1.221.

15. The Enforcement Bureau is made a party to this proceeding.

16. Pursuant to Section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 309(e), and § 1.254 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.254, the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon Alee with respect to the issues designated under para. 13 above.

17. The Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau shall send a copy of this Order via certified mail, return receipt requested, to Alee and its counsel at the following addresses:

David L. Hill, Audrey P. Rasmussen, Hall, Estill, Hardwick, Gable, Golden & Nelson, P.C., Suite 700 North Building, 1120 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036-3406.

Philip J. Mause, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, 1500 K Street, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005-1209.

Alee Cellular Communications, 602-7 College Avenue, Clemson, SC 29631.

18. The Secretary of the Commission shall cause this Order or a summary thereof to be published in the **Federal Register**.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-6226 Filed 3-15-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

Proposed Collection; Comment Request: Proposed Slightly Revised OGE Form 450 Executive Branch Confidential Financial Disclosure Report

AGENCY: Office of Government Ethics (OGE).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: After this first round notice and public comment period, OGE plans to submit a slightly revised version of its OGE Form 450 for confidential financial disclosure reporting under its existing executive branch regulations for review and three-year extension of approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Comments by the agencies and the public on this proposal are invited and should be received by June 3, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Mary T. Donovan, Office of Administration and Information Management, Office of Government Ethics, Suite 500, 1201 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3917. Comments may also be sent electronically to OGE's Internet E-mail address atusoge@oge.gov (for E-mail messages, the subject line should include the following reference—"OGE Form 450 Executive Branch Confidential Financial Disclosure Report Paperwork Comment").

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Donovan at the Office of Government Ethics; telephone: 202-208-8000, ext. 1185; TDD: 202-208-8025; FAX: 202-208-8038. A copy of the proposed slightly revised Confidential Financial Disclosure Report form may be obtained, without charge, by contacting Ms. Donovan.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Government Ethics is planning to submit, after this notice and comment period a slightly revised (pending the minor change noted below) version of the OGE Form 450 Executive Branch Confidential Financial Disclosure Report for three-year extension of approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35. The OGE Form 450 (OMB control # 3209-0006) collects information from covered department and agency officials as required under OGE's executive branchwide regulatory provisions in subpart I of 5 CFR part 2634. The OGE Form 450 serves as the uniform report form for collection, on a confidential basis, of financial information required by the OGE regulation from certain new entrant and incumbent employees of the Federal Government executive branch departments and agencies in order to allow ethics officials to conduct conflict of interest reviews and to resolve any actual or potential conflicts found.

The basis for the OGE regulation and the report form is two-fold. First, section 201(d) of Executive Order 12674 of April 12, 1989 (as modified by Executive Order 12731 of October 17, 1990) makes OGE responsible for the establishment of a system of nonpublic (confidential) financial disclosure by executive branch employees to complement the system of public financial disclosure under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (the "Ethics Act"), as amended, 5 U.S.C. appendix. Second, section 107(a) of the Ethics Act, 5 U.S.C. app. sec. 107(a), further

provides authority for OGE as the supervising ethics office for the executive branch of the Federal Government to require that appropriate executive agency employees file confidential financial disclosure reports, "in such form as the supervising ethics office may prescribe." The current OGE Form 450, adopted in 1999, together with the underlying OGE 5 CFR part 2634 executive branchwide financial disclosure regulation, issued in 1992 and modified at various times since, constitute the basic form OGE has prescribed for such confidential financial disclosure in the executive branch.

The only changes to the OGE Form 450 that OGE is proposing at this time (as also referenced on the mark-up copy of the form) are updating the contact information to reflect recent OGE organizational changes, adding a continuation page to Part I, and the forthcoming adjustment to the thresholds for reporting of gifts and travel reimbursements for regular employee annual filers in Part V of the OGE Form 450. Currently these thresholds require the reporting of gifts and reimbursements totaling more than \$260 from any one source during the annual reporting period, subject to a de minimis exclusion for any item valued at \$104 or less (which is not counted toward the overall threshold). The thresholds will have to be adjusted sometime this year when the General Services Administration redefines "minimal value" under the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, 5 U.S.C. 7342(a)(5), for the three-year period 2002-2004. Currently, foreign gifts minimal value is set at \$260 or less pursuant to 41 CFR 102-42.10 of GSA's regulations. Under section 102(a)(2)(A) and (B) of the Ethics Act, 5 U.S.C. app. section 102(a)(2)(A) and (B), the public financial disclosure reporting thresholds are pegged to any adjustment of minimal value over \$250 (at the same time and by the same amount percentage). The Office of Government Ethics has extended the statutory thresholds to confidential financial disclosure reporting for the executive branch. See 5 CFR 2634.907(a)(3), so incorporating the reporting of gifts and reimbursements specified in § 2634.304 for public reports but without amounts or values. Once GSA adjusts minimal value for foreign gifts, OGE will revise the gifts and reimbursements reporting thresholds of the OGE Form 450 and amend the underlying part 2634 regulation (public financial disclosure reporting would also be affected). The Office of Government Ethics will advise