

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT

### A. Justification:

1. Section 87.37 requires that a report, which shall include comprehensive and detailed information on:
  - (a) The results of the operation to date;
  - (b) Analysis of the results obtained;
  - (c) Copies of any published reports;
  - (d) Need for continuation of the program; and
  - (e) Number of hours of operation on each authorized frequency during the term of the license to the date of the report, on the results of a developmental program shall be filed with and made a part of each application for renewal of authorization.

This showing must be signed by the applicant. In cases where no renewal is requested, such report shall be filed within 60 days of the expiration of such authorization. Matters which the applicant does not wish to disclose publicly may be so labeled, and not be publicly disclosed without permission of the applicant. Further, non-public matters will be used solely for the Commission's information. The data is required to determine whether such developmental authorizations should be renewed and/or whether rule making proceedings should be initiated to provide generally for such operations in the Aviation Service. This rule is needed to implement the FCC's responsibilities under section 303(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 303(g).

The Commission is now seeking OMB approval to extend the approval for this information collection (no change in the reporting requirement) in order to obtain the three year clearance from them. There is no change in the estimated burden.

As noted on the Form OMB-83I, this information collection does not affect individuals or households; thus, there are no impacts under the Privacy Act.

Statutory authority for this collection of information is contained in sections 47 U.S.C. 154, 303(g) and 307(e), unless otherwise noted.

2. The information is used by Commission personnel to determine the merits of the program for which a developmental authorization was granted. If such information was not collected, the value of developmental programs in the Aviation Service would be severely limited. The Commission would have little, if any information available regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the subject developmental operations and, therefore, would be handicapped in determining whether developmental authorizations should be renewed or a rule making initiated to accommodate new operations in this radio service.
3. Prior to finalizing rule makings the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau conducts an analysis to insure that improved information technology may be used to reduce the burden on the public. This analysis considers the possibility of obtaining and/or computer-generating the required data from existing data bases in the Commission or other Federal agencies.

4. This agency does not impose a similar information collection on the respondents. There are no similar data available.
5. In conformance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Commission is making an effort to minimize the burden on all respondents, regardless of size. The Commission has limited the information requirements to those absolutely necessary for evaluating and processing each application and to deter against possible abuses of the processes.
6. The information collection is conducted at the expiration of a developmental authorization or at the time a renewal of a developmental authorization is requested. Therefore, a less frequent collection interval equates to no collection of such information.
7. Current data collection is consistent with 5 CFR 1320.6.
8. The Commission initiated a 60-day public comment period which appeared in the Federal Register on February 14, 2012 (77 FR 8255). No comments were received as a result of the Notice.
9. Respondents will not receive any payments.
10. There is no need for confidentiality.
11. This collection doesn't address any private matters of a sensitive nature.
12. Approximately **10 reports** on developmental operations in the Aviation Service are filed each year. Such a report must be submitted at the end of the one year developmental license term. Essentially the subject report contains the results of the program, the licensee's analysis and the need for continuation of the operation. Since the licensee's purpose in conducting the developmental program is to gather this very information, the estimated burden is based on the approximate time required for the licensee or a competent engineer to draft the subject report. The majority of these reports are in the form of a standard business letter a few pages long. Based on a review of such reports, it is estimated that **eight (8) hours** of an in-house engineer's time would be required to prepare and submit the subject report. Thus, 10 respondents x 8 hours per response = **80 total annual burden hours**.

Estimate of in-house cost to respondents:

10 (respondents) x \$40/hour (engineer) x 8 (hrs report preparation) + 10% overhead = \$3,520.00

13. Estimate of cost to respondents – None.

- a. There are no capital or start-up costs.
- b. There are no operational or maintenance costs.

14. Estimated annual cost to the Federal Government:

10 (reports) x \$32.35/hour (GS-12 engineer) x 3 (hrs/report examination) = \$ 970.5 rounded \$971.00.

15. There are no changes to the Commission's burden estimates.

16. The data will not be published for statistical use.

17. We do not seek approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection.

18. There were no exceptions to Item 19.

**B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods:**

No statistical methods are employed.