be withheld unreasonably. (Section IV(D)(I)).

To comply with the requirements of a QMCP set forth in the proposed Final Judgment, (1) the owners or members of WPHO (to the extent they compete with other owners or members or compete with physicians on their provider panels) must share substantial financial risk, and constitute no more than 30% of the physicians in any relevant market;[9] *and* (2) to the extent WPHO has a provider panel that exceeds this limit in any relevant market, there must be a divergence of economic interest between the owners and the subcontracting physicians, such that the owners have the incentive to bargain down the fees of the subcontracting physicians.[10] (Section II(G) (1) and (2)) In addition, a QMCP cannot facilitate agreements between competing physicians concerning charges, or other terms and conditions relating to payers not contracting with the organization, and cannot be operated with the purpose or effect of maintaining or increasing physician fees. (Section II(G) (3) and (5)) The requirements of a QMCP are necessary to avoid the creation of a physician cartel while at the same time allowing payers access to provider-controlled plans.

3. Applicability to Consenting Physicians

The proposed Final Judgment applies not only to named defendants Woman's Hospital and WPHO, but also to all ''consenting physicians'' defined as physicians who continue as owners or participants in physician networks owned or operated by Woman's Hospital or WPHO. Consenting physicians are required to affirm in writing that the physician has read and understands the Final Judgment and agrees to be bound by it. (Section IV(B)).

Application of the proposed Final Judgment to consenting physicians will help prevent recurrence of the violations alleged in the Complaint. Those violations could not have occurred without the willing participation of physicians who, in addition to Woman's Hospital, were the intended beneficiaries of those violations. Physicians could abuse the messenger model and the QMCP in ways that might not violate the Final Judgment but would at the same time achieve the anticompetitive results addressed by the Final Judgment. The ''consenting physicians'' provisions should reduce this risk.

IV

Alternative to the Proposed Final Judgment

The alternative to the proposed Final Judgment would be a full trial on the merits of the case. In the view of the Department of Justice, such a trial would involve substantial costs to the United States and defendants and is not warranted because the proposed Final Judgment provides all of the relief necessary to remedy the violations of the Sherman Act alleged in the Complaint.

V

Remedies Available to Private Litigants

Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, provides that any person who has been injured as a result of conduct prohibited by the antitrust laws may bring suit in federal court to recover three times the damages suffered, as well as costs and a reasonable attorney's fee. Entry of the proposed Final Judgment will neither impair nor assist in the bringing of such actions. Under the provisions of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(a), the proposed Final Judgment has no *prima facie* effect in any subsequent lawsuits that may be brought against one or more defendants in this matter.

VI

Procedures Available for Modification of the Proposed Final Judgment

As provided by Sections 2 (b) and (d) of the APPA, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b) and (d), any person believing that the proposed Final Judgment should be modified may submit written comments to Gail Kursh, Chief; Health Care Task Force; United States Department of Justice; Antitrust Division; 325 7th Street, NW., Room 400; Washington, DC 20530, within the 60-day period provided by the Act. Comments received, and the Government's responses to them, will be filed with the Court and published in the Federal Register. All comments will be given due consideration by the Department of Justice, which remains free, pursuant to Paragraph 2 of the Stipulation, to withdraw its consent to the proposed Final Judgment at any time before its entry, if the Department should determine that some modification of the Final Judgment is necessary for the public interest. Moreover, the proposed Final Judgment provides in Section IX that the Court will retain jurisdiction over this action, and that the parties may apply to the Court for such orders as may be necessary or appropriate for the modification, interpretation, or enforcement of the proposed Final Judgment.

VII

Determinative Documents

No materials and documents of the type described in Section 2(b) of the APPA, 15 U.S.C. 16(b), were considered in formulating the proposed Final Judgment. Consequently, none are filed herewith.

Dated: April 23, 1996.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark J. Botti,
Steven Kramer,
Pamela C. Girardi,
Attorneys, Antitrust Division, U.S. Dept. of Justice, 325 7th Street, N.W., Room 450, Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 307–0827.

L.J. Hymel,
United States Attorney.

By: _____
John J. Gaupp,
LBN# 14976, Assistant United States Attorney, 777 Florida St., Suite 208, Baton Rouge, LA 70801, (504) 389–0443, Local Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–11796 Filed 5–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

[9] The financial risk-sharing requirement of a QMCP ensures that the physician owners in the venture share a clear economic incentive to achieve substantial cost savings and provide better services at lower prices to consumers. The 30% limitation is designed to ensure that there are available sufficient remaining physicians in the market with the incentive to contract with competing managed care plans or to form their own plans. These limitations are particularly critical in this case in view of defendants' prior conduct in forming negotiating groups with nearly every OB/GYN practicing at private hospitals in Baton Rouge and obtaining higher prices for these doctors.

[10] The QMCP's subcontracting requirements are designed to permit physician panels above the 30% limit, but with sufficient safeguards to avoid the risk of competitive harm. Specifically, the owners of a QMCP must bear significant financial risk for the payments to, and utilization practices of, the panel physicians in excess of the 30% limitation. In this way, a QMCP must operate with the same incentives as a nonprovider-controlled plan to bargain down the fees of the subcontracting physicians, and the risk of it using the subcontracts as a mechanism for increasing fees for physician services is substantially reduced.

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Advanced Telecommunications Information Distribution Research Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on January 29, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), the Advanced Telecommunications information Distribution Research Consortium (''ATIRP Consortium'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade

Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are the United States of America, represented by U.S. Army Research Laboratories (''ARL''), Adelphi, MD; Sanders, a Lockheed Martin Company, Nashua, NH; Bell Communications Research, Inc., Morristown, NJ; City University of New York, City College, New York, NY; University of Delaware, Newark, DE; GTE Laboratories, Inc., Waltham, MA; Howard University, Washington, DC; University of Maryland, College Park, MD; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA; Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD; and Motorola, Inc., Scottsdale, AZ.

The nature of the ATIRP Consortium is to conduct research in the area of telecommunications and information distribution for a limited duration to gain further knowledge and understanding of emerging technologies. Through its partnerships, the Consortium will forge cooperative relationships with the customer community to develop innovative ideas and applications for new telecommunications and information distribution technologies.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96–11652 Filed 5–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Notice of Registration; Norac Co., Inc.

By Notice dated October 16, 1995, and published in the Federal Register on October 23, 1995, (60 FR 54387), Norac Company, Inc., 405 S. Motor Avenue, Azusa, California 91702, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of tetrahydrocannabinols (7370), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule I.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Norac Company, Inc. to manufacture the listed controlled substance is consistent with the public interest at this time. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic class of controlled substance listed above is granted.

Dated: April 12, 1996.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–11665 Filed 5–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

May 6, 1996.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (P.L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this individual ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor Acting Departmental Clearance Officer, Theresa M. O'Malley ((202) 219–5095). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY/TDD) may call (202) 219–4720 between 1:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Comments should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employment and Training Administration, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 ((202) 395–7316), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the Federal Register.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

* Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

* Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

* Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

* Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration.

Title: Job Search Assistance Demonstration Followup Interview.

Frequency: One-time survey.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Number of Respondents: 4,500.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 30 minutes.

Total Burden Hours: 2,250.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: The information collected in this questionnaire is necessary for the evaluation of the Job Search Assistance (JSA) demonstration, a Congressionally mandated demonstration and evaluation. The questionnaire collects information on employment and training services received and labor market experiences of unemployment insurance claimants selected for the demonstration.

Theresa M. O'Malley,

Acting Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–11765 Filed 5–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management

National Skill Standards Board; Notice of Open Meeting

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Skill Students Board was established by an Act of Congress, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, Title V, Pub L. 103–227. The 27-member National Skill Standards Board will serve as a catalyst and be responsible for the development and implementation of a national system of voluntary skill standards and certification through voluntary partnerships which have the full and balanced participation of business, industry, labor, education and other key groups.

Time and Place: The meeting will be held from 8:00 a.m. to appproximately 11:30 a.m. on Friday, May 31, 1996, in the Mt. Vernon Salon A & B, 2nd Floor of the Madison Hotel at 15th & M Streets N.W, Washington, D.C.