grants your request in accordance with the law and the public interest.

Postal mail addressed to the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security screening. As a result, we encourage you to submit your comments online. To make sure that the Commission considers your online comment, you must file it at *https://ftcpublic.commentworks.com/ftc/levelthreeconsent* by following the instructions on the web-based form. If this Notice appears at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!home,* you also may file a comment through that Web site.

If you file your comment on paper, write ''Level 3 Communications, LLC.—Consent Agreement; File No. 142–3028'' on your comment and on the envelope, and mail or deliver it to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H–113 (Annex D), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20580. If possible, submit your paper comment to the Commission by courier or overnight service.

Visit the Commission Web site at *http://www.ftc.gov* to read this Notice and the news release describing it. The FTC Act and other laws that the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives on or before February 20, 2014. You can find more information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, in the Commission's privacy policy, at *http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.htm.*

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission (''FTC'' or ''Commission'') has accepted, subject to final approval, a consent agreement applicable to Level 3 Communications, LLC (''Level 3'').

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for thirty (30) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty (30) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement and take appropriate action or make final the agreement's proposed order.

This matter concerns alleged false or misleading representations that Level 3 made to consumers concerning its participation in the Safe Harbor privacy frameworks agreed upon by the U.S. and the European Union (''EU'') (''U.S.-EU Safe Harbor Framework'') and the U.S. and Switzerland (''U.S.-Swiss Safe Harbor Framework''). It is among several actions the Commission is bringing to enforce the promises that companies make when they certify that they participate in the U.S.-EU Safe Harbor Framework and/or U.S.-Swiss Safe Harbor Framework (''Safe Harbor Frameworks''). The Safe Harbor Frameworks allow U.S. companies to transfer data outside the EU and Switzerland consistent with European law. To join the Safe Harbor Frameworks, a company must self-certify to the U.S. Department of Commerce (''Commerce'') that it complies with a set of principles and related requirements that have been deemed by the European Commission and Switzerland as providing ''adequate'' privacy protection. These principles include notice, choice, onward transfer, security, data integrity, access, and enforcement. Commerce maintains a public Web site, *www.export.gov/safeharbor,* where it posts the names of companies that have self-certified to the Safe Harbor Frameworks. The listing of companies indicates whether their self-certification is ''current'' or ''not current.'' Companies are required to re-certify every year in order to retain their status as ''current'' members of the Safe Harbor Frameworks.

Level 3 is an international communications provider and one of the six largest internet service providers in the world. According to the Commission's complaint, from June 2001 until November 2013, Level 3 set forth on its Web site, *www.level3.com,* privacy policies and statements about its practices, including statements related to its participation in the U.S.-EU Safe Harbor Framework and the U.S.-Swiss Safe Harbor Framework.

The Commission's complaint alleges that Level 3 falsely represented that it was a ''current'' participant in the Safe Harbor Frameworks when, in fact, from June 2012 until November 2013, Level 3 was not a ''current'' participant in the Safe Harbor Frameworks. The Commission's complaint alleges that in June 2001, Level 3 submitted a self-certification to the Safe Harbor Frameworks. Level 3 did not renew its self-certification in June 2012 and Commerce subsequently updated Level 3's status to ''not current'' on its public Web site.

Part I of the proposed order prohibits Level 3 from making misrepresentations about its membership in any privacy or security program sponsored by the government or any other self-regulatory or standard-setting organization, including, but not limited to, the U.S.-EU Safe Harbor Framework and the U.S.-Swiss Safe Harbor Framework.

Parts II through VI of the proposed order are reporting and compliance provisions. Part II requires Level 3 to retain documents relating to its compliance with the order for a five-year period. Part III requires dissemination of the order now and in the future to persons with responsibilities relating to the subject matter of the order. Part IV ensures notification to the FTC of changes in company status. Part V mandates that Level 3 submit an initial compliance report to the FTC, and make available to the FTC subsequent reports. Part VI is a provision ''sunsetting'' the order after twenty (20) years, with certain exceptions.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the proposed complaint or order or to modify the order's terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–01746 Filed 1–28–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[Notice-FTR–2014–01; Docket No: 2014–0004; Sequence 1:

GSA Bulletin FTR 14–04] Federal Travel Regulation (FTR); Relocation Allowances—Standard Mileage Rate for Moving Purposes

AGENCY: Office of Government-wide Policy, U.S. General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Notice of a bulletin.

SUMMARY: The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) published FTR Amendments 2007–03, June 27, 2007, and 2007–06, December 11, 2007, in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 35187 and 72 FR 70234 respectively) specifying that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Standard Mileage Rate for moving purposes would be the rate at which agencies will reimburse an employee for using a Privately Owned Vehicle (POV) for relocation worldwide. The amendment indicated that the change to the IRS Standard Mileage Rate for moving purposes applied to relocations on and after September 25, 2007, and that GSA would publish a bulletin announcing any changes to that rate made by the IRS thereafter. On

December 6, 2013, the IRS announced that as of January 1, 2014, the relocation mileage rate would decrease to $0.235 per mile for the 12-month period ending on December 31, 2014. Thus, the reimbursement rate for POVs used in conjunction with official relocation will also be $0.235 for the same period. FTR Bulletin 14–04 is attached. FTR Bulletin 14–04 and all other FTR bulletins may be found at *www.gsa.gov/federaltravelregulation.*

DATES: This notice is effective January 29, 2014 and applies to relocations performed on or after January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ed Davis, GSA, Office of Government-wide Policy (M), Office of Asset and Transportation Management (MA), at 202–208–7638 or via email at *ed.davis@gsa.gov*. Please cite FTR Bulletin 14–04.

Dated: January 17, 2014.

Anne E. Rung,

Associate Administrator, Office of Government-wide Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014–01705 Filed 1–28–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–14–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources (ASFR); Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority

Part A, Office of the Secretary, Statement of Organization, Functions and Delegations of Authority for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is being amended at Chapter AM, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources, as last amended at 77 FR 19666–67, dated April 2, 2012. This reorganization will eliminate the Office of Executive Program Information (AMW) within ASFR through the following changes:

A. Under Section AM.10 Organization, delete the last sentence of the section in its entirety and replace with the following:

The office consists of the following components:

- Immediate Office of the Assistant Secretary (AM).
- Office of Budget (AML).
- Office of Finance (AMS).
- Office of Grants and Acquisition Policy and Accountability (AMT).

B. Under Section AM.20 Functions, delete Chapter AMW, Office of Executive Program Information (OEPI), in its entirety.

Dated: November 13, 2013.

E.J. Holland, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary for Administration.

[FR Doc. 2014–01712 Filed 1–28–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the intention of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to request that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approve the proposed information collection project: ''Pilot Test of an Emergency Department Discharge Tool.'' In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), AHRQ invites the public to comment on this proposed information collection.

This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on August 27th, 2013 and allowed 60 days for public comment. One comment was received. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comment.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by February 28, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: Doris Lefkowitz, Reports Clearance Officer, AHRQ, by email at *doris.lefkowitz@ahrq.hhs.gov.*

Copies of the proposed collection plans, data collection instruments, and specific details on the estimated burden can be obtained from the AHRQ Reports Clearance Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doris Lefkowitz, AHRQ Reports Clearance Officer, (301) 427–1477, or by email at *doris.lefkowitz@ahrq.hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Project

Pilot Test of an Emergency Department Discharge Tool

The research study ''Pilot Test of an Emergency Discharge Tool'' fully supports AHRQ's mission. The ultimate aim of this study is to pilot test a discharge tool which has the potential to reduce unnecessary visits to the Emergency Department (ED), reduce healthcare expenditure in the ED, as well as streamline and enhance the quality of care delivered to ED patients.

The ED is an important and frequently used setting of care for a large part of the U.S. population. In 2006, there were nearly 120 million ED visits in the U.S., of which only 15.5 million (14.7%) resulted in admission to the hospital or transfer to another hospital. Thus the majority ED visits result in discharge to home. Patients discharged from the ED face significant risk for adverse outcomes, with between 3–5 patients per 100,000 visits experiencing an unexpected death following discharge from the ED. Additionally, a sizable minority of patients return to the ED frequently. Published studies estimate that 4.5% to 8% of patients revisit the ED 4 or more times per year, accounting for 21% to 28% of all ED visits. Internal data from John Hopkins Hospital, AHRQ's contractor for this pilot test, supports these findings with 7% of their patients accounting for 26% of visits to the Johns Hopkins Hospital ED in 2011.

Patients who revisit the ED contribute to overcrowding, unnecessary delays in care, dissatisfaction, and avoidable patient harm. ED revisits are also an important contributor to rising health care costs, as ED care is estimated to cost two to five times as much as the same treatment delivered by a primary care physician. Thus it is estimated that eliminating revisits and inappropriate use of EDs could reduce health care spending as much as $32 billion each year. Overall, an effective and efficient ED discharge process would improve the quality of patient care in the ED as well as reduce healthcare costs.

To respond to the challenges faced by our nation's EDs and the patients they serve, AHRQ will develop and pilot test a tool to improve the ED discharge process. More specifically, this project has the following goals:

(1) Develop and Pilot Test a Prototype ED Discharge Tool in a limited number of settings to assess:

(a) The feasibility for use with patients;

(b) The methodological and resource requirements associated with tool use;

(c) The feasibility of measuring outcomes;

(d) The costs of implementation and;

(e) Preliminary outcomes or impacts of tool use.

(2) Revise the Tool based on the results from the Pilot Test.

This study is being conducted by AHRQ through its contractor, John Hopkins Hospital, pursuant to AHRQ's statutory authority to conduct and support research on healthcare and on systems for the delivery of such care, including activities with respect to the