qualify or disqualify the appliance as “smart?” In the alternative, should the portion of a given test procedure that verifies the “smart” capabilities of the appliance be integrated into the existing test procedure and internalized in the outputted metric on a product-by-product basis?

- The “smart” capabilities of an appliance are considered as part of a “network mode.” IEC 62301 defines network mode(s) as: “Any product modes where the energy using product is connected to a mains power source and at least one network function is activated (such as reactivation via network command or network integrity communication) but where the primary function is not active.” Does this definition apply to all covered products and consumer equipment, or would other definitions apply more appropriately to certain products or equipment?
- EPICA authorizes DOE to set standards in active, standby, and off mode and to amend the EPCA definitions for these modes as appropriate for a given product. DOE requests comments on which of these three modes should be used to capture “network” mode energy use, or whether more than one of these modes should be used.
- How do you expect “smart” capabilities to change the energy use of an appliance in active and standby modes? What is the energy use impact of “network mode” and how should it be accounted for in test procedures?
- How should test procedures deal with various communication standards and protocols?

Implications for Energy Conservation Standards Analyses

DOE recognizes that “smart” appliances, however defined, could have implications on the economics and energy use of covered products analyzed during the energy conservation standards rulemakings.

- What costs and benefits of “smart” appliances can and should DOE account for within the appliance standards analytical framework? DOE seeks information and data that would help quantify such costs and benefits.
- DOE requests information and data on how, if at all, product and equipment energy usage profiles change when they are equipped with “smart” capabilities. DOE specifically seeks data related to covered products and equipment.
- DOE seeks estimates and underlying assumptions for market share penetration estimates of “smart” appliances, as well as other complementary technologies (such as smart meters) that may be necessary to the realization of “smart appliance” benefits.
- DOE seeks information and data from pilot programs or studies involving “smart” appliances. DOE also requests information of international voluntary and regulatory programs addressing “smart” appliances.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 22, 2011.

Kathleen Hogan,

[FR Doc. 2011–19930 Filed 8–4–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

RIN 2120–AA64
Airworthiness Directives; ATR–GIE Avions de Transport Régional Model ATR42 and ATR72 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for the products listed above. This proposed AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as:

One ATR operator has experienced in-flight elevator travel limitations with unusual effort being necessary on pitch axis to control the aeroplane, while the “pitch mistrim” message appeared on the ADU [advisory display unit] display. The elevators seemed to be jammed.

During the post-flight inspection, it was discovered that the LH [left-hand] elevator lower stop assembly was broken at the level of the angles, which may have prevented the elevator to respond normally to the flight control input.

This condition, if not detected and corrected, could lead to reduced control of the aeroplane.

The proposed AD would require actions that are intended to address the unsafe condition described in the MCAI.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by September 19, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments by any of the following methods:

- Fax: (202) 493–2251.
- Hand Delivery: U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–40, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact ATR–GIE Avions de Transport Régional, 1, Allée Pierre Nadot, 31712 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 (0) 5 62 21 62 21; fax +33 (0) 5 62 21 67 18; e-mail continued.airworthiness@atr.fr; Internet http://www.aerochain.com. You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov; or in person at the Docket Operations office between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone (800) 647–5527) is in the ADDRESSES section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposed AD. Send your comments to an address listed under the ADDRESSES section. Include “Docket No. FAA–2011–0721; Directorate Identifier 2010–NM–217–AD” at the beginning of
The MCAI states:

condition for the specified products.

Airworthiness Directive 2010–0138, dated July 1, 2010 (referred to after this as “the MCAI”), to correct an unsafe
dated by the Technical Agent

Discussion

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), which is the Technical Agent

for the Member States of the European Community, has issued EASA

Airworthiness Directive 2010–0138, dated July 1, 2010 (referred to after this

as “the MCAI”), to correct an unsafe

correct the unsafe condition described in the

MCAI and service information referenced above. We are proposing this

AD because we evaluated all pertinent

information and determined an unsafe

condition exists and is likely to exist or
develop on other products of the same
design.

Differences Between This AD and the

MCAI or Service Information

We have reviewed the MCAI and

related service information and, in

general, agree with their substance. But

we might have found it necessary to use
different words from those in the MCAI
to ensure the AD is clear for U.S.
operators and is enforceable. In making

these changes, we do not intend to differ

substantively from the information

provided in the MCAI and related

service information.

We might also have proposed
different actions in this AD from those

in the MCAI in order to follow FAA

policies. Any such differences are

highlighted in a NOTE within the

proposed AD.

Costs of Compliance

Based on the service information, we

estimate that this proposed AD would

affect about 86 products of U.S. registry.

We also estimate that it would take

about 4 work-hours per product to

comply with the basic requirements of

this proposed AD. The average labor

rate is $85 per work-hour. Based on

these figures, we estimate the cost of the

proposed AD on U.S. operators to be

$29,240, or $340 per product.

In addition, we estimate that any

necessary follow-on actions would take

about 60 work-hours and require parts

costing up to $960, for a cost of up to

$6,060 per product. We have no way of
determining the number of products that

may need these actions.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code

specifies the FAA’s authority to issue

rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I,

section 106, describes the authority

of the FAA Administrator. “Subtitle VII:

Aviation Programs,” describes in more
detail the scope of the Agency’s

authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under

the authority described in “Subtitle VII,

Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701:

General requirements.” Under that

section, Congress charges the FAA with

promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in

air commerce by prescribing regulations

for practices, methods, and procedures

the Administrator finds necessary for

safety in air commerce. This regulation

is within the scope of that authority

because it addresses an unsafe condition

that is likely to exist or develop on

products identified in this rulemaking

action.

Regulatory Findings

We determined that this proposed AD

would not have federalism implications

under Executive Order 13132. This

proposed AD would not have a

substantial direct effect on the States, on

the relationship between the national

Government and the States, or on the

distribution of power and responsibilities among the various

governments.

For the reasons discussed above, I
certify this proposed regulation:

1. Is not a “significant regulatory

action” under Executive Order 12866; and

2. Is not a “significant rule” under the

DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures

(44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and

3. Will not have a significant
economic impact, positive or negative,
on a substantial number of small entities

under the criteria of the Regulatory

Flexibility Act.

We prepared a regulatory evaluation

of the estimated costs to comply with

this proposed AD and placed it in the

AD docket.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation

safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority
delegated to me by the Administrator,

the FAA proposes to amend 14 CFR part

39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS

DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39

continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding

the following new AD:

ATR–GIE Avions de Transport Régional:

Docket No. FAA–2011–0721; Directorate

Identifier 2010–NM–217–AD.

Comments Due Date

(a) We must receive comments by

September 19, 2011.

AFFECTED ADS

(b) None.

Applicability

(c) This AD applies to ATR–GIE Avions de

Transport Régional Model ATR42–200, –300,
Subject
(d) Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 55: Stabilizers.

Reason
(e) The mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) states:

One ATR operator has experienced in-flight elevator travel limitations with unusual effort being necessary on pitch axis to control the aeroplane, while the “pitch mistrim” message appeared on the ADU (advisory display unit) display. The elevators seemed to be jammed.

During the post-flight inspection, it was discovered that the LH [left-hand] elevator lower stop assembly was broken at the level of the angles, which may have prevented the elevator to respond normally to the flight control input.

This condition, if not detected and corrected, could lead to reduced control of the aeroplane.

Compliance
(f) You are responsible for having the actions required by this AD performed within the compliance times specified, unless the actions have already been done.

Actions
(g) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, perform a general visual inspection of the inboard hinge fitting area and a detailed inspection of lower stop angles of the inboard hinge fittings on both LH and right-hand (RH) elevators, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Avions de Transport Régional Service Bulletin ATR42–55–0014, dated May 11, 2010; or Avions de Transport Régional Service Bulletin ATR72–55–1006, dated May 11, 2010; or applicable.

(1) If any damaged angle is found during the inspection required by paragraph (g) of this AD, before further flight, replace the damaged angles with serviceable parts and accomplish a detailed inspection of the adjacent areas to detect any damage, in accordance with the Accomplishment Instructions of Avions de Transport Régional Service Bulletin ATR42–55–0014, dated May 11, 2010; or Avions de Transport Régional Service Bulletin ATR72–55–1006, dated May 11, 2010; as applicable.

(2) If any damage is detected in adjacent areas during the inspection required by paragraph (g)(1) of this AD, before further flight, repair the damage using a method approved by either the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA; or European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) (or its delegated agent).

Summarized: We propose to supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain Model 737–100 and –200 series airplanes. The existing AD currently requires various inspections for cracks in the outboard chord of the frame at body station (BS) 727 and in the outboard chord of stringer (S) 18A, and repair or replacement of cracked parts. Since we issued that AD, there have been several reports of fatigue cracking in the frame outboard chord at BS 727 and in the radius of the auxiliary chord on airplanes that were not affected by the existing AD. This proposed AD would add airplanes to the applicability statement in the existing AD and add inspections for cracks in the BS 727 frame outboard chords and the radius of the auxiliary chord on airplanes, which
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Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737–100, –200, –200C, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD) that applies to certain Model 737–100 and –200 series airplanes. The existing AD currently requires various inspections for cracks in the outboard chord of the frame at body station (BS) 727 and in the outboard chord of stringer (S) 18A, and repair or replacement of cracked parts. Since we issued that AD, there have been several reports of fatigue cracking in the frame outboard chord at BS 727 and in the radius of the auxiliary chord on airplanes that were not affected by the existing AD. This proposed AD would add airplanes to the applicability statement in the existing AD and add inspections for cracks in the BS 727 frame outboard chords and the radius of the auxiliary chord, for certain airplanes. This proposed AD would also remove the inspections of the outboard chord of S-18A required by the existing AD. We are proposing this AD to detect and correct fatigue cracking of the outboard and auxiliary chords, which