ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180
[40-CFR-2011-0780; FRL–9389–9]

Triforine, Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Correcting amendments.

SUMMARY: EPA issued a final rule in the Federal Register of May 29, 2013, concerning tolerances for triforine on blueberry and tomato. This document corrects a typographical error to the section number.

DATES: This final rule correction is effective June 19, 2013.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2011–0780, is available at http://www.regulations.gov or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information to the U.S. governmental Web site at http://www.epa.gov/dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather Garvie, Registration Division, (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 308–0034; email address: garvie.heather@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Does this action apply to me?

The Agency included in the final rule a list of those who may be potentially affected by this action.

II. What does this technical correction do?

EPA is correcting the CFR section number assigned to the pesticide tolerance for triforine, which was published in the Federal Register of May 29, 2013 (78 FR 32146). Specifically, EPA is changing the section number from § 180.1321 to § 180.673 so that the pesticide tolerance can be correctly placed in 40 CFR part 180, subpart C.

III. Why is this correction issued as a final rule?

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B)) provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a final rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. EPA has determined that there is good cause for making this technical correction final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment, because this is merely a change in section number and is not a substantive change. EPA finds that this constitutes good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B).

IV. Do any of the statutory and Executive Order reviews apply to this action?

A discussion of statutory and Executive Order Review was included in the original document published on May 29, 2013.

V. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the Federal Register. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 7, 2013.
Daniel J Rosenblatt,
Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR part 180 is corrected as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:


§ 180.1321 [Redesignated]

2. Section 180.1321 is redesignated as § 180.673, and transferred from subpart D to subpart C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 5
[ET Docket No. 10–236 and 06–155; FCC 13–76]

Radio Experimentation and Market Trials—Streamlining Rules

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document the Commission modifies on its own motion the rules adopted in this proceeding regarding transfer and assignment of experimental licenses of its rules. Upon reflection, the Commission found it in the public interest to specifically prohibit the transfer of program, medical testing, and compliance testing experimental radio licenses, while continuing to permit conventional experimental authorizations to be transferred with the written approval of the Commission. There is an inconsistency between the adopted rule and this prohibition, which is resolved by clearly prohibiting such transfers. In making this rule modification, it is noted that the rules provide options for entities to obtain an experimental license to ensure continuation of all experiments without lapse including those being conducted under a program, medical testing, and compliance testing license. Thus, this action will result in no harm to any qualified license applicant or licensee.

DATES: This rule requires approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), and will become effective after the Commission publishes a notice in the Federal Register announcing such approval and the relevant effective date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rodney Small, Office of Engineering and Technology, 202–418–2452, Rodney.Small@fcc.gov.
1. In this Order, the Commission modifies on its own motion the rules adopted in the Report and Order (R&O), 78 FR 25137, April 29, 2013, in this proceeding regarding transfer and assignment of experimental licenses issued under Part 5 of its rules.

2. In the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), 76 FR 6928, February 8, 2011, in this proceeding, the Commission, inter alia, proposed to establish research program, medical program, and innovation zone program Experimental Radio Service (ERS) licenses to complement the existing conventional experimental license. The Commission also proposed to amend the language of § 5.79 of the Commission’s rules regarding ERS license transfers. The proposed language modified the title of the rule to specifically refer to conventional experimental licenses and preserved the core component of the rule by continuing to prohibit the transfer of such licenses, unless the Commission approves in writing such a transfer. The proposed rule did not address transfers of the proposed program licenses. No comments were received on this proposal.

3. In the R&O, the Commission authorized three new types of ERS licenses, but modified the proposal set forth in the NPRM by classifying those licenses as program, medical testing, and compliance testing. The Commission also adopted the body of proposed § 5.79, but included the three new types of ERS licenses—in addition to conventional licenses—in the section heading. Thus, the R&O implies that under amended § 5.79, the transfer of any type of ERS license is permitted with the written approval of the Commission.

4. Upon reflection, the Commission finds it in the public interest to modify § 5.79 to specifically prohibit the transfer of program, medical testing, and compliance testing experimental radio licenses, while continuing to permit conventional experimental authorizations to be transferred with the written approval of the Commission. As an initial matter, the Commission observes that the text of the R&O stated that the Commission would prohibit the transfer of compliance testing licenses. Thus, in this respect, there is an inconsistency between the adopted rule and this prohibition, which should be resolved by clearly prohibiting such transfers.

5. The Commission concluded that, based on the nature of the program, medical testing, and compliance licenses, transfer of these licenses should not be permitted. These new ERS licensed offer some important advantages relative to the conventional ERS license—including significantly more flexibility to undertake a broad range of experiments under a single authorization—also impose additional requirements on applicants of these new licenses, requirements that reflect that these licenses are more tailored to the unique characteristics of the particular licensed entity than is the case with conventional experimental licenses. For example, unlike the eligibility requirements for conventional licenses, which require only that licensees be “qualified to conduct the types of operations permitted in § 5.3 of this part . . . ,” these new ERS licenses are limited to specialized organizations and institutions. Specifically, program experimental licenses are available only to “colleges, universities, research laboratories, manufacturers of radio frequency equipment, manufacturers that integrate radio frequency equipment into their end products, and medical research institutions;” medical testing licenses are available only to “hospitals and health care institutions that demonstrate expertise in testing and operation of experimental medical devices that use wireless telecommunications technology or communications functions in clinical trials for diagnosis, treatment, or patient monitoring;” and compliance testing licenses are available only to “laboratories recognized by the FCC under subpart J of this chapter to perform product testing of radio frequency equipment, and (ii) testing of radio frequency equipment in an Open Area Test Site.” Program and medical testing licensees must also meet additional requirements concerning responsible party, public notification, and safety of the public to ensure that harmful interference to other licensed radio services is not caused by program and medical testing experiments. These factors necessitate a greater level of review of the specific attributes of the applicant and the details of the experimentation plans than the Commission undertakes when evaluating applications pertaining to a conventional license, and much of this additional information is not normally provided on a transfer application. Thus, it would be difficult for the Commission to ascertain if the transferee has the necessary knowledge, expertise, and internal controls required by the rules without introducing significant complexity to our existing transfer process (comparable to that required for initial licensing).

6. In addition, unlike a conventional ERS license, which conveys a narrowly defined right to operate a single experiment in a specific frequency band at specific locations, program and medical testing licenses will convey broad rights to operate multiple experiments in a variety of frequency bands at a single location under the licensee’s control. It is only after the license grant that the exact characteristics of the experiment are revealed via a publicly accessible web-based registration system. In addition, the rules require a minimum period of 10 days between the registration and the commencement of the experiment for public comment. Because a program and medical testing license authorizes ongoing experimentation only at specified locations that the licensee controls, a transfer of these licenses to another party who would likely be at another location is problematic and could deprive interested parties who are concerned about potential interference of the ability to raise such concerns prior to experimentation. Moreover, compliance testing licenses convey additional flexibility beyond that provided for program and medical testing licenses. Specifically, the Commission notes that compliance testing licenses may operate on any frequency (including in restricted bands) and are not subject to the web-based prior notification requirement. Therefore, it does not find that there would be the same kind of significant public benefit in allowing any of these new licenses to be transferred as there is under some circumstances for conventional experimental licenses.
Even with respect to conventional licenses, the Commission finds it prudent to permit license transfers only in certain circumstances, such as where the experimentation cannot be fruitfully continued by the licensee; accordingly, such transfers are not permitted without written Commission approval.

7. Finally, the Commission notes that there are practical options to ensure the continuation of an experiment being conducted under a program, medical testing, or compliance testing license in the event of a change in ownership or control of the licensee. First, an experimenter may obtain a conventional license for the particular experiment. Or, with advance planning, the new owner, assuming it is duly qualified, may apply for and obtain one of the new licenses and complete the advance registration requirement prior to taking over the experimentation (either before or after the change in ownership or control of the licensee). And, as indicated, if the Commission were to allow assignments or transfers of these new forms of experimental license, the detail of the submissions and level of scrutiny that would be required—due to the nature of the operations conducted under such licenses—would not differ significantly from that which is required for obtaining an initial license. Thus, the Commission believes that modifying the rule to explicitly prohibit transfer of program, medical testing, and compliance testing licenses will result in no harm to any qualified license applicant or licensee.

Regulatory Flexibility Certification

8. The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) requires that agencies prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for notice-and-comment rulemaking proceedings, unless the agency certifies that “the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.” The Commission hereby certifies that this rule revision will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following two reasons: (1) The action maintains the status quo for conventional experimental licensees, and (2) The Commission finds that prohibiting the assignment or transfer of program, medical testing, and compliance testing licenses will have, at most, a de minimis effect on small entities, in light of the comparable alternatives available, as described in paragraph 7 of the Order on Reconsideration.

9. Indeed, no party provided any comments indicating either that a bar on such transactions would have any adverse effects or that permitting such transfers would provide any benefits. The Commission will send a copy of this Order, including this certification, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

Congressional Review Act

10. The Commission will send a copy of this Order on Reconsideration in a report to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, see 5 U.S.C. 801(n)(1)(A).

Ordering Clauses

11. Pursuant to sections 4(i), 301, and 303 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 301, and 303, and §§1.1 and 1.108 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1 and 1.108, this Order on Reconsideration is adopted.

12. Section 5.79 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR is amended as set forth below in the rule changes. Section 5.79 contains a modified information collection requirement that requires approval by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act, and will become effective after the Commission publishes a notice in the Federal Register announcing such approval and the relevant effective date.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 5

Radio, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.
Federal Communications Commission.
Gloria J. Miles,
Federal Register Liaison.

Rule Changes

For the reasons set forth in the preamble the Federal Communications Commission amends 47 CFR part 5 as follows:

PART 5—EXPERIMENTAL RADIO SERVICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 5 continues to read as follows:


■ 2. Section 5.79 is revised to read as follows:

§ 5.79 Transfer and assignment of station authorization for conventional, program, medical testing, and compliance testing experimental radio licenses.

(a) A station authorization for a conventional experimental radio license, the frequencies authorized to be used by the grantee of such authorization, and the rights therein granted by such authorization shall not be transferred, assigned, or in any manner either voluntarily or involuntarily disposed of, unless the Commission decides that such a transfer is in the public interest and gives its consent in writing.

(b) A station authorization for a program, medical testing, or compliance testing experimental radio license, the frequencies authorized to be used by the grantees of such authorizations, and the rights therein granted by such authorizations shall not be transferred, assigned, or in any manner either voluntarily or involuntarily disposed of.

[FR Doc. 2013–13675 Filed 6–18–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 52


Petitions of Vonage Holdings Corp. and TeleCommunications Systems, Inc. for Limited Waiver Regarding Access to Numbering Resources

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) establishes a limited technical trial of direct access to numbers. Specifically, it grants Vonage Holdings Corporation (Vonage) and other interconnected VoIP providers that have pending petitions for waiver of the Commission’s rules and that meet the terms and conditions outlined a limited, conditional waiver to obtain a small pool of telephone numbers directly from the NANPA and/or the PA for use in providing interconnected VoIP services. We tailor this waiver to test whether giving interconnected VoIP providers direct access to numbers will raise issues relating to number exhaust, number porting, VoIP interconnection, or intercarrier compensation, and if so, how those issues may be efficiently addressed. The trial, and the public comment, will improve the