

“ON” ignition status to any other status. The certification ECU then performs the calculation for the immobilizer and the immobilizer signals the ECM to activate the device. Toyota also stated that key verification is also performed after the driver pushes the engine switch. Specifically, after the driver pushes the engine switch, the certification ECU and steering lock ECU receive confirmation of a valid key, and the certification ECU allows the ECM to start the engine. Toyota also stated that in the “smart entry and start system” installed vehicle, a security indicator notifies the users and others inside and outside the vehicle with the status of the immobilizer. Toyota further explained that the security indicator flashes continuously when the immobilizer is activated, and turns off when it is deactivated.

Toyota stated that the proposed antitheft device has also been installed as standard equipment on its Avalon vehicle line beginning with its MY 2015 vehicles. The theft rate for the MY 2015 Avalon vehicle line is not available. However, Toyota compared its proposed device to other devices NHTSA has determined to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements. Toyota compared its proposed device to that which has been installed on the Nissan Altima and granted a parts-marking exemption from 49 CFR part 541 by the agency beginning with its MY 2000 vehicles. Toyota also referenced the NHTSA theft rate data published for several years before and after the Nissan Altima was equipped with a standard immobilizer device. Specifically, Toyota stated that the publication showed that the average theft rate for the Nissan Altima dropped to 3.0 per 1,000 cars produced between MY’s 2000–2006 compared to 5.3 per 1,000 cars produced between MY’s 1996–1999. This represents approximately a 43% decrease in the theft rate for the Nissan Altima vehicle line installed with an immobilizer between MY’s 2000–2006 as compared to the Nissan Altima vehicle line without an immobilizer between MY’s 1996–1999. The theft rates for the Nissan Altima vehicle line using an average of three model years’ data (2012–2014) are 2.4207, 1.7598 and 2.1212 respectively, all well below the median theft rate of 3.5826. Therefore, Toyota has concluded that the antitheft device proposed for its Avalon vehicle line is no less effective than those devices on the lines for which NHTSA has already granted full exemption from the parts-marking requirements. Toyota

stated that it believes that installing the immobilizer device as standard equipment reduces the theft rate for the Avalon vehicle line and expects it to experience comparable effectiveness and ultimately be more effective than parts-marking labels.

Based on the supporting evidence submitted by Toyota on its device, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Avalon vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR 541). The agency concludes that the device will provide four of the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7 (b), the agency grants a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of Part 541, either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment antitheft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of Part 541. The agency finds that Toyota has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the antitheft device for the Avalon vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR part 541). This conclusion is based on the information Toyota provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Toyota’s petition for exemption for the Avalon vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541. The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, Appendix A–1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the Theft Prevention Standard for a given model year. 49 CFR part 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the antitheft device is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

If Toyota decides not to use the exemption for this line, it should

formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Toyota wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line’s exemption is based. Further, Part 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions “to modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption.”

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes, the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95.

Raymond R. Posten,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2017–22657 Filed 10–18–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Petition for Exemption From the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Nissan North America, Inc.

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Grant of petition for exemption.

SUMMARY: This document grants in full the Nissan North America, Inc.’s, (Nissan) petition for exemption of the Infiniti QX50 vehicle line in accordance with the *Exemption from the Theft Prevention Standard*. This petition is granted because the agency has determined that the antitheft device to be placed on the line as standard

equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the *Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard* (Theft Prevention Standard). Nissan also requested confidential treatment for specific information in its petition. Therefore, no confidential information provided for purposes of this notice has been disclosed.

DATES: The exemption granted by this notice is applicable beginning with the 2019 model year (MY).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Carlita Ballard, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Programs, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building, Room W43-439, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard's telephone phone number is (202) 366-5222. Her fax number is (202) 493-2990.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a petition dated July 8, 2017, Nissan requested an exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard for the Infiniti QX50 vehicle line beginning with MY 2019. The petition requested an exemption from parts-marking pursuant to 49 CFR part 543, *Exemption from Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard*, based on the installation of an antitheft device as standard equipment for the entire vehicle line.

Under 49 CFR part 543.5(a), a manufacturer may petition NHTSA to grant an exemption for one vehicle line per model year. In its petition, Nissan provided a detailed description and diagram of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the Infiniti QX50 vehicle line. Nissan stated that the MY 2019 Infiniti QX50 vehicle line will be installed with a passive, electronic engine immobilizer antitheft device as standard equipment. Key components of the antitheft device will include an engine immobilizer, engine control module (ECM), body control module (BCM), security indicator light, immobilizer antenna, Key FOB, and a specially-designed key with a microchip. Nissan stated that its vehicle's security indicator light will be a warning to a potential thief, and an added deterrence to a thief's decision to enter the vehicle. However, Nissan stated that its antitheft device will not provide any visible or audible indication if unauthorized vehicle entry (*i.e.*, flashing lights and horn alarm) on its Infiniti QX50 vehicle line.

Nissan's submission is considered a complete petition as required by 49 CFR

543.7, in that it meets the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6.

In addressing the specific content requirements of 543.6, Nissan provided information on the reliability and durability of its proposed device. Nissan stated that its antitheft device is tested for specific parameters to ensure its reliability and durability. Nissan provided a detailed list of the tests conducted and believes that the device is reliable and durable since the device complied with its specified requirements for each test. Nissan further stated that its immobilizer device satisfies the European Directive ECE R116, including tamper resistance. Nissan also stated that all control units for the device are located inside the vehicle, providing further protection from unauthorized accessibility of the device from outside the vehicle.

Nissan stated that activation of its immobilizer device occurs automatically when the ignition switch is turned to the "OFF" position which then causes the security indicator light to flash notifying the operator that the immobilizer device is activated. Nissan stated that the immobilizer device prevents normal operation of the vehicle without using a specially-designed microchip key with a pre-registered "Key-ID". Nissan also stated that, when the brake and clutch is on and the key FOB is near the engine start switch, the Key-ID is scanned via the immobilizer antenna. The microchip in the key transmits the Key-ID to the BCM, beginning an encrypted communication process. If the Key-ID and encrypted code are correct, the ECM will allow the engine to keep running and the driver to operate the vehicle. If the Key-ID and encrypted code are not correct, the ECM will cause the engine to shut down.

Nissan stated that the proposed device is functionally equivalent to the antitheft device installed on the MY 2011 Nissan Cube vehicle line which was granted a parts-marking exemption by the agency on April 14, 2010 (75 FR 19458). The agency notes that the theft rates for the Nissan Cube using an average of 3 MYs data (2012-2014), are 0.3322, 0.6471 and 2.0373 respectively.

Nissan provided data on the effectiveness of the antitheft device installed on its Infiniti QX50 vehicle line in support of the belief that its antitheft device will be highly effective in reducing and deterring theft. Nissan referenced the National Insurance Crime Bureau's data which it stated showed a 70% reduction in theft when comparing MY 1997 Ford Mustangs (with a standard immobilizer) to MY 1995 Ford

Mustangs (without an immobilizer). Nissan also referenced the Highway Loss Data Institute's data which reported that BMW vehicles experienced theft loss reductions resulting in a 73% decrease in relative claim frequency and a 78% lower average loss payment per claim for vehicles equipped with an immobilizer. Additionally, Nissan stated that theft rates for its Pathfinder vehicle line experienced reductions from model year (MY) 2000 to 2001 and subsequent years with implementation of an engine immobilizer device as standard equipment. Specifically, Nissan stated that the agency's theft rate data for MY's 2001 through 2006 reported theft rates of 1.9146, 1.8011, 1.1482, 0.8102, 1.7298 and 1.3474 respectively for the Nissan Pathfinder.

Nissan compared its device to other similar devices previously granted exemptions by the agency. Specifically, it referenced the agency's grant of full exemptions to General Motors Corporation for its Buick Riviera and Oldsmobile Aurora vehicle lines (58 FR 44872, August 25, 1993) and its Cadillac Seville vehicle line (62 FR 20058, April 24, 1997) from the parts-marking requirements of the theft prevention standard. Nissan stated that it believes that since its device is functionally equivalent to other comparable manufacturer's devices that have already been granted parts-marking exemptions by the agency, along with the evidence of reduced theft rates for vehicle lines equipped with similar devices and advanced technology of transponder electronic security, the Nissan immobilizer device will have the potential to achieve the level of effectiveness equivalent to those vehicles already exempted by the agency. The agency agrees that the device is substantially similar to devices installed on other vehicle lines for which the agency has already granted exemptions.

Based on the supporting evidence submitted by Nissan, the agency believes that the antitheft device for the Infiniti QX50 vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR part 541). The agency concludes that the device will provide four of the five types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): Promoting activation; preventing defeat or circumvention of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 33106 and 49 CFR 543.7(b), the agency grants a petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of Part 541 either in whole or in part, if it determines that, based upon substantial evidence, the standard equipment anti-theft device is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of Part 541. The agency finds that Nissan has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the anti-theft device for the Infiniti QX50 vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR part 541). This conclusion is based on the information Nissan provided about its device.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby grants in full Nissan's petition for exemption for the Nissan Infiniti QX50 vehicle line from the parts-marking requirements of 49 CFR part 541. The agency notes that 49 CFR part 541, Appendix A-1, identifies those lines that are exempted from the Theft Prevention Standard for a given model year. 49 CFR part 543.7(f) contains publication requirements incident to the disposition of all Part 543 petitions. Advanced listing, including the release of future product nameplates, the beginning model year for which the petition is granted and a general description of the anti-theft device is necessary in order to notify law enforcement agencies of new vehicle lines exempted from the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

If Nissan decides not to use the exemption for this line, it must formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR parts 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Nissan wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Part 543.7(d) states that a Part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the anti-theft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, Part 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "to modify an exemption to permit the use of an anti-theft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption."

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden that Part 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted

vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting Part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an anti-theft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes, the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR part 1.95.

Raymond R. Posten,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2017-22658 Filed 10-18-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Form 1024-A; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document extends the comment period for a notice and request for comments that was published in the **Federal Register** on Monday, August 28, 2017. The notice and request for comments relates to the Application for Recognition of Exemption Under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

DATES: The comment period for the notice and request for comments published on August 28, 2017 (82 FR 40228), is extended to November 28, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to L. Brimmer, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6526, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form and instructions should be directed to LaNita Van Dyke at (202) 317-6009, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6526, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet at lanita.vandyke@irs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice and request for comments that appeared in the **Federal Register** on Monday, August 28, 2017 (82 FR 40228) announced that written comments are to

be received by October 23, 2017. In order to provide the public with a sufficient opportunity to submit comments, the due date to receive written comments has been extended to Tuesday, November 28, 2017.

Approved: October 12, 2017.

L. Brimmer,

Senior Tax Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2017-22596 Filed 10-16-17; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Cooperative Studies Scientific Evaluation Committee; Notice of Meeting

The Department of Veterans Affairs gives notice under the Federal Advisory Committee Act that the Cooperative Studies Scientific Evaluation Committee will hold a meeting on December 13, 2017, at the American Association of Airport Executives, 601 Madison Street, Alexandria, VA. The meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3:30 p.m.

The Committee advises the Chief Research and Development Officer on the relevance and feasibility of proposed projects and the scientific validity and propriety of technical details, including protection of human subjects.

The session will be open to the public for approximately 30 minutes at the start of the meeting for the discussion of administrative matters and the general status of the program. The remaining portion of the meeting will be closed to the public for the Committee's review, discussion, and evaluation of research and development applications.

During the closed portion of the meeting, discussions and recommendations will deal with qualifications of personnel conducting the studies, staff and consultant critiques of research proposals and similar documents, and the medical records of patients who are study subjects, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. As provided by section 10(d) of Public Law 92-463, as amended, closing portions of this meeting is in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6) and (c)(9)(B).

The Committee will not accept oral comments from the public for the open portion of the meeting. Those who plan to attend or wish additional information should contact Dr. Grant Huang, Acting Director, Cooperative Studies Program (10P9CS), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420, at (202) 443-