

Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 85, No. 231

Tuesday, December 1, 2020

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

5 CFR Part 2641

RIN 3209-AA58

Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations

AGENCY: Office of Government Ethics.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Office of Government Ethics (OGE) is issuing a proposed rule to revise the component designations of one agency for purposes of the one-year post-employment conflict of interest restriction for senior employees. Specifically, based on the recommendation of the Department of Defense, OGE is proposing to designate one new component to its regulations.

DATES: Written comments are invited and must be received on or before December 31, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, in writing, to OGE on this proposed rule, identified by RIN 3209-AA58, by any of the following methods:

Email: usoge@oge.gov. Include the reference “Proposed Rule Revising Departmental Component Designations” in the subject line of the message.

Instructions: All submissions must include OGE’s agency name and the Regulation Identifier Number (RIN), 3209-AA58, for this proposed rulemaking. All comments, including attachments and other supporting materials, will become part of the public record and be subject to public disclosure. OGE may post comments on its website, www.oge.gov. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or Social Security numbers, should not be included. Comments generally will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberly L. Sikora Panza, Associate Counsel, Office of Government Ethics, Suite 500, 1201 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005-3917;

Telephone: (202) 482-9300; TTY: (800) 877-8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Substantive Discussion; Addition of New Departmental Component

The Director of OGE (Director) is authorized by 18 U.S.C. 207(h) to designate distinct and separate departmental or agency components in the executive branch for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207(c), the one-year post-employment conflict of interest restriction for senior employees. Under 18 U.S.C. 207(h)(2), component designations do not apply to persons employed at a rate of pay specified in or fixed according to subchapter II of 5 U.S.C. chapter 53 (the Executive Schedule). Component designations are listed in appendix B to 5 CFR part 2641.

The representational bar of 18 U.S.C. 207(c) usually extends to the whole of any department or agency in which a former senior employee served in any capacity during the year prior to termination from a senior employee position. However, 18 U.S.C. 207(h) provides that whenever the Director determines that an agency or bureau within a department or agency in the executive branch exercises functions which are distinct and separate from the remaining functions of the department or agency and there exists no potential for use of undue influence or unfair advantage based on past Government service, the Director shall by rule designate such agency or bureau as a separate component of that department or agency. As a result, a former senior employee who served in a designated component of a parent department or agency is barred from communicating to or making an appearance before any employee of that component, but is not barred as to any employee of the parent, of another designated component, or of any other agency or bureau of the parent that has not been designated. Likewise, a former senior employee who served in a “parent” department or agency is not barred by 18 U.S.C. 207(c) from making communications to or appearances before any employees of any designated component of that parent, but is barred as to employees of that parent or of other components that have not been separately designated.

The Director regularly reviews the component designations listed in appendix B to part 2641, and in

consultation with the department or agency concerned, makes such additions and deletions as are necessary. Specifically, the Director “shall, by rule, make or revoke a component designation after considering the recommendation of the designated agency ethics official.” 5 CFR 2641.302(e)(3). Before designating an agency component as distinct and separate for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207(c), the Director must find that there exists no potential for use of undue influence or unfair advantage based on past Government service, and that the component is an agency or bureau within a parent agency that exercises functions which are distinct and separate from the functions of the parent agency and from the functions of other components of that parent. 5 CFR 2641.302(c).

Pursuant to the procedures prescribed in 5 CFR 2641.302(e), one agency has forwarded a written request to OGE to amend its listing in appendix B to part 2641. After carefully reviewing the requested change in light of the criteria in 18 U.S.C. 207(h) as implemented in 5 CFR 2641.302(c), OGE is proposing to grant this request and amend appendix B as explained below.

The Department of Defense (DoD) has requested that OGE designate the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in appendix B to part 2641 as a separate component of DoD for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207(c) because it exercises functions that are distinct and separate from the functions of the parent agency and other components. DARPA was created under the statutory authority of the Secretary of Defense in 1958, *see* DoD Directive No. 5105.15 (Feb. 7, 1958), in response to the unforeseen launch of the world’s first satellite by the Soviet Union. DARPA “serves as the research and development (R&D) organization in DoD with a primary responsibility of maintaining U.S. technological superiority over our adversaries.” *See* DoD Directive 5134.10 (May 7, 2013, as amended Sept. 22, 2017) (outlining DARPA’s roles and responsibilities). Directive 5134.10 provides independent authority for DARPA to carry out its uniquely-focused mission using its imagination and innovativeness to project what capabilities the military might want in the future, and sponsor high-risk, high payoff research to deliver

those capabilities. DARPA has special hiring authorities and separate and distinct contracting authorities that help it exercise this mission.

DARPA is a small component, both in absolute terms and in relative terms as compared to the DoD as a whole. DARPA currently has about 220 employees, while the DoD civilian workforce is approximately 750,000 individuals and the entirety of DoD has almost 3 million individuals. Although the Director of DARPA reports to the DoD Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Director of DARPA is delegated broad authority and responsibility to act independently and with minimal supervision in carrying out the organization's mission and directing its research strategy and execution. Directive 5134.10 delegates to the Director of DARPA the fiscal, contracting, and acquisition authority necessary to carry out the organization's responsibilities, as well as authority to communicate directly with other domestic and foreign entities. *See* Directive 5134.10, paragraph 7. DARPA has a separate and distinct budget, and conducts its budgeting process independently of the Office of the Secretary of Defense or any DoD component, including decisions regarding which programs to fund that support the development of breakthrough technologies and capabilities for national security. DARPA's budget independence demonstrates that it does not exercise significant responsibilities that cut across organizational lines within DoD.

According to DoD, designating DARPA as a separate component will not create the potential for undue influence or unfair advantage based on past government service. DARPA independently determines what R&D projects to pursue, and those projects are separate and unique from the rest of DoD and do not cut across organizational lines. Other DoD components do not typically get involved in DARPA's R&D work because the component's mission contemplates developing radically new technologies that do not exist at present and are not known to other DoD components. The typical senior employee who departs DARPA has worked on projects that are entirely outside of and beyond the work of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and other DoD components.

OGE is proposing to grant the request of DoD and amend the agency's listing in appendix B to part 2641 to add DARPA as a new component for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207(c). DARPA is separate and distinct from its parent organization and other DoD

components, and given the manner in which DARPA works independently from other component agencies and the general management of the DoD, there exists no potential for the use of undue influence or unfair advantage based on past Government service.

As indicated in 5 CFR 2641.302(f), a designation "shall be effective on the date the rule creating the designation is published in the **Federal Register** and shall be effective as to individuals who terminated senior service either before, on or after that date." Initial designations in appendix B to part 2641 were effective as of January 1, 1991. The effective date of subsequent designations is indicated by means of parenthetical entries in appendix B. The new component designation of DARPA made in this proposed rule would be effective on the date the final rule is published in the **Federal Register**.

II. Matters of Regulatory Procedure

Regulatory Flexibility Act

As Director of the Office of Government Ethics, I certify under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 6) that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it affects only Federal departments and agencies and current and former Federal employees.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) does not apply to this proposed rule because it does not contain information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

For purposes of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. chapter 25, subchapter II), this proposed rule would not significantly or uniquely affect small governments and will not result in increased expenditures by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more (as adjusted for inflation) in any one year.

Congressional Review Act

The proposed rule is not a major rule as defined in 5 U.S.C. chapter 8, Congressional Review of Agency Rulemaking.

Executive Orders 13563 and 12866

Executive Orders 13563 and 12866 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select the regulatory

approaches that maximize net benefits (including economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. In promulgating this proposed rule, the Office of Government Ethics has adhered to the regulatory philosophy and the applicable principles of regulation set forth in Executive Orders 12866 and 13563. This proposed rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 because it is not a "significant" regulatory action for the purposes of that order.

Executive Order 12988

As Director of the Office of Government Ethics, I have reviewed this proposed rule in light of section 3 of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, and certify that it meets the applicable standards provided therein.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 2641

Conflict of interests, Government employees.

Approved: November 17, 2020.

Emory Rounds,

Director, Office of Government Ethics.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Office of Government Ethics proposes to amend 5 CFR part 2641, as set forth below:

PART 2641—POST-EMPLOYMENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST RESTRICTIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 2641 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. App. (Ethics in Government Act of 1978); 18 U.S.C. 207; E.O. 12674, 54 FR 15159, 3 CFR, 1989 Comp., p. 215, as modified by E.O. 12731, 55 FR 42547, 3 CFR, 1990 Comp., p. 306.

■ 2. Amend appendix B to part 2641 by adding the listings for the Department of Defense to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 2641—Agency Components for Purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207(c)

* * * * *

Parent: Department of Defense

Components

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) (EFFECTIVE UPON PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL RULE IN THE **Federal Register**).

Department of the Air Force.
Department of the Army.
Department of the Navy.

Defense Information Systems Agency.
 Defense Intelligence Agency.
 Defense Logistics Agency.
 Defense Threat Reduction Agency
 (effective February 5, 1999).

National Geospatial-Intelligence
 Agency (formerly National Imagery and
 Mapping Agency) (effective May 16,
 1997).

National Reconnaissance Office
 (effective January 30, 2003).

National Security Agency.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2020-25750 Filed 11-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6345-03-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

8 CFR Parts 103 and 235

[Docket No. USCBP-2020-0035]

RIN 1651-AB34

Harmonization of the Fees and Application Procedures for the Global Entry and SENTRI Programs and Other Changes

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border
 Protection, Department of Homeland
 Security.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking;
 correction; re-opening of comment
 period.

SUMMARY: U.S. Customs and Border
 Protection (CBP) published a notice of
 proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the
Federal Register of September 9, 2020,
 concerning harmonization of the fees for
 the Global Entry and SENTRI trusted
 traveler programs as well as other
 changes to those programs. An incorrect
 Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) was
 inadvertently listed in the heading of
 that document. This document corrects
 the September 9, 2020 document to
 reflect that the correct RIN is 1651-
 AB34 as set forth above. Additionally,
 CBP included a summary of the *CBP
 Trusted Traveler Programs Fee Study*
 (Fee Study) in the NPRM and stated that
 the full Fee Study was included in the
 docket of the rulemaking. CBP
 inadvertently failed to post the Fee
 Study on the docket when the NPRM
 was published. Therefore, CBP is
 notifying the public that the Fee Study
 has now been posted in the docket and
 that CBP is re-opening the comment
 period and requesting comments on the
 stand-alone Fee Study.

DATES: Comments must be received on
 or before December 31, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Charity McKenzie Shick, Regulations

and Rulings, Office of International
 Trade, charity.m.shick@cbp.dhs.gov.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be
 submitted, identified by docket number
 USCBP-2020-0035, by the following
 method:

■ *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the
 instructions for submitting comments.

Due to COVID-19-related restrictions,
 CBP has temporarily suspended its
 ability to receive public comments by
 mail.

Instructions: All submissions received
 must include the agency name and
 docket title for this rulemaking, and
 must reference docket number USCBP-
 2020-0035. All comments received will
 be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>,
 including any personal information provided.
 For detailed instructions on submitting
 comments and additional information
 on the rulemaking process, see the
 “Public Participation” heading of the
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of
 this document.

Docket: For access to the docket to
 read background documents or
 comments received, go to: <https://www.regulations.gov>. Due to relevant
 COVID-19-related restrictions, CBP has
 temporarily suspended its on-site public
 inspection of submitted comments.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation

Interested persons are invited to
 participate in this rulemaking by
 submitting written data, views, or
 arguments on the Fee Study. Only
 comments on the Fee Study will be
 considered. Comments that will provide
 the most assistance to CBP will
 reference a specific portion of the Fee
 Study, explain the reason for any
 recommended change, and include data,
 information, or authority that support
 such recommended change.

Background

CBP operates several voluntary
 trusted traveler programs at land, sea
 and air ports of entry into the United
 States that allow certain pre-approved
 travelers dedicated processing into the
 United States, including the Secure
 Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid
 Inspection (SENTRI) program, the
 Global Entry program, and the NEXUS
 program. As part of an effort to
 harmonize the fees and application
 procedures for these programs, CBP
 published a notice of proposed
 rulemaking (NPRM) titled
 “Harmonization of the Fees and
 Application Procedures for the Global
 Entry and SENTRI Programs and Other

Changes” in the **Federal Register** (85 FR
 55597) on September 9, 2020. The
 NPRM proposes to change the Global
 Entry and SENTRI application fees to a
 uniform amount, provide a uniform
 standard regarding the payment of the
 Global Entry and SENTRI application
 fees for minors, change the fee payment
 schedule and certain aspects of the
 application process for the SENTRI
 program, and incorporate the SENTRI
 program into the Department of
 Homeland Security (DHS) regulations.
 CBP will be issuing a separate **Federal
 Register** notice regarding changes to the
 NEXUS fee.

Fee Study

As part of the development of the
 NPRM, CBP performed a fee study
 entitled *CBP Trusted Traveler Programs
 Fee Study* (Fee Study) to determine the
 amount of the fee that is necessary to
 recover the costs associated with
 application processing for the Global
 Entry, SENTRI, and NEXUS programs.
 In the NPRM and Fee Study, CBP
 concluded that a uniform \$120 fee is
 appropriate and necessary to recover a
 reasonable portion of costs associated
 with application processing for these
 three CBP trusted traveler programs.
 The NPRM summarizes the Fee Study,
 seeks comments on its conclusion, and
 states that the full Fee Study can be
 found in the docket of the rulemaking.
 However, CBP inadvertently failed to
 post the Fee Study to the docket at the
 time the NPRM was published. CBP has
 now posted the Fee Study to the docket
 at <https://www.regulations.gov> under
 docket number USCBP-2020-0035 and
 is re-opening the comment period to
 allow for comments to be submitted on
 that Fee Study. Comments must be
 received on or before December 31,
 2020. CBP will not accept comments on
 any topic other than the Fee Study.

Correction of RIN

In the NPRM document, FR Doc.
 2020-16369, beginning on page 55597
 in the issue of September 9, 2020 (85 FR
 55597), make the following correction in
 the first column:

Remove in the heading of the
 document “RIN 1651-AB94” and add in
 its place “RIN 1651-AB34.”

Alice A. Kipel,

*Executive Director, Regulations and Rulings
 Office of Trade, U.S. Customs and Border
 Protection.*

[FR Doc. 2020-26275 Filed 11-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-14-P