

document, would USDA need to consider in order to properly review and assess risks associated with amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering that are intended for agricultural purposes? Are there limitations to the types of information that could be gathered or technologies that could be used to inform the evaluation of animal health claims? If so, please describe the limitations.

- What is the minimal information would need to consider to evaluate animal disease claims made for the animals of the amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering? What are the limitations of current technologies that exist to evaluate animal disease claims?

- What other animal health claims, aside from disease resistance, should USDA require developers to validate? Why?

- Under the current proposal, USDA is not performing a post-market evaluation of animal health. Should USDA require developers to submit information in order to monitor risks to animal health post-market? Why?

- Are there any gaps in the contemplated framework with respect to animal and human health, and if so, how might they be addressed?

Regulatory Authority and Framework

- Does the contemplated regulatory framework provide adequate scope and flexibility to regulate current and future advances in agricultural animals developed using genetic engineering?

- What, if any, terms related to the regulation of animals of the amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering would need to be defined under the contemplated regulatory framework?

- Should animals of the amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering with multiple uses (such as an amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering and intended for both biomedical/ pharmaceutical purposes and agricultural purposes) receive any different treatment than other amenable species during USDA's review processes? What steps should USDA take to ensure efficient review of these products? What steps should USDA take to account for existing regulatory burden when a product must be reviewed both by USDA and by another agency?

- Do you have any other specific concerns or recommendations for appropriately reducing regulatory burdens involving the regulation of amenable species modified or

developed using genetic engineering by USDA as described in this document?

Genetic Engineering and Conventional Breeding

- What are the known current limits of conventional breeding in animals in terms of generating and/or selecting for a specific trait, or multiple traits?

- What problems are entities currently attempting to solve using animals modified or developed using genetic engineering?

FSIS Assessment

- Would the pre-slaughter assessment ever require physical examination or testing by FSIS of amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering, specifically examination or testing in regard to their genetic modifications, prior to arrival at the slaughter facility? If so, under what circumstances?

- What documentation, if any, should accompany amenable species modified or developed using genetic engineering destined for slaughter, certifying that their modifications have been assessed by USDA (APHIS and FSIS)?

Economic Considerations

- What classes of entities are currently engaged in the modification, production, breeding, distribution, commercialization or any related activities involving animals modified or developed using genetic engineering? How many of these entities fall within or below the threshold for "small entity" size standards according to the Small Business Administration?

- What markets are there where animals for agricultural use modified or developed using genetic engineering have been produced and commercialized? What challenges and opportunities (regulatory, economic, or otherwise) have been encountered by the relevant authorities?

- How often does a start-up company or not-for-profit university or research organization modify or develop an animal using genetic engineering?

- Could the contemplated regulatory framework have adverse impacts on international trade (imports or exports)? If so, what?

- Should USDA assess user fees in connection with conducting reviews for animals modified or developed using genetic engineering? If so, how should USDA structure the fees? What factors should USDA consider in assessing fees?

We welcome all comments on the questions outlined above and on all aspects of this document.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 8301–8317; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

Done in Washington, DC, this 18th day of December 2020.

Lorren Walker,

Acting Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

Paul Kiecker,

Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2020–28534 Filed 12–23–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2020–1165; Project Identifier 2019–SW–027–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Airbus Helicopters Model SA341G and SA342J helicopters. This proposed AD was prompted by the determination that a new life limit was necessary for certain tail rotor blades (TRBs). This proposed AD would require replacing certain TRBs, re-identifying certain TRBs, and repairing certain other TRBs, as specified in a European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD, which is proposed for incorporation by reference. The FAA is proposing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: The FAA must receive comments on this proposed AD by February 11, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery:* Deliver to Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For material that will be incorporated by reference (IBR) in this AD, contact the EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 89990 000; email ADS@easa.europa.eu; internet www.easa.europa.eu. You may find this IBR material on the EASA website at <https://ad.easa.europa.eu>. You may view this IBR material at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Room 6N-321, Fort Worth, TX 76177. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 817-222-5110. It is also available in the AD docket on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA-2020-1165.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA-2020-1165; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this NPRM, any comments received, and other information. The street address for Docket Operations is listed above. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Blaine Williams, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles ACO Branch, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627-5371; email blaine.williams@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

The FAA invites you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under **ADDRESSES**. Include "Docket No. FAA-2020-1165; Project Identifier 2019-SW-027-AD" at the beginning of your comments. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the proposal, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. The FAA will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposal because of those comments.

Except for Confidential Business Information (CBI) as described in the following paragraph, and other information as described in 14 CFR 11.35, the FAA will post all comments received, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. The agency will also post a report

summarizing each substantive verbal contact received about this proposal.

Confidential Business Information

CBI is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this NPRM contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this NPRM, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Please mark each page of your submission containing CBI as "PROPIN." The FAA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under the FOIA, and they will not be placed in the public docket of this NPRM. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Blaine Williams, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles ACO Branch, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627-5371; email blaine.williams@faa.gov. Any commentary that the FAA receives that is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this rulemaking.

Discussion

The EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union, has issued EASA AD 2019-0034, dated February 14, 2019 (EASA AD 2019-0034) (also referred to as the Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information, or the MCAI), to correct an unsafe condition for all Airbus Helicopters Model SA341G and SA342J helicopters.

This proposed AD was prompted by the determination that a new life limit was necessary for TRBs that were manufactured without a new process that affects the structural characteristics. The FAA is proposing this AD to address TRBs that might break, resulting in loss of tail rotor control and consequent loss of control of the helicopter. See the MCAI for additional background information.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51

EASA AD 2019-0034 describes procedures for replacing TRBs having certain part numbers, re-identifying TRBs having a certain part number and certain serial numbers, and repairing TRBs that have been reworked/repaired/modified before being re-identified.

This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course

of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

FAA's Determination and Requirements of This Proposed AD

This product has been approved by the aviation authority of another country, and is approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the bilateral agreement with the State of Design Authority, the FAA has been notified of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA is proposing this AD because the FAA evaluated all the relevant information and determined the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design.

Proposed AD Requirements

This proposed AD would require accomplishing the actions specified in EASA AD 2019-0034, described previously, as incorporated by reference, except for any differences identified as exceptions in the regulatory text of this proposed AD.

Explanation of Required Compliance Information

In the FAA's ongoing efforts to improve the efficiency of the AD process, the FAA initially worked with Airbus and EASA to develop a process to use certain EASA ADs as the primary source of information for compliance with requirements for corresponding FAA ADs. The FAA has since coordinated with other manufacturers and civil aviation authorities (CAAs) to use this process. As a result, EASA AD 2019-0034 will be incorporated by reference in the FAA final rule. This proposed AD would, therefore, require compliance with EASA AD 2019-0034 in its entirety, through that incorporation, except for any differences identified as exceptions in the regulatory text of this proposed AD. Using common terms that are the same as the heading of a particular section in the EASA AD does not mean that operators need comply only with that section. For example, where the AD requirement refers to "all required actions and compliance times," compliance with this AD requirement is not limited to the section titled "Required Action(s) and Compliance Time(s)" in the EASA AD. Service information specified in EASA AD 2019-0034 that is required for compliance with EASA AD 2019-0034 will be available on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No.

FAA-2020-1165 after the FAA final rule is published.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this proposed AD affects 20 helicopters of U.S.

registry. The FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this proposed AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR REQUIRED ACTIONS

Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product	Cost on U.S. operators
1 work-hour × \$85 per hour = \$85	\$3,900	\$3,985	\$79,700

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.

The FAA is 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

The FAA 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 levels of government.

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

- (1) Is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866,
- (2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, 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.

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 airworthiness directive:

Airbus Helicopters: Docket No. FAA-2020-1165; Project Identifier 2019-SW-027-AD.

(a) Comments Due Date

The FAA must receive comments by February 11, 2021.

(b) Affected Airworthiness Directives (ADs)

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to Airbus Helicopters Model SA341G and SA342J helicopters, certificated in any category, equipped with any tail rotor blade (TRB) specified in paragraph (c)(1) or (2) of this AD.

(1) An affected part as defined in European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2019-0034, dated February 14, 2019 (EASA AD 2019-0034).

(2) A TRB having part number (P/N) 341A335101.01, P/N 341A335130.05, or P/N 341A335130.06.

(d) Subject

Joint Aircraft System Component (JASC) Code 6410, Tail Rotor Blades.

(e) Reason

This AD was prompted by the determination that a new life limit was necessary for TRBs that were manufactured without a new process that affects the structural characteristics. The FAA is issuing this AD to address TRBs that might break, resulting in loss of tail rotor control and consequent loss of control of the helicopter.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraph (h) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and

compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, EASA AD 2019-0034.

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2019-0034

(1) Where EASA AD 2019-0034 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(2) The “Remarks” section of EASA AD 2019-0034 does not apply to this AD.

(3) Where EASA AD 2019-0034 refers to flight hours (FH), this AD requires using hours time-in-service.

(4) Where paragraph (4) of EASA AD 2019-0034 specifies to contact the manufacturer, for this AD, repair using a method approved by the Manager, Strategic Policy Rotorcraft Section, FAA. For a repair method to be approved by the Manager, Strategic Policy Rotorcraft Section, as required by this paragraph, the Manager’s approval letter must specifically refer to this AD.

(5) Where paragraph (5) of EASA AD 2019-0034 specifies it must be determined that the rework/repair/modification is valid for part number 341A335130.06, for this AD, rework/repair/modification of an affected part is prohibited.

(i) Special Flight Permit

Special flight permits, as described in 14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199, are not allowed.

(j) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

The Manager, Strategic Policy Rotorcraft Section, FAA, may approve AMOCs for this AD. Send your proposal to: Manager, Strategic Policy Rotorcraft Section, FAA, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Fort Worth, TX 76177; telephone 817-222-5110; email 9-ASW-FTW-AMOC-Requests@faa.gov.

(k) Related Information

(1) For EASA AD 2019-0034, contact the EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 89990 000; email ADs@easa.europa.eu; internet www.easa.europa.eu. You may find this EASA AD on the EASA website at <https://ad.easa.europa.eu>. You may view this material at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 10101 Hillwood Pkwy., Room 6N-321, Fort Worth, TX 76177. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 817-222-5110. This material may be found in the AD docket on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA-2020-1165.

(2) For more information about this AD, contact Blaine Williams, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles ACO Branch, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, California 90712; telephone

(562) 627-5371; email blaine.williams@faa.gov.

Issued on December 17, 2020.

Lance T. Gant,

Director, Compliance & Airworthiness Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2020-28440 Filed 12-23-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 310

[Docket ID DoD-2020-OS-0094]

RIN 0790-AL17

Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense (Department or DoD) is giving concurrent notice of a new Department-wide system of records pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 for the DoD 0005 “Defense Training Records” system of records and this proposed rulemaking. In this proposed rulemaking, the Department proposes to exempt portions of the Defense Training Records system of records from certain provisions of the Privacy Act because of national security requirements and to preserve the objectivity and fairness of testing and examination material.

DATES: Send comments on or before February 26, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods.

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

* *Mail:* The DoD cannot receive written comments at this time due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Comments should be sent electronically to the docket listed above.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at <https://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Lyn Kirby, Defense Privacy, Civil

Liberties and Transparency Division, Directorate for Oversight and Compliance, Department of Defense, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24, Suite 08D09, Alexandria, VA 22350-1700; *OSD.DPCLTD@mail.mil*; (703) 571-0070.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The DoD 0005, “Defense Training Records” system of records describes training records created and maintained by all component parts of the DoD, wherever they are maintained. The system consists of both electronic and paper records and will be used by DoD components and offices to maintain records about training provided to DoD-affiliated individuals, including Military Service members, civilian employees, dependents and family members, contractors, and other individuals enrolled in courses administered by the DoD. These records may include information pertaining to class schedules, enrollment, participation, programs, and instructors; training trends and needs; testing and examination materials; and assessments of training efficacy. The collection and maintenance of this information will assist the DoD in meeting its obligations under law, regulation, and policy to provide training on various subjects to ensure that the agency mission can be successfully accomplished.

II. Privacy Act Exemption

The Privacy Act allows federal agencies to exempt eligible records in a system of records from certain provisions of the Act, including those that provide individuals with a right to request access to and amendment of their own records. If an agency intends to exempt a particular system of records, it must first go through the rulemaking process to provide public notice and an opportunity to comment on the proposed exemption. This proposed rule explains why an exemption is being claimed for this system of records and invites public comment, which DoD will consider before the issuance of a final rule implementing the exemption.

The DoD proposes to modify 32 CFR part 310 to add a new Privacy Act exemption rule for the DoD 0005 “Defense Training Records” system of records. The DoD proposes this exemption because some of its training records may contain classified national security information and disclosure of those records to an individual may cause damage to national security. The Privacy Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), authorizes agencies to claim an exemption for systems of records that

contain information properly classified pursuant to executive order. The DoD is proposing to claim an exemption from the access and amendment requirements of the Privacy Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), to prevent disclosure of any information properly classified pursuant to executive order, as implemented by DoD Instruction 5200.01 and DoD Manual 5200.01, Volumes 1 and 3.

The DoD also proposes an exemption for DoD 0005 “Defense Training Records” because these records contain testing and examination material, the release of which could undermine the objectivity and fairness of the testing and examination process. The Privacy Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(6), authorizes agencies to claim an exemption for systems of records that contain examination and testing material used solely to determine individual qualification for appointment or promotion in the Federal service. The DoD is proposing to claim an exemption from the access and amendment requirements of the Privacy Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(6), to prevent disclosure of any information that would compromise the objectivity or fairness of testing and examination material.

If implemented, this rule will deny an individual access under the Privacy Act to only those portions of records for which one or more claimed exemptions apply. In addition, records in the DoD 0005 “Defense Training Records” system of records are only exempt from the Privacy Act to the extent the purposes underlying the exemption pertain to the record.

A notice of a new system of records for DoD 0005 “Defense Training Records” is also published in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

Regulatory Analysis

Executive Order 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review” and Executive Order 13563, “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distribute 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. It has been determined that this proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action.