

Person owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary means any person, wherever located, who acts as an agent, representative, or employee, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign adversary or of a person whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in majority part by a foreign adversary; any person, wherever located, who is a citizen or resident of a nation-state controlled by a foreign adversary; any corporation, partnership, association, or other organization organized under the laws of a nation-state controlled by a foreign adversary; and any corporation, partnership, association, or other organization, wherever organized or doing business, that is owned or controlled by a foreign adversary.

While the Department welcomes comments and views on all aspects of the future licensing process, the Department is particularly interested in obtaining information on the following questions:

- Multiple commenters pointed to notifications to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) regarding certain investments in U.S. businesses and real estate transactions in the United States by foreign persons, as well as voluntary disclosures to the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) regarding potential violations of U.S. export controls, as potential models for creating a process that would provide entities seeking to engage in an ICTS Transaction greater certainty that the transaction will not be prohibited. Given the differences between the type of transactions subject to CFIUS jurisdiction, those governed by BIS's export control regime, and ICTS Transactions governed by the interim final rule, are the CFIUS and BIS processes useful models for an ICTS Transaction licensing or pre-clearance process? If so, are there specific factors or aspects of the CFIUS and BIS processes that Commerce should consider?

- Pre-clearance or licensing processes can take a range of forms from, for example, a regime that would require authorization prior to engaging in an ICTS Transaction, to one that allow entities to seek additional certainty from the Department that a potential ICTS Transaction would not be prohibited by the process under the interim final rule. What are the benefits and disadvantages of these various approaches? Which would be most appropriate given the nature of ICTS transactions? How can

these approaches be implemented to ensure that national security is protected?

- What considerations could be provided to small entities in the licensing or other pre-clearance process that would not impair the goal of protecting the national security?

- Are there categories or types of ICTS Transactions described in 15 CFR 7.3 or within the interim final rule that should or should not be considered for a license or pre-clearance? Are there categories or types of ICTS Transactions described in 15 CFR 7.3 or within the interim final rule that the Department should prioritize for licensing or pre-clearance? Should the licensing or pre-clearance process be structured differently for distinct categories or types of ICTS Transactions?

- Should a license or pre-clearance apply to more than a single ICTS Transaction? For example, should the Department consider issuing a license that applies to multiple ICTS Transactions from a single entity that is engaged in a long-term contract for ICTS? If so, what factors should the Department evaluate in determining the appropriateness of such a license or series of licenses?

- What categories of information should the Department require or not require, e.g. technical, security, operational information?
- While the Department understands that business decisions must often be made within tight timeframes, the Department may not be able to determine whether a particular ICTS Transaction qualifies for a license or pre-clearance without detailed information and analysis. Considering this tension, should the Department issue decisions on a shorter timeframe if that could result in fewer licenses or pre-clearances being granted, or would the inconvenience of a longer timeframe for review be outweighed by the potential for a greater number of licenses or pre-clearances being issued?

- How should the potential for mitigation of an ICTS Transaction be assessed in considering whether to grant a license or pre-clearance for that transaction?

- If a license or pre-clearance request is approved, but the subject ICTS Transaction is subsequently modified, what process should be enacted to avoid invalidation of the license or other form of pre-clearance?

- Should holders of an ICTS Transaction license or other form or pre-clearance have the opportunity to renew them rather than reapplying? If so, what factors should be considered in a renewal assessment? What would be the

appropriate length of time between renewals? How should any renewal process be structured?

Wynn Coggins,

Acting Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021-06529 Filed 3-26-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-20-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 21-55; RM-11878; DA 21-162; FR ID 17506]

Television Broadcasting Services St. George, Utah

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission has before it a petition for rulemaking (Petition) filed by KUTV Licensee, LLC, (Licensee), licensee of KMYU, channel 9, St. George, Utah (KMYU or Station), requesting the substitution of channel 21 for channel 9 at St. George in the DTV Table of Allotments. Licensee states that the proposed channel change from channel 9 to channel 21 would result a substantial increase in signal receivability for KMYU's core viewers and enable viewers to receive the Station's signal with a significantly smaller antenna. Licensee maintains that KMYU, as a VHF channel station, has had a long history of dealing with severe reception problems exacerbated by the analog to digital conversion. The proposed migration of KMYU from channel 9 to channel 21, Licensee contends, will result in the delivery of enhanced signal levels to a large percentage of the Station's population without any predicted loss of coverage. Further, Licensee maintains that the change will result in an predicted increase of more than 8,000 persons in the Station's overall population. Licensee concludes by saying that the public interest would be best served by promptly granting its Petition with the specifications set forth in therein so that St. George-area viewers may benefit from substantially improved over-the-air broadcast television service as soon as possible.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before April 28, 2021 and reply comments on or before May 13, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the

FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for petitioner as follows: Paul A. Cicelski, Esq., Lerman Senter PLLC, 2001 L Street NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC, 20036.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shaun Maher, Media Bureau, at (202) 418-2324; or *Shaun.Maher@fcc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission’s *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, MB Docket No. 21-53; RM-11878; DA 21-162, adopted February 12, 2021, and released February 12, 2021. The full text of this document is available for download at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. To request materials in accessible formats (braille, large print, computer diskettes, or audio recordings), please send an email to *FCC504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Government Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (VOICE), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

This document does not contain information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden “for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,” pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107-198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4). Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited from the time a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is issued to the time the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, *see* 47 CFR 1.1208. There are, however, exceptions to this prohibition, which can be found in § 1.1204(a) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1204(a).

See §§ 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission’s rules for information regarding the proper filing procedures for comments, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas Horan,

Chief of Staff, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rule

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 155, 301, 303, 307, 309, 310, 334, 336, 339.

■ 2. In § 73.622(i) amend the Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments under Utah by revising the entry for St. George to read as follows:

§ 73.622 Digital television table of allotments.

	Community	Channel No.
* * * * *		
(i) * * *		
	Utah	
* * * * *		
St. George		21
* * * * *		

[FR Doc. 2021-06396 Filed 3-26-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems; Denial of Petition for Rulemaking

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition for rulemaking from Jewkes Biomechanics (Jewkes) requesting that NHTSA amend Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 213, “Child restraint systems,” to remove a requirement that child restraint systems (CRSs) must meet performance requirements without use of a top tether, or exclude from that requirement a new kind of CRS that the petitioner would like to develop called a “hybrid CRS.” Alternatively, the petitioner requests that the definition of a “harness” in FMVSS No. 213 be amended to include its hybrid CRS. NHTSA is denying the petition because the requested amendments would unreasonably reduce the child occupant protection provided by FMVSS No. 213.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For non-legal issues, you may contact Cristina Echemendia, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202-366-6345. For legal issues, you may contact Deirdre Fujita, Office of the Chief Counsel, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202-366-5246.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. Petition for Rulemaking
- III. Discussion
 - a. NHTSA Denies the Request To Remove the Untethered Test Completely
 - b. NHTSA Denies the Request To Remove the Untethered Test for Hybrid CRSs
 - c. The Requested Amendment’s Possible Adverse Effect on Child Occupant Protection
 - d. The Absence of Safety Advantages
 - e. Denial of Request To Consider Hybrid CRSs as Harnesses

I. Background

FMVSS No. 213 specifies performance and other requirements for child restraint systems to reduce the number of children killed or injured in motor vehicle crashes.¹ Under FMVSS No. 213, “child restraint systems” are devices, except vehicle lap or lap/shoulder belts, designed for use in a motor vehicle to restrain, seat, or position children weighing 36 kilograms (80 pounds) or less. S5(b) requires each child restraint system to meet the requirements of the standard when tested in accordance with S6.1 and S5. Among other tests is a dynamic frontal sled test involving a 48-kilometer per hour (km/h) (30-mile per hour (mph)) velocity change. NHTSA dynamically tests CRSs with anthropomorphic test devices (test dummies) of sizes representing the children for whom the CRS is designed.

S6.1 specifies the conditions and procedures for the dynamic sled test. Under S6.1.2(a)(1)(B), NHTSA may test a CRS without a top tether attached.²

¹ 49 CFR 571.213, “Child restraint systems.” All references to subparagraphs in this denial of the petition for rulemaking are to FMVSS No. 213 unless otherwise noted. All references in this document to the requirements in FMVSS No. 213 are to the requirements for “add-on” (portable) CRSs (as opposed to “built-in” CRSs). (*See* S4 of 49 CFR 571.213 for definitions of these terms.) NHTSA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on November 2, 2020 proposing updates to FMVSS No. 213, including updating the standard seat assembly used to test CRSs in NHTSA’s compliance tests (85 FR 69388).

² In this document, the terms “tether,” “top tether” and the like also include other