is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

C. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by November 1, 2021. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action.

This action pertaining to the District's regional haze state implementation plan for the second implementation period and correction for the RACT rule for major stationary sources of NO_X may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: August 11, 2021.

Diana Esher,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA amends 40 CFR part 52 as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart J—District of Columbia

■ 2. Amend § 52.470:

■ a. In the table in paragraph (c), by revising the entry for ''Section 805''; and

■ b. In the table in paragraph (e), by adding the entry ''Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period'' at the end of the table.

The revision and addition read as follows:

§ 52.470 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

EPA—APPROVED REGULATIONS AND STATUTES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
*	*	*	*	*
Chapter 8 Asbestos, Sulfur and Nitrogen Oxides				
*	*	*	*	*
Section 805	Reasonably Available Control Technology for Major Stationary Sources of Nitrogen Oxides.	12/14/2018	8/31/2021, [insert **Federal Register** citation].	Amended 805.1(a), 805.1(a)(2), and 805.4 (a) and (b). Previous approval (see the **Federal Register** of 2/24/2020) corrected to include accurate citation of amendments to DC NOx RACT rule.
*	*	*	*	*

* * * * *

(e) * * *

Name of non-regulatory SIP revision	Applicable geographic area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
*	*	*	*	*
Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period.	Statewide	11/8/2019	8/31/2021, [insert **Federal Register** citation].	For the Regional Haze Second Implementation Period.

[FR Doc. 2021–17952 Filed 8–30–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2020–0475; FRL–8763–01–OCSPP]

Acequinocyl; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of acequinocyl in or on tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B. The Interregional Project Number 4 (IR–4) requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective August 31, 2021. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before November 1, 2021, and must be filed in accordance with the

instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2020–0475, 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), West William Jefferson Clinton 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 Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805.

Due to the public health concerns relating to COVID–19, the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC) and Reading Room is closed to visitors with limited exceptions. The staff continues to provide customer service via email, phone, and webform. For the latest status information on EPA/DC services, docket access, visit *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marietta Echeverria, Acting Director, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Publishing Office's e-CFR site at *http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.*

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2020–0475 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before November 1, 2021. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2020–0475, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/where-send-comments-epa-dockets.*

Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of December 21, 2020 (85 FR 82998) (FRL–10016–93), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 0E8860) by IR–4, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 500 College Road East, Suite 201W, Princeton, NJ 08540. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.599 be amended by establishing a tolerance for the residue of the miticide acequinocyl [2-(acetyloxy)-3-dodecyl-1,4-naphthalenedione] and its metabolite acequinocyl-OH [2-dodecyl-3-hydroxy-1,4-naphthoquinone], expressed as acequinocyl, in or on tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B at 7 parts per million (ppm). That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by IR–4, the petitioner, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA is establishing the tolerance for the tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B at 4 ppm. The reason for this change is explained in Unit IV.C.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is ''safe.'' Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA defines ''safe'' to mean that ''there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.'' This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .''

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for acequinocyl including exposure resulting from the tolerance established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with acequinocyl follows.

In an effort to streamline its publications in the **Federal Register**, EPA is not reprinting sections that repeat what has been previously published for tolerance rulemaking of the same pesticide chemical. Where scientific information concerning a particular chemical remains unchanged, the content of those sections would not vary between tolerance rulemaking and republishing the same sections is unnecessary. EPA considers referral back to those sections as sufficient to provide an explanation of the information EPA considered in making its safety determination for the new rulemaking.

EPA has previously published a number of tolerance rulemakings for acequinocyl, in which EPA concluded, based on the available information, that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm would result from aggregate exposure to acequinocyl and established tolerances for residues of that chemical. EPA is incorporating previously published sections from those rulemakings as described further in this rulemaking, as they remain unchanged.

Toxicological profile. For a discussion of the Toxicological Profile of acequinocyl, see Unit III.A. of the June 7, 2018 rulemaking (83 FR 26369) (FRL–9978–20).

Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern. For a summary of the Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern for acequinocyl used for human risk assessment, please reference Unit III.B. of the January 18, 2017 rulemaking (82 FR 5409) (FRL–9956–85).

Exposure assessment. Much of the exposure assessment remains the same although updates have occurred to accommodate exposures from the petitioned-for tolerance. These updates are discussed in this section; for a description of the rest of the EPA approach to and assumptions for the exposure assessment, please reference Unit III.C. of the June 7, 2018 rulemaking.

EPA's dietary exposure assessments have been updated to include the additional exposure from the new use of acequinocyl on the commodities in tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B. The assessment used the same assumptions as the June 7, 2018 final rule concerning tolerance-level residues, default processing factors for all processed commodities and 100 percent crop treated.

Drinking water exposure. EPA has revised the acequinocyl drinking water assessment since the June 7, 2018 rulemaking to reflect the water solubility limits of acequinocyl and its hydroxylated degradate acequinocyl-OH (R1) due to uncertainty in the environmental fate study data. The recommended acute estimated drinking water concentration (EDWC) is 21 parts per billion (ppb) based on the water solubility limits of acequinocyl and acequinocyl-OH added together. The recommended chronic EDWC is 14 ppb, which is the maximum amount of acequinocyl residues of concern that may be present over a year. This level is based on the solubility of the degradate acequinocyl-OH (R1), which persists over the chronic exposure period.

Non-occupational exposure. There are no new residential (non-occupational) exposures associated with the new proposed use. The assessment of exposures to the currently registered uses on residential sites (*e.g.,* ornamentals for landscapes, gardens, and trees) has not changed since the June 7, 2018 rulemaking.

Cumulative exposure. Unlike other pesticides for which EPA has followed a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity, EPA has not made a common mechanism of toxicity finding as to acequinocyl and any other substances and acequinocyl does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this action, therefore, EPA has not assumed that acequinocyl has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances.

Safety Factor for Infants and Children. EPA continues to conclude that there are reliable data to support the reduction of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) safety factor. See Unit III.D. of the June 7, 2018 rulemaking for a discussion of the Agency's rationale for that determination.

Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety. EPA determines whether acute and chronic dietary pesticide exposures are safe by comparing aggregate exposure estimates to the acute population adjusted dose (aPAD) and the chronic population adjusted dose (cPAD). Short-, intermediate-, and chronic term risks are evaluated by comparing the estimated aggregate food, water, and residential exposure to the appropriate points of departure to ensure that an adequate margin of exposure (MOE) exists. For linear cancer risks, EPA calculates the lifetime probability of acquiring cancer given the estimated aggregate exposure.

Acute dietary risks are below the Agency's level of concern of 100% of the aPAD; they are 96% of the aPAD for children 1 to 2 years old, the population subgroup with the highest exposure estimate. Chronic dietary risks are below the Agency's level of concern of 100% of the cPAD; they are 90% of the cPAD for children 1 to 2 years old, the population subgroup with the highest exposure estimate.

As explained in the June 7, 2018 rulemaking, the Agency has assumed that there will be no residential handler exposure; therefore, a residential handler assessment was not conducted. The Agency only anticipates short-term post-application dermal exposures from registered uses of acequinocyl in residential areas. Using the exposure assumptions described for short-term exposures, EPA has concluded the combined short-term food, water, and residential exposures result in aggregate MOEs of 1,800 in adults and 1,400 for children 6 to 11 years old. Because EPA's level of concern for acequinocyl is an MOE of 100 or below, these MOEs are not of concern.

As stated in the June 7, 2018 rulemaking, acequinocyl is not registered for any use patterns that would result in intermediate-term residential exposure. Because there is no intermediate-term residential exposure and chronic dietary exposure has been assessed under the appropriately protective cPAD, EPA relies on the chronic dietary risk assessment for evaluating intermediate-term risk for acequinocyl.

Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in two adequate rodent carcinogenicity studies, acequinocyl is not expected to pose a cancer risk to humans.

Therefore, based on the risk assessments and information described above, EPA concludes there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children, from aggregate exposure to acequinocyl residues. More detailed information can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in the document titled ''Acequinocyl. Human Health Risk Assessment for the Proposed New Use on Tropical and Subtropical, Medium to Large Fruit, Smooth, Inedible Peel (Subgroup 24B)'' in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2020–0475.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

For a discussion of the available analytical enforcement method, see Unit IV.A. of the June 7, 2018 rulemaking.

B. International Residue Limits

In making its tolerance decisions, EPA seeks to harmonize U.S. tolerances with

international standards whenever possible, consistent with U.S. food safety standards and agricultural practices. EPA considers the international maximum residue limits (MRLs) established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), as required by FFDCA section 408(b)(4).

The Codex has not established an MRL for residues of acequinocyl in/on tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, inedible peel, subgroup 24B.

C. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances

FFDCA section 408(d)(4)(A)(i) permits the Agency to finalize a tolerance that varies from that sought by the petition. The petitioner initially requested a tolerance of 7 ppm for tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel (crop subgroup 24B). However, upon review of the requested tolerance, the Agency noticed that the petitioner incorrectly calculated the residues for whole fruit. Whole fruit residues were calculated as the sum of residues for pulp and peel combined and did not account for total sample weight. Residue concentrations are expressed in ppm, which is equivalent to mg/kg; therefore, residues from pulp and peel cannot simply be combined together to determine whole fruit residues without accounting for total sample weight. The corrected residue concentrations for the whole fruit were approximately half of the initially calculated concentrations and produced a recommended tolerance of 4 ppm when entered into the OECD calculator.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, a tolerance is established for residues of acequinocyl, including its metabolites and degradates, in or on tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B at 4 ppm.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(d) in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled ''Regulatory Planning and Review'' (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this action has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001), or to Executive Order 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled ''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'' (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), do not apply.

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or Tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or Tribal Governments, on the relationship between the National Government and the States or Tribal Governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled ''Federalism'' (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

VII. 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, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides, and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 18, 2021.

Catherine Aubee,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, for the reasons stated in the preamble, EPA is amending 40 CFR chapter 1 as follows:

PART 180—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES IN FOOD

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

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.599, amend the table in paragraph (a) by adding a table heading and in alphabetical order an entry for ''Tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B'' to read as follows:

§ 180.599 Acequinocyl; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (a)

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * * * *	
Tropical and subtropical, medium to large fruit, smooth, inedible peel subgroup 24B	4
* * * * * * *	

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2021–18716 Filed 8–30–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Parts 59, 61, and 62

[Docket ID FEMA–2018–0026]

RIN 1660–AA95

National Flood Insurance Program: Conforming Changes To Reflect the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (BW–12) and the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (HFIAA), and Additional Clarifications for Plain Language; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency; DHS.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On July 20, 2020, FEMA published in the **Federal Register** a final rule revising the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations to codify certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014, and to clarify certain existing NFIP rules relating to NFIP operations and the Standard Flood Insurance Policy. This final rule provides corrections to those instructions, to be used in lieu of the information published July 20.

DATES: This correction is effective October 1, 2021.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this rulemaking is available for inspection using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* and can be viewed by following that website's instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Bronowicz, Director, Policyholder Services Division, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 400 C Street SW, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 557–9488.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In FR Doc. 2020–09260, beginning on page 43946 in the **Federal Register** of Monday, July 20, 2020, the following corrections are made:

PART 61—INSURANCE COVERAGE AND RATES

Appendix A(1) to Part 61 [Corrected]

■ 1. On page 43961, in the first column, in Appendix A(1) to Part 61, article III.A.5.a, ''(*see* II.B.6.a)'' is corrected to read ''(*see* II.C.6.a)''.

■ 2. On page 43963, in the second column, in Appendix A(1) to Part 61, article IV.4, ''(see II.B.6.c)'' is corrected to read ''(*see* II.C.6.c)''.

Appendix A(2) to Part 61 [Corrected]

■ 3. On page 43970, in the first column, in Appendix A(2) to Part 61, article III.A.6.a, ''(*see* II.B.6.a.)'' is corrected to read ''(*see* II.C.6.a)''.

Appendix A(3) to Part 61 [Corrected]

■ 4. On page 43978, in the first column, in Appendix A(3) to Part 61, article III.A.6.a, ''(*see* II.B.6.a.)'' is corrected to read ''(*see* II.C.6.a)''.

Deanne B. Criswell,

Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2021–18262 Filed 8–30–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–52–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 0 and 64

[WC Docket Nos. 17–97 and 21–291; FCC 21–93; FR ID 45192]

Call Authentication Trust Anchor; Appeals of the STIR/SHAKEN Governance Authority Token Revocation Decisions

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (the Commission) adopts rules establishing a process for voice service providers aggrieved by a token revocation decision of the private STIR/SHAKEN Governance Authority to file a request for review to the Commission. Without this process the private STIR/SHAKEN Governance Authority can place other private entities out of compliance with the Commission's STIR/SHAKEN implementation rules without oversight from the Commission. The adopted rules will provide appropriate oversight and ensure due process for voice service providers aggrieved by a Governance Authority token revocation decision.

DATES: Effective September 30, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexander Hobbs, Attorney Advisor, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at (202) 418–7433, or email: *Alexander.Hobbs@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Report and Order in WC Docket Nos. 17–97, 21–291, FCC 21–93, adopted on August 5, 2021, and released on August 6, 2021. The complete text of this document is available for download at *https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-21-93A1.pdf.* To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Synopsis

I. Introduction

Caller ID authentication using the STIR/SHAKEN framework is a key component of our multi-pronged effort to combat the scourge of illegal robocalls. STIR/SHAKEN is a set of technological standards that helps to prevent illegal ''spoofing,'' a practice that involves falsifying caller ID information in order to trick unsuspecting Americans into thinking that calls are trustworthy because the caller ID information appears as if the call came from a neighbor or a familiar or reputable source. With voice service providers required by our rules to implement STIR/SHAKEN in the internet Protocol (IP) portions of their networks by June 30, 2021, Americans are now in a position to answer their phones with greater confidence that the number displayed is correct.

To guard against bad actors and preserve trust within the distributed caller ID authentication system, the ability of a voice service provider to participate in STIR/SHAKEN can be revoked by the private Governance Authority that oversees the STIR/SHAKEN framework. This revocation process effectively allows the private Governance Authority to make decisions that render voice service providers noncompliant with our rules. To provide appropriate oversight and ensure due process, today we establish a process for voice service providers to appeal such revocation decisions to the Commission.

II. Background

To address the issue of illegal caller ID spoofing, technologists from the internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) developed standards to allow for