

by Tracey A. LeBeau, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DOE Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of the Department of Energy. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Signed in Washington, DC, on August 29, 2025.

Jennifer Hartzell,

*Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer,
U.S. Department of Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2025-16885 Filed 9-2-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060-0289; FR ID 310634]

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collections. Comments are requested concerning: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees. The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the PRA that does not display a valid OMB control number.

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before November 3, 2025. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Cathy Williams, FCC, via email *PRA@fcc.gov* and to *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Cathy Williams at (202) 418-2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060-0289.

Title: Section 76.601, Performance Tests; § 76.1704, Proof of Performance Test Data;

§ 76.1717, Compliance with Technical Standards.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, and state, local, or tribal government.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 4,085 respondents, 6,433 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.5 to 70 hours.

Frequency of Response: Recordkeeping requirement, Semi-annual and Triennial reporting requirements; Third party disclosure requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this collection of information is contained in sections 4(i) and 624(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Total Annual Burden: 166,405 hours.

Total Annual Cost: No cost.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality with this collection of information.

Needs and Uses: 47 CFR 76.601(b) requires the operator of each cable television system that delivers analog signals to conduct performance tests of the analog channels on that system at least twice each calendar year (at intervals not to exceed seven months).

47 CFR 76.1704 requires that proof of performance test required by 47 CFR 76.601 shall be maintained on file at the operator's local business office for at least five years. The test data shall be made available for inspection by the Commission or the local franchiser, upon request. If a signal leakage log is being used to meet proof of performance test recordkeeping requirement in accordance with § 76.601, such a log

must be retained for the period specified in 47 CFR 76.601(d). 47 CFR 76.1717 states that an operator shall be prepared to show, on request by an authorized representative of the Commission or the local franchising authority, that the system does, in fact, comply with the technical standards rules in part 76, subpart K.

Federal Communications Commission.

Aleta Bowers,

Information Management Specialist, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025-16807 Filed 9-2-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[WC Docket No. 17-97; DA 25-763; FR ID 310677]

Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comment on Two Periodic TRACED Act Obligations Regarding STIR/SHAKEN Caller ID Authentication

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) of the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) seeks comment concerning two recurring statutory obligations under the Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act (TRACED Act). First, the Bureau seeks comment on whether the extensions granted by the Commission for implementation of the STIR/SHAKEN caller ID authentication framework should be revised or extended. Second, the Bureau seeks comment to inform the Commission's second triennial assessment of the efficacy of the STIR/SHAKEN caller ID authentication framework as a tool to combat illegal robocalls.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 3, 2025, and reply comments are due on or before October 20, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated on the first page of this document. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS).

• *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the ECFS: <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs>.

- *Paper Filers*: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.

- Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial courier, or by the U.S. Postal Service. All filings must be addressed to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- Hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary are accepted between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. by the FCC's mailing contractor at 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.

- Commercial courier deliveries (any deliveries not by the U.S. Postal Service) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- Filings sent by U.S. Postal Service First-Class Mail, Priority Mail, and Priority Mail Express must be sent to 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

People with Disabilities: 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 & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information about the *Public Notice*, please contact Janice Gorin, Attorney Advisor, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at Janice.Gorin@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Bureau's *Public Notice*, DA 25-763, in WC Docket No. 17-97, released on August 27, 2025. The complete text of this document is available for download at <https://www.fcc.gov/document/wcb-seeks-comment-two-traced-act-obligations-1>.

Ex Parte Rules. This proceeding shall be treated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation

consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

Synopsis

I. Comments Sought on Stir/Shaken Implementation Extensions

In the TRACED Act, Congress instructed the Commission to "assess any burdens or barriers" to the implementation of STIR/SHAKEN that certain providers might face, and "upon a public finding of undue hardship," authorized the Commission to delay STIR/SHAKEN implementation deadlines "for a reasonable period of time." In its initial assessment conducted in 2020 [88 FR 43446-01], the Commission granted three categorical implementation extensions based on undue hardship, and it added a third undue hardship extension in 2023. Pursuant to the TRACED Act, providers also have a continuing extension for the portions of their networks that rely on technology that cannot initiate, maintain, or terminate session internet protocol (SIP) calls. Because this extension was not granted on the basis of undue hardship, we do not address it further in this Public Notice. Additionally, providers that lack control over the network infrastructure necessary to implement STIR/SHAKEN are exempt from implementing STIR/SHAKEN. As this is not an undue hardship extension, we also do not address it further in this Public Notice. Only two such extensions remain for (1) providers that cannot obtain the Service

Provider Code (SPC) token necessary to participate in STIR/SHAKEN, and (2) small voice service providers that originate calls via satellite using North American Numbering Plan (NANP) numbers. The extension for services scheduled for section 214 discontinuance expired on June 30, 2022, and the extension for non-facilities-based and facilities-based small voice service providers ended on June 30, 2022, and June 30, 2023, respectively.

The TRACED Act further instructs the Commission to annually "consider revising or extending" any extension granted due to undue hardship, including whether an extension remains necessary. To comply, the Commission has directed the Bureau to annually "reevaluate" and "revise or extend" any such extension "as necessary." As part of this evaluation, the Bureau may lengthen a granted extension and it can also decrease, but not expand, the scope of entities that are entitled to such an extension.

Pursuant to the TRACED Act and section 64.6304(f) of the Commission's rules, we seek comment to enable our annual reevaluation of the remaining STIR/SHAKEN undue hardship implementation extensions. When considering whether a hardship is "undue" under the TRACED Act, and whether an extension is for a "reasonable amount of time," the Commission has found it appropriate to balance the hardship of compliance due to "the burdens and barriers to implementation" faced by a provider or class of providers with the benefit to the public of implementing STIR/SHAKEN expeditiously. With that in mind, we seek comment on whether the Bureau should revise or extend the two remaining extensions.

Extension for Providers That Cannot Obtain an SPC Token. We seek comment on the extension for providers that cannot obtain an SPC token. To participate in STIR/SHAKEN, a provider must obtain an SPC token through the STIR/SHAKEN governance system. Because access to a token is necessary for participation in STIR/SHAKEN, the Commission initially granted providers unable to obtain a token an indefinite extension until they were able to receive a token. In May 2021, the STIR/SHAKEN Governance Authority revised the Token Access Policy to enable more providers to obtain a token. In its November 2024 *Eighth Caller ID Authentication Report and Order* [90 FR 40241], the Commission required, *inter alia*, that all providers with a STIR/SHAKEN implementation obligation obtain an SPC token from the STIR/

SHAKEN Policy Administrator, but declined to repeal the indefinite SPC token extension.

In its most recent annual evaluation, the Bureau declined to terminate or modify the extension so staff could assess the number of providers still claiming the extension in their most recent Robocall Mitigation Database submissions and the merit of those claims. To supplement this assessment, we seek comment on the types and number of providers that remain unable to obtain a token and the barriers to token access for these providers, in light of the changes to the Token Access Policy. Is there anything that can be done to make tokens available to these providers? Does the extension remain necessary?

Extension for Small Voice Service Providers Originating Calls via Satellite Using NANP Numbers. We seek comment on the Commission's extension for small voice service providers that originate calls via satellite using NANP numbers. The Commission adopted this indefinite extension concluding that the balance of benefits and burdens counseled "against requiring such providers to implement" STIR/SHAKEN. We seek comment on the current benefits, burdens, and barriers to STIR/SHAKEN implementation by small voice service providers that originate calls via satellite using NANP numbers. Have these benefits, burdens, and barriers changed since the Commission adopted the extension and if so, how? Do the justifications for the extension still apply? Have any abuses occurred due to this extension, or are any abuses likely to result if the extension is continued? What impact does the extension have on the Commission's longstanding goal of achieving ubiquitous deployment of the STIR/SHAKEN framework? Is it necessary for the extension to remain indefinite, or would it be more appropriate to modify the extension to provide a known end date?

II. Comments Sought on Stir/Shaken Efficacy

Section 4(b)(4) of the TRACED Act directs the Commission to, every three years, "assess the efficacy of the technologies used for [the] call authentication frameworks" implemented pursuant to the TRACED Act and "based on the assessment . . . revise or replace the call authentication frameworks . . . if the Commission determines it is in the public interest to do so." The Commission must submit to Congress "a report on the findings of the assessment" and any actions taken by the Commission "to revise or replace

the call authentication frameworks." Before conducting the assessment under the TRACED Act, the Commission is required to provide public notice and an opportunity to comment. The Commission submitted its first such triennial report to Congress on December 20, 2022, finding that STIR/SHAKEN is effective at authenticating caller ID information. Through this Public Notice, the Bureau seeks comment to inform the Commission's second triennial assessment on the efficacy of STIR/SHAKEN, which remains the only call authentication framework currently implemented pursuant to the TRACED Act.

In the *First Triennial Report*, the Bureau established a standard for conducting its assessment that is based on "how well [STIR/SHAKEN] effectuates the authentication of caller ID information." Although the Bureau considered applying alternative standards, such as STIR/SHAKEN's "impact on preventing illegally spoofed robocalls, or preventing all illegal robocalls," it agreed with the majority of commenters that assessing STIR/SHAKEN under such standards "would fail to account for the fact that, while a critical tool in protecting consumers from illegal spoofing, the STIR/SHAKEN framework is only one facet of the larger campaign by the Commission and industry to combat illegal robocalls." The Bureau seeks comment on whether it should maintain, revise, or replace this standard for its second assessment of the efficacy of STIR/SHAKEN.

In the three years that have passed since the Commission conducted its first triennial assessment, providers have gained more experience implementing the STIR/SHAKEN framework. The Commission has also adopted rules expanding STIR/SHAKEN implementation obligations to cover gateway providers and non-gateway intermediate providers, in addition to voice service providers. Gateway providers were required to implement STIR/SHAKEN by June 30, 2023, and non-gateway intermediate providers that receive unauthenticated calls directly from domestic originating providers were required to authenticate those calls using STIR/SHAKEN as of December 31, 2023. Now, all providers with control over the network infrastructure necessary to authenticate calls are required to implement STIR/SHAKEN for SIP calls unless subject to an exemption or extension. With these developments in mind, we seek comment on how well STIR/SHAKEN effectuates the authentication of caller ID information today. Are there ways

STIR/SHAKEN could be more effective at authenticating caller ID information? Do any specific factors limit STIR/SHAKEN's efficacy, and what solutions might resolve these issues? Have there been other developments, such as industry changes or evolution in technologies, that affect the efficacy of STIR/SHAKEN, and how should any such developments be factored into our assessment? Do any commenters believe the Commission should revise STIR/SHAKEN or replace it with a different framework? We also seek comment on the efficacy of STIR/SHAKEN under any alternative standard proposed by commenters.

Federal Communications Commission.

Joseph Calascione,

Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2025-16804 Filed 9-2-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 25-24]

Southern International Co., Ltd., Complainant v. Daynamez Group of Companies LLC, Respondent; Notice of Filing of Complaint and Assignment

Notice is given that a complaint has been filed with the Federal Maritime Commission (the "Commission") by Southern International Co., Ltd. (the "Complainant") against Daynamez Group of Companies LLC (the "Respondent"). Complainant states that the Commission has subject-matter jurisdiction over the complaint pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 41301 and 46 CFR 502.61(c).

Complainant is a limited liability company and ocean transportation intermediary organized and operating under the laws of Vietnam with its principal place of business located in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

Complainant identifies Respondent as a limited liability company organized and operating under the laws of the state of Virginia with its principal place of business located in Fairfax, Virginia.

Complainant alleges that Respondent violated 46 U.S.C. 41102(c); 41104(a)(2) and (a)(3); and 41105(1). Complainant alleges these violations arose from Respondent's failure to remit payment to relevant carriers for the shipping of 558 containers contracted by Complainant, repeated misappropriation of funds, and other acts or omissions by Respondent.

An answer to the complaint must be filed with the Commission within 25 days after the date of service.