

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 91, No. 173

Wednesday, September 9, 2026

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Administration

7 CFR Parts 210, 215, 220, 225, and 226

[FNS–2025–0013]

RIN 0584–AF06

Simplified Geographic Preference Procurement in Child Nutrition Programs

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Administration (FNA), Department of Agriculture (USDA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: This direct final rule amends geographic preference option language in National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Special Milk Program for Children, Child and Adult Care Program, and Summer Food Service Program regulations. The changes are customer-focused and intended to simplify program regulations and make them easier to understand. They do not change the meaning of the regulations or their implementation.

DATES: This rule will become effective on November 9, 2026, unless the Department receives written adverse comments on or before October 9, 2026. If written adverse comments within the scope of the rulemaking are received, the Department will publish timely notification of withdrawal of this rule or a portion thereof in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: The Food and Nutrition Administration, USDA, invites interested persons to submit written comments on this direct final rule. Comments may be submitted in writing by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal* (preferred): Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Send comments to Community Food Systems Division,

Food and Nutrition Administration, USDA, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705.

All written comments submitted in response to this direct final rule will be included in the record and will be made available to the public. Please be advised that the substance of the comments and the identity of the individuals or entities submitting the comments will be subject to public disclosure. FNA will make the written comments publicly available on the internet via <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Community Food Systems Division, Food and Nutrition Administration, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705; telephone: 703–305–2054.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Section I: Background

Purpose of This Direct Final Rule

The National School Lunch Program (NSLP), School Breakfast Program (SBP), Special Milk Program for Children (SMP), Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), and Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) are collectively referred to as the Child Nutrition Programs (CNP) and offer opportunities for children across the nation to access nutritious, well-balanced meals while supporting local farmers and agriculture. USDA's current geographic preference option regulations provide flexibilities that CNP operators may use to purchase unprocessed foods that are locally grown, caught, or raised; this direct final rule clarifies the existing strategies available through the geographic preference option. This direct final rule reflects Secretary of Agriculture Brooke Rollins' February 2025 commitments to clarify statutory, regulatory, and administrative requirements; create new opportunities to connect America's farmers to nutrition assistance programs; and strengthen strategies to encourage healthy choices, healthy outcomes, and healthy families.¹ *The changes in this direct final rule do not alter the meaning of the regulations or their implementation; rather, they are*

¹ Secretary Rollins' Vision for the Department's 16 Nutrition Programs (February 13, 2025). Available at: <https://www.fns.usda.gov/rollins-statement-nutrition-programs>.

intended to clarify existing regulatory requirements.

USDA expects that clearer regulations will help CNP operators use the geographic preference option, resulting in the procurement of more local, unprocessed agricultural products in CNP meals and snacks. This will also support the Make Our Children Healthy Again Strategy Report, which emphasizes the need to improve access to whole, healthy foods in government-funded nutrition programs and ensure the availability of nutritious food for populations in need.² Furthermore, this clarification will help local agricultural producers, food vendors, and food processors—many of them small businesses—by increasing market opportunities and sales to CNP operators.

Statutory Authority

Section 4302 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–246) amended the National School Lunch Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage institutions operating child nutrition programs to purchase unprocessed, locally grown and locally raised agricultural products.³ Effective October 1, 2008, institutions receiving funds through the child nutrition programs could apply an optional geographic preference for the procurement of unprocessed, locally grown or locally raised agricultural products. This provision applies to institutions operating any of the child nutrition programs, including the NSLP, SBP, SMP, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, CACFP, and SFSP, as well as to purchases made for these programs by the USDA Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program. The provision also applies to State agencies making purchases on behalf of any of the aforementioned child nutrition program operators.

Description of the Direct Final Rule

With this direct final rule, USDA is clarifying the geographic preference option regulations revised by the 2024

² Make America Healthy Again. Commission. Strategy Report: Make Our Children Healthy Again. Available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/The-MAHA-Strategy-WH.pdf> page 10.

³ The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–246). June 18, 2008. Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/110/plaws/publ246/PLAW-110publ246.pdf>.

final rule titled, *Child Nutrition Programs: Meal Patterns Consistent With the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans* (the “2024 rule”).⁴ The 2024 rule expanded the scope of the geographic preference option by allowing CNP operators to use local (e.g., “locally grown,” “locally raised,” or “locally caught”) as a procurement specification (i.e., the written description of a product or service that a vendor must meet to be considered responsive to a solicitation) in addition to using geography as a preference or “selection criteria,” as already allowed in solicitations for unprocessed agricultural products purchased for CNP meals and snacks. Prior to the 2024 rule, CNP operators were only allowed to apply local as a preference, now known as a defined scoring advantage. A defined scoring advantage allows CNP operators to preference local products by awarding additional credits or points to unprocessed agricultural products that are locally grown, caught, or raised, during the evaluation of responses to a solicitation. With the 2024 rule, CNP operators may use both geographic preference option strategies:

- Using local as a procurement specification; and/or
- Applying a defined scoring advantage.

The 2024 rule regulatory language maintained that CNP operators, or State agencies purchasing on their behalf, have maximum flexibility to adopt their own definitions of “local” and did not prescribe a Federal definition for the purpose of procuring local foods for CNPs. The 2024 rule explanatory language also maintained flexibility for CNP operators by continuing to note that Federal regulations do not prescribe the way that geographic preference (i.e., the defined scoring advantage) may be applied or the amount of preference, such as additional credits or points, that can be given to local products. However, the 2024 rule did not add language to program regulations affirming to CNP operators that this flexibility was available to them.

Since the 2024 rule went into effect, USDA has published both implementation guidance and anticipatory policy guidance to support program operators implementing the provision.⁵ This guidance has helped

prevent and address many technical assistance questions related to implementation. This direct final rule codifies clarifying aspects from that guidance by removing unnecessary language, clearly outlining geographic preference option strategies, and making nonsignificant copy edits.

This direct final rule:

1. Replaces “procurement specification” with “product specification” to align with industry terminology.
2. Replaces “selection criteria” with “defined scoring advantage” to align with policy guidance.
3. Affirms that CNP operators have the flexibility to prescribe the way that a defined scoring advantage is applied and the amount of preference given to a product that meets their definition of local.
4. Reformats the regulatory text to clearly describe how geographic preference strategies may be applied during the procurement process as a product specification, a defined scoring advantage during bid evaluation, or a mix of both strategies.
5. Clarifies that CNP operators may use, but are not limited to, the phrases “local,” “locally grown,” “locally raised,” and “locally caught” in their solicitations.
6. Removes the undefined term “minimally processed” since all allowable food handling and preservation techniques are specified in the definition of “unprocessed agricultural products.”
7. For SBP, SMP, CACFP, and SFSP, revises regulations to refer back to NSLP geographic preference option regulations for consistency.

Accordingly, this direct final rule amends 7 CFR 210.21(g), 215.14a(e), 220.16(f), 225.17(e), and 226.22(c) to clarify how to apply the geographic preference option for the procurement of local, unprocessed agricultural products.

This direct final rule is not subject to the requirement to provide notice and an opportunity for public comment because it falls under the good cause exception at 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B). The good cause exception is satisfied when notice and comment is “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” As stated before, the changes in this direct final rule do not alter the

meaning of the regulations or their implementation; rather, they are intended to clarify existing regulatory requirements. It is unnecessary to provide notice and an opportunity for public comment because there is no change to regulations that impact the public.

If a significant adverse comment applies to a part of the direct final rule and that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, USDA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of the significant adverse comment.

Procedural Matters

Regulatory Impact Analysis

This rule is necessary to correct inadequate information in the existing regulatory language that has hitherto been clarified via agency-issued guidance, which is less formal and binding than a rule and may be overlooked by some program operators despite the agency’s best efforts to promulgate the information. By formalizing these clarifications in regulation, the government will ensure that all program operators have access to the same information in determining geographic preference.

USDA assessed possible benefits of the final rule, assuming a baseline counterfactual in which the agency continues to clarify geographic preference via guidance. Because the direct final rule merely clarifies existing guidance and codifies available practices, it does not alter the baseline regulatory environment. Formal clarification of ambiguities through edits to the regulatory language may help reach those who were not aware of the guidance, increase Federal government efficiency by removing the need to re-circulate the guidance or provide redundant technical assistance to those who were unaware of the guidance, and reduce administrative burden for program operators who wish to procure local foods. Any such benefits are likely to be minimal, however, because these clarifications were already officially available from USDA to program operators, posted on the agency website and sent via PartnerWeb so all operators have access.

USDA also assessed possible cost impacts. To the extent that these clarifications induce any marginal shift in procurement patterns—which, as noted, we believe unlikely—purchasing decisions by program operators remain bounded by price-reasonableness standards. As a result, any induced substitution toward geographically preferred vendors is expected to be cost-

⁴ Child Nutrition Programs: Meal Patterns Consistent With the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (89 FR 31962, April 25, 2024). Available at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/25/2024-08098/child-nutrition-programs-meal-patterns-consistent-with-the-2020-2025-dietary-guidelines-for>.

⁵ SP 22–2024, CACFP 08–2024, SFSP 13–2024, Geographic Preference Expansion Related to the

Final Rule titled, *Child Nutrition Programs: Meal Patterns Consistent With the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans*. Available at: <https://www.fns.usda.gov/f2s/geographic-preference-expansion>. SP 24–2024, CACFP 10–2024, SFSP 14, 2024 Geographic Preference Option Questions & Answers. Available at: <https://www.fns.usda.gov/f2s/geographic-preference-option-qa-memo>.

neutral, generating no incremental costs relative to the baseline.

Executive Order 12866, 13563, and 14192

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, 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. This rule is considered an Executive Order 14192 deregulatory action.

This direct final rule has been determined to be significant and was reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in conformance with Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612) requires Agencies to analyze the impact of rulemaking on small entities and consider alternatives that would minimize any significant impacts on a substantial number of small entities. Pursuant to that review, it has been certified that this rule would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While the clarifications made with this rulemaking may help some small businesses increase market opportunities and sales, this direct final rule would not have an impact on small entities because it does not change the meaning of the regulations or their implementation.

Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs designated this rule as not a major rule, as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104–4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local and Tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, the Department generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with “Federal mandates” that may result in expenditures by State, local or Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector, of \$146 million or

more (when adjusted for inflation; GDP deflator source: Table 1.1.9 at <http://www.bea.gov/iTable>) in any one year. When such a statement is needed for a rule, Section 205 of the UMRA generally requires the Department to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the most cost effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule.

This direct final rule does not contain Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local and Tribal governments or the private sector of \$146 million or more in any one year. Thus, the rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA.

Executive Order 12372

The SBP, NSLP, SMP, CACFP, and SFSP are listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under SBP No. 10.553, NSLP No. 10.555, SMP No. 10.556, CACFP No. 10.558, and SFSP No. 10.559, respectively, and are subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 2 CFR chapter IV.) Since the Child Nutrition Programs are State-administered, USDA’s FNA Regional Offices have formal and informal discussions with State and local officials, including representatives of Indian Tribal Organizations, on an ongoing basis regarding program requirements and operations. This provides USDA with the opportunity to receive regular input from program administrators and contributes to the development of feasible program requirements.

Federalism Summary Impact Statement

Executive Order 13132 requires Federal agencies to consider the impact of their regulatory actions on State and local governments. Where such actions have Federalism implications, agencies are directed to provide a statement for inclusion in the preamble to the regulations describing the agency’s considerations in terms of the three categories called for under Section (6)(b)(2)(B) of Executive Order 13132.

The Department has determined that this rule does not have Federalism implications. This rule does not impose substantial or direct compliance costs on State and local governments. Therefore, under Section 6(b) of the Executive Order, a Federalism summary impact statement is not required.

Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform

This direct final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988,

Civil Justice Reform. This rule is intended to have preemptive effect with respect to any State or local laws, regulations or policies which conflict with its provisions or which would otherwise impede its full and timely implementation. This rule is not intended to have retroactive effect unless so specified in the **EFFECTIVE DATES** section of the final rule. Prior to any judicial challenge to the provisions of the final rule, all applicable administrative procedures must be exhausted.

Civil Rights Impact Analysis

USDA has reviewed the direct final rule, in accordance with the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (the 2018 Farm Bill), Section 12403, Civil Rights Analyses, to identify and address any major civil rights impacts the direct final rule may have on specific groups. The promulgation of this direct final rule will expand local food access in all CNPs for all participants. It is unlikely that this direct final rule will have a civil rights impact on State agencies, Program operators, program participants, or food producers as the changes are customer-focused and intended to simplify program regulation language.

USDA will continue engaging with State agencies and Program operators to address any needs and/or challenges associated with the updated geographic preference option regulatory language. In accordance with applicable laws, regulations and directives, USDA will also propose further outreach and mitigation strategies to alleviate any unforeseen impacts, if deemed necessary.

Executive Order 13175

Executive Order 13175 requires Federal agencies to consult and coordinate with Tribes on a government-to-government basis on policies that have Tribal implications, including regulations, legislative comments or proposed legislation, and other policy statements or actions that have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. We are unaware of any Tribal implications of this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chap. 35; 5 CFR 1320) requires the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approve all collections of information by a Federal agency before

they can be implemented. Respondents are not required to respond to any collection of information unless it displays a current valid OMB control number.

This rule contains information collections that have been approved by OMB under OMB numbers 0584–0006, 0584–0012, 0584–0055, 0584–0280, and 0584–0005. The rule does not add new information collection requirements, nor does it alter the burden associated with existing requirements.

E-Government Act Compliance

The Department is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

List of Subjects

7 CFR Part 210

Food assistance programs, Grant programs—education, Grant programs—health, Infants and children, Nutrition, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, School breakfast and lunch programs, Surplus agricultural commodities.

7 CFR Part 215

Food assistance programs, Grant programs—education, Grant programs—health, Infants and children, Milk, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 220

Grant programs—education, Grant programs—health, Infants and children, Nutrition, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, School breakfast and lunch programs.

7 CFR Part 225

Food assistance programs, Grant programs—health, Infants and children, Labeling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements

7 CFR Part 226

Accounting, Aged, Day care, Food assistance programs, Grant programs, Grant programs—health, Indians, Individuals with disabilities, Infants and children, Intergovernmental relations, Loan programs, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Surplus agricultural commodities.

Accordingly, 7 CFR parts 210, 215, 220, 225, and 226 are amended as follows:

PART 210—NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for part 210 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1751–1760, 1779.

■ 2. In § 210.21, revise paragraph (g) to read as follows:

§ 210.21 Procurement.

* * * * *

(g) *Geographic preference.* (1) School food authorities participating in the Program and State agencies making purchases on behalf of school food authorities, may apply the geographic preference option when procuring local, unprocessed agricultural products. The geographic preference option may be applied using the following strategies, either singly or in combination:

(i) A “local product specification,” a written product description in a solicitation that identifies the local area from which the unprocessed agricultural product must originate for a bid to be considered responsive; or

(ii) A “defined scoring advantage,” a preference that gives additional credits or points for unprocessed agricultural products from a specified local area during bid evaluation. School food authorities and State agencies making purchases on behalf of school food authorities have the discretion to determine the method for applying a defined scoring advantage and to determine the amount of preference to give to products that meet their definition of local.

(2) In paragraph (g)(1) of this section, “local” means products that are locally grown, raised, or caught. School food authorities making the purchase and State agencies making purchases on behalf of school food authorities may use, but are not limited to, terms like “local,” “locally grown,” “locally raised,” and “locally caught” in their solicitations and have the discretion to determine the local area to which geographic preference will be applied, so long as there are an appropriate number of qualified firms able to compete.

(3) In paragraph (g)(1) of this section, “unprocessed agricultural products” means only agricultural products that retain their inherent character. The following food handling and preservation techniques are not considered to change the inherent character of an agricultural product:

(i) Cooling;
(ii) Refrigerating;
(iii) Freezing;
(iv) Size adjustment made by peeling, slicing, dicing, cutting, chopping, shucking, and grinding;

(v) Forming ground products into patties without any additives or fillers;
(vi) Drying/dehydration;
(vii) Washing;
(viii) Packaging (such as placing eggs in cartons), vacuum packing and bagging (such as placing vegetables in bags or combining two or more types of vegetables or fruits in a single package);
(ix) Adding ascorbic acid or other preservatives to prevent oxidation of produce;
(x) Butchering livestock and poultry;
(xi) Cleaning fish; and
(xii) Pasteurizing milk.

* * * * *

PART 215—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

■ 3. The authority citation for part 215 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1772 and 1779.

■ 4. In § 215.14a:

■ a. Revise paragraph (e); and

■ b. Remove the parenthetical authority citation at the end of the section.

The revision reads as follows:

§ 215.14a Procurement standards.

* * * * *

(e) *Geographic preference.* School food authorities participating in the Program may apply the geographic preference option under § 210.21(g) of this chapter.

PART 220—SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

■ 5. The authority citation for part 220 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1773, 1779, unless otherwise noted.

■ 6. In § 220.16:

■ a. Revise paragraph (f); and

■ b. Remove the parenthetical authority citation at the end of the section.

The revision reads as follows:

§ 220.16 Procurement standards.

* * * * *

(f) *Geographic preference.* School food authorities participating in the Program may apply the geographic preference option under § 210.21(g) of this chapter.

PART 225—SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

■ 7. The authority citation for part 225 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 9, 13 and 14, Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1758, 1761 and 1762a).

■ 8. In § 225.17, revise paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 225.17 Procurement standards.

* * * * *

(e) Sponsors participating in the Program may apply the geographic preference option under § 210.21(g) of this chapter.

* * * * *

PART 226—CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM

■ 9. The authority citation for part 226 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 9, 11, 14, 16, and 17, Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1758, 1759a, 1762a, 1765 and 1766).

■ 10. In § 226.22, revise paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 226.22 Procurement standards.

* * * * *

(c) *Geographic preference.* Institutions participating in the Program may apply the geographic preference option under § 210.21(g) of this chapter.

Shiela Corley,

Acting Administrator, Food and Nutrition Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–18337 Filed 9–8–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**8 CFR Parts 101 and 264**

[CIS No. 2882–26; DHS Docket No. USCIS–2026–0496]

RIN 1615–AD24

Registration of Lawful Permanent Residence for Children Born to Foreign Government Employees in the United States

AGENCY: Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

ACTION: Interim final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is amending its regulations to permit children born in the United States to “foreign government employees” who are not U.S. citizens to register for permanent residence. DHS is also making corresponding changes to Form I–485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status and Form G–325R, Biographic Information (Registration).

DATES: This interim final rule (IFR) is effective on September 4, 2026. This IFR

will apply to children born to foreign government employees on or after September 4, 2026; children born to a foreign government employees prior to that date will be treated consistently with the regulations in place at the time of their birth. Comments must be received on or before October 5, 2026. The electronic Federal Docket Management System will accept comments prior to midnight eastern time at the end of that day.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the entirety of this interim final rulemaking package, identified by DHS Docket No. USCIS–2026–0496, through the Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the website instructions for submitting comments. Comments must be submitted in English, or an English translation must be provided. Comments that will provide the most assistance to USCIS in implementing these changes will reference a specific portion of the interim final rule, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include data, information, or authority that support such recommended change.

Comments submitted in a manner other than the one listed above, including emails or letters sent to DHS or USCIS officials, will not be considered comments on the interim final rule and may not receive a response from DHS. Please note that DHS and USCIS cannot accept any comments that are hand-delivered or couriered. In addition, USCIS cannot accept comments contained on any form of digital media storage devices, such as CDs/DVDs and USB drives. USCIS is also not accepting mailed comments at this time. If you cannot submit your comment by using <http://www.regulations.gov>, please contact the Regulatory Coordination Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, by telephone at (240) 721–3000 for alternate instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), DHS, 5900 Capital Gateway Drive, Camp Springs, MD 20746; telephone (240) 721–3000 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with hearing or speech impairments may access the telephone number above via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 711.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Table of Contents**

I. Public Participation

II. Purpose and Background

A. Purpose of the Regulatory Action

B. Background

III. Discussion of Interim Final Rule

A. Applicability and Timing

B. Definition of Foreign Government Employee

C. Subject to the Jurisdiction of the United States

D. Registration as a Lawful Permanent Resident

E. Form Changes

F. Conforming Regulatory Changes

IV. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

A. Administrative Procedures Act (APA)

B. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review), and Executive Order 14192 (Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation)

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

D. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA)

F. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

G. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform)

H. Family Assessment

I. Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments)

J. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

K. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

Table of Abbreviations

APA—Administrative Procedures Act

ASC—Application Support Center

CPI–U—Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers

CRA—Congressional Review Act

DHS—Department of Homeland Security

DOS—Department of State

E.O.—Executive Order

HSA—Homeland Security Act of 2002

NEPA—National Environmental Policy Act

OMB—Office of Management and Budget

PRA—Paperwork Reduction Act

RFA—Regulatory Flexibility Act

SBREFA—Small Business Regulatory

Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

Secretary—Secretary of Homeland Security

UMRA—Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

USCIS—U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

I. Public Participation

DHS invites all interested parties to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, comments and arguments on all aspects of this interim final rule. DHS also invites comments that relate to the economic, environmental, or federalism effects that might result from this interim final rule. Comments must be submitted in English, or an English translation must be provided. Comments that will provide the most assistance to USCIS in implementing these changes will reference a specific portion of the interim final rule, explain the reason for any recommended