second year if the IA holder passes an oral test given by an FAA inspector to determine if the holder's knowledge of applicable regulations and standards is current. If the holder passes the oral test, the FAA will consider the first year requirement completed. Each IA holder must also perform one of the five activities listed in § 65.93 (a)(1)–(5) during the second year of the inspection authorization period to be eligible for renewal.

Discussion of Comments

The FAA received approximately 60 comments in response to the IA renewal period direct final rule. The comments generally were supportive of the two-year renewal period. Commenters stated they were happy to see the FAA become actively involved in reviewing inspection authorization procedures and agreed that the change would result in time and money savings.

Many who commented favorably on the direct final rule also took the opportunity to recommend other and more significant changes to the regulations applicable to IA holders. Several commenters suggested completely restructuring the cycle for renewing IA holders to provide for individual expiration dates for each IA holder based on date of birth or the date of the initial grant of IA authority. A number of commenters said the annual activity requirement should be eliminated and a two-year period for the activity requirement should be established. The Aircraft Electronics Association (AEA) suggested the FAA establish a rating system for IA holders similar to the rating system for repair stations. Several comments addressed matters of the FAA's oversight of IA holders.

These comments will be evaluated by the FAA as it considers possible future actions to amend the rules relating to IAs, but they address matters beyond the limited scope of the direct final rule. The FAA could not adopt those proposals without further rulemaking, and the significance of those actions would require FAA to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking prior to amending the rule.

Three commenters misunderstood one provision in the rule. The rule permits an IA who fails to meet the annual activity requirement during the first year the option to take an oral test from an FAA inspector and thereafter exercise IA privileges during the remainder of the second year of the two-year IA period. For purposes of later renewal, the oral test would be counted as meeting the activity for the first year. (The individual also could choose to reapply for IA authority, the only means available under the prior rule when the activity requirement was not met.) The rule does not require, as these commenters thought, that all IA holders must take an oral test during the two-year IA renewal cycle to be able to renew their authority.

Several commenters mistakenly thought the rule requires each IA holder to submit a list of activities each year to the FAA that demonstrates the IA holder's compliance with the annual activity requirement. This is not the case. Rather, the rule requires an applicant for renewal every two years to present evidence of compliance with the annual activity requirement for each of the preceding two years.

A number of commenters expressed concern that some IA holders inadvertently may continue to exercise IA privileges into the second year of the two-year renewal period even though they failed to meet the annual activity requirement before March 31 of the first year. The FAA is aware of this possibility because similar events occurred under the prior rule. Each year under the old rule, a few IA holders failed to renew during March and then mistakenly continued to perform IA responsibilities. The instances were rare, and the FAA addressed them without significant difficulties as part of its routine oversight of IA holders.

There is a multi-decade history of the annual activity requirement for IA holders and nothing in the rule change disturbed that requirement. Indeed, not only was it retained, but the request for comments on this rule served as a way of reminding IA holders of the longstanding annual activity requirement. The FAA does not expect IA holders to perform differently or to lose sight of this core element of the rule simply because of the two-year renewal cycle. As in the past, the FAA will monitor compliance with the regulations and take enforcement action where appropriate. The FAA also will use the refresher course training curriculum as a way of ensuring that IA holders attending training are reminded of the rule requirement, and FAA inspectors will regularly address the matter in the context of their routine checks of IAs.

Finally, because 2008 will be the first year under the new two-year renewal cycle, FAA will remind each IA of the annual activity requirements for March 2008 through the FAA Information for Operations procedure.

Conclusion

After consideration of the comments submitted in response to the final rule, the FAA has determined that no further rulemaking action is necessary. Amendment 65–50 remains in effect as adopted.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 20, 2007.

James J. Ballough,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. E7–12453 Filed 6–26–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 97

[Docket No. 30557; Amdt. No. 3224]

Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment amends Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) for operations at certain airports. These regulatory actions are needed because of changes occurring in the National Airspace System, such as the commissioning of new navigational facilities, addition of new obstacles, or changes in air traffic requirements. These changes are designed to provide safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under instrument flight rules at the affected airports.

DATES: This rule is effective June 27, 2007. The compliance date for each SIAP is specified in the amendatory provisions.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of June 27, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Availability of matter incorporated by reference in the amendment is as follows:

For Examination—

1. FAA Rules Docket, FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20591;

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which affected airport is located; or

3. The National Flight Procedures Office, 6500 South MacArthur Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73169 or,

4. The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this

material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.*

For Purchase—Individual SIAP copies may be obtained from:

1. FAA Public Inquiry Center (APA–200), FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; or

2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located.

By Subscription—Copies of all SIAPs, mailed once every 2 weeks, are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald P. Pate, Flight Procedure Standards Branch (AFS–420), Flight Technologies and Programs Division, Flight Standards Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center, 6500 South MacArthur Blvd. Oklahoma City, OK 73169 (Mail Address: P.O. Box 25082 Oklahoma City, OK 73125) telephone: (405) 954–4164.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amendment to Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 97 (14 CFR part 97) amends Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs). The complete regulatory description of each SIAP is contained in the appropriate FAA Form 8260, as modified by the National Flight Data Center (FDC)/Permanent Notice to Airmen (P–NOTAM), which is incorporated by reference in the amendment under 5 U.S.C. 552(a), 1 CFR part 51, and § 97.20 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Materials incorporated by reference are available for examination or purchase as stated above.

The large number of SIAPs, their complex nature, and the need for a special format make their verbatim publication in the **Federal Register** expensive and impractical. Further, airmen do not use the regulatory text of the SIAPs, but refer to their graphic depiction on charts printed by publishers of aeronautical materials. Thus, the advantages of incorporation by reference are realized and publication of the complete description of each SIAP contained in FAA form documents is unnecessary. The provisions of this amendment state the affected CFR sections, with the types and effective dates of the SIAPs. This amendment also identifies the airport, its location, the procedure identification and the amendment number.

The Rule

This amendment to 14 CFR part 97 is effective upon publication of each separate SIAP as amended in the transmittal. For safety and timeliness of change considerations, this amendment incorporates only specific changes contained for each SIAP as modified by FDC/P–NOTAMs.

The SIAPs, as modified by FDC P–NOTAM, and contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS). In developing these chart changes to SIAPs, the TERPS criteria were applied to only these specific conditions existing at the affected airports. All SIAP amendments in this rule have been previously issued by the FAA in a FDC NOTAM as an emergency action of immediate flight safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts. The circumstances which created the need for all these SIAP amendments requires making them effective in less than 30 days.

Further, the SIAPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in TERPS. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure before adopting these SIAPs are impracticable and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, that good cause exists for making these SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

Conclusion

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. For the same reason, the FAA certifies that this amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 97

Air Traffic Control, Airports, Incorporation by reference, and Navigation (Air).

Issued in Washington, DC on June 15, 2007.

James J. Ballough,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

Adoption of the Amendment

■ Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, Title 14, Code of Federal regulations, Part 97, 14 CFR part 97, is amended by amending Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 UTC on the dates specified, as follows:

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 97 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40106, 40113, 40114, 40120, 44502, 44514, 44701, 44719, 44721–44722.

■ 2. Part 97 is amended to read as follows:

By amending: § 97.23 VOR, VOR/DME, VOR or TACAN, and VOR/DME or TACAN; § 97.25 LOC, LOC/DME, LDA, LDA/DME, LDA w/GS, SDF, SDF/DME; § 97.27 NDB, NDB/DME; § 97.29 ILS, MLS, TLS, GLS, WAAS PA, MLS/RNAV; § 97.31 RADAR SIAPs; § 97.33 RNAV SIAPs; § 97.35 COPTER SIAPs, § 97.37 Takeoff Minima and Obstacle Departure Procedures. Identified as follows:

** * *Effective Upon Publication*

FDC date	State	City	Airport	FDC No.	Subject
6/13/07	NJ ...	NEWARK	NEWARK LIBERTY INTL	7/4255	RNAV (RNP) Y RWY 22L, ORIG–B.

[FR Doc. E7–12118 Filed 6–26–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

19 CFR Parts 10, 163, and 178

[USCBP–2007–0001]
[CBP Dec. 07–50]

RIN 1505–AB75

United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement

AGENCIES: Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Interim regulations; solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: This document amends title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (''CFR'') on an interim basis to implement the preferential tariff treatment and other customs-related provisions of the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement entered into by the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

DATES: Interim rule effective June 27, 2007; comments must be received by August 27, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by *docket number,* by *one* of the following methods:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments via docket number USCBP–2007–0001.

• *Mail:* Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Regulations and Rulings, Office of International Trade, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. (Mint Annex), Washington, DC 20229.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the ''Public Participation'' heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submitted comments may also be inspected during regular business days between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. at the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 799 9th Street, NW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC. Arrangements to inspect submitted comments should be made in advance by calling Mr. Joseph Clark at (202) 572–8768.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Operational Aspects: Seth Mazze, Office of International Trade (202–344–2634).

Legal Aspects: Holly Files, Office of International Trade (202–572–8817).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation

Interested persons are invited to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments on all aspects of the interim rule. CBP also invites comments that relate to the economic, environmental, or federalism effects that might result from this interim rule. Comments that will provide the most assistance to CBP will reference a specific portion of the interim rule, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include data, information, or authority that support such recommended change. See **ADDRESSES** above for information on how to submit comments.

Background

On October 24, 2000, the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (the ''Parties'') signed the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement (''US–JFTA''), which is designed to eliminate tariffs and other trade barriers between the two countries. The provisions of the US–JFTA were adopted by the United States with the enactment on September 28, 2001 of the United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act (the ''Act''), Public Law 107–43, 115 Stat. 243 (19 U.S.C. 2112 note). On December 7, 2001, the President signed Proclamation 7512 to implement the provisions of the US–JFTA. The Proclamation, which was published in the **Federal Register** on December 13, 2001 (66 FR 64497), modified the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') as set forth in Annexes I and II of the Proclamation. The modifications to the HTSUS included the addition of new General Note 18, incorporating the relevant US–JFTA rules of origin as set forth in the Act, and the insertion throughout the HTSUS of the preferential duty rates applicable to individual products under the US–JFTA where the special program indicator ''JO'' appears in parenthesis in the ''Special'' rate of duty subcolumn.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') is responsible for administering the provisions of the US–JFTA and the Act that relate to the importation of goods into the United States from Jordan. Therefore, the regulations set forth in this document pertain specifically to US–JFTA customs-related provisions, such as rules of origin, that govern the duty-free or reduced-duty treatment of products imported into the United States from Jordan. These rules do not confer origin or establish a criterion for determining the origin of imported goods for any other purpose. For example, origin determinations for country of origin marking purposes under 19 U.S.C. 1304 are not affected.

Article 2 and Annex 2.2 of the US–JFTA set forth the rules of origin and documentary requirements that apply for purposes of obtaining preferential treatment under the US–JFTA. Annex 2.1 of the US–JFTA sets forth the terms for the immediate elimination or staged reduction of duties on products of Jordan, with all products to become duty free within a ten-year period (by the year 2010).

Under Annex 2.2 of the US–JFTA and § 102 of the Act, to be eligible for reduced or duty-free treatment under the US–JFTA, a good imported into the United States from Jordan must meet three basic requirements: (1) It must be imported directly from Jordan into the customs territory of the United States; (2) it must be a product of Jordan, *i.e.*, it must be either wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of Jordan or a new or different article of commerce that has been grown, produced, or manufactured in Jordan; and (3) if it is a new or different article of commerce, it must have a minimum domestic content, *i.e.*, at least 35 percent of its appraised value must be attributed to the cost or value of materials produced in Jordan plus the direct costs of processing operations performed in Jordan. Annex 2.2 of the US–JFTA further provides that: (1) The cost or value of U.S.-produced materials may be counted toward the Jordanian domestic content requirement to a maximum of 15 percent of the appraised value of the imported good; and (2) simple combining or packaging operations or mere dilution with water or another substance will confer neither Jordanian origin on an imported good nor Jordanian or U.S. origin on a constituent material of an imported good.

In addition, for purposes of demonstrating compliance with the origin criteria, Annex 2.2 of the US–