approved inspection site. Each consignment of fruit would have to be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate with an additional declaration stating that the fruit had been found free of B. chilensis based on field and packinghouse inspections. This proposed rule would allow for the safe importation of lemons from Chile using mitigation measures other than fumigation with methyl bromide.

Implementing this rule will require permits, production site registration with low-prevalence level certification option, phytosanitary inspections, phytosanitary certificates, and chemical treatment procedures.

We are soliciting comments from the public (as well as affected agencies) concerning our proposed information collection and recordkeeping requirements. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of our agency’s functions, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the information collection on those who are to respond (such as through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of electronic submission of responses).

Estimate of burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.6917 hours per response.

Respondents: Producers and importers of lemons, and the NPPO of Chile.

Estimated annual number of respondents: 198.

Estimated annual number of responses per respondent: 6.71.

Estimated annual number of responses: 1,330.

Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 920 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Ms. Kimberly Hardy, APHIS’ Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 851–2727.

E-Government Act Compliance

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is committed to compliance 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. For information pertinent to E-Government Act compliance related to this proposed rule, please contact Ms. Kimberly Hardy, APHIS’ Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 851–2727.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 319

Coffee, Cotton, Fruits, Imports, Logs, Nursery stock, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rice, Vegetables.

Accordingly, we propose to amend 7 CFR part 319 as follows:

PART 319—FOREIGN QUARANTINE

§319.56–38 [Amended]

2. Section 319.56–38 is amended as follows:

■ a. In the introductory text, by adding the words “, lemons (Citrus limon (L.) Burm. f.),” between the words “((Citrus paradisi Macfad.)” and “and sweet oranges”.

■ b. In paragraph (e), by adding the word “lemons,” between the words “grapefruit,” and “mandarins,”.

■ c. In paragraph (f), by adding the word “lemons,” between the words “grapefruit,” and “mandarins,”.

Done in Washington, DC, this 29th day of March 2016.

Kevin Shea,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–07673 Filed 4–1–16; 8:45 am]
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ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is proposing to amend the regulation describing lesser administrative actions that may be imposed on an Institutional Review Board (IRB) that has failed to comply with FDA’s IRB regulations. We are clarifying that FDA may require the IRB to withhold approval of new FDA-regulated studies, stop the enrollment of new subjects in ongoing studies, and terminate ongoing studies, or any combination of these actions, until the noncompliance with FDA’s IRB regulations is corrected. We are taking this action to ensure clarity and improve the accuracy of the regulations.

DATES: Submit electronic or written comments on this proposed rule or its companion direct final rule by June 20, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to http://www.regulations.gov will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else’s Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on http://www.regulations.gov.

• If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the
I. Background

FDA is proposing to amend the text of § 56.120(b) (21 CFR 56.120(b)), which describes lesser administrative actions that the Agency may impose on an IRB until the IRB takes appropriate action to correct the IRB's noncompliance. FDA is proposing this revision to clarify the language and improve the accuracy of the regulations. Specifically, this proposed rule would propose to amend § 56.120(b) by clarifying that FDA has authority to require the IRB to withhold approval of new FDA-regulated studies conducted at the institution or reviewed by the IRB, direct that no new subjects be added to ongoing studies, and terminate ongoing studies provided that doing so would not endanger study subjects.

This amendment also proposes to renumber current paragraphs (b)(4) and (c) as paragraphs (c) and (d), respectively, and inserts “FDA may” into newly designated paragraph (c) so that it is a complete sentence.

FDA first proposed requirements for the composition and operations of institutional review committees in the “Proposed Investigational Device Exemptions,” published in the Federal Register of August 20, 1976 (41 FR 35282; “Proposed IDE Rule”). In that document, FDA proposed disqualification procedures for institutional review committees and requested comments on the proposed procedures and other possible administrative actions that FDA might take against a committee that is not in compliance with the regulations (41 FR 35282 at 35293). FDA also stated its intention to publish uniform, Agency-wide regulations governing clinical investigations at a later date, including requirements governing institutional review committees (41 FR 35282 at 35283).

Subsequently, FDA published “Standards for Institutional Review Boards for Clinical Investigations” on August 8, 1978 (43 FR 35186; “Proposed IRB Standards”). Comments on implementing institutional review requirements received in response to the Proposed IDE Rule were reviewed and utilized in preparing the Proposed IRB Standards (43 FR 35186 at 35187). In the Proposed IRB Standards, FDA proposed that disqualification would be used only if the Commissioner of Food and Drugs finds that: (1) The IRB failed to comply with one or more of the standards for IRBs in part 56 or other supplemental requirements in the investigational new drugs or investigational device exemptions (IDE) regulations; (2) the noncompliance adversely affects the validity of the data or the rights or safety of the human subjects; and (3) other lesser regulatory actions (e.g., warnings or rejection of data from individual clinical investigations) have not been or probably will not be adequate in achieving compliance (43 FR 35186 at 35195).

FDA received numerous comments to the Proposed IRB Standards, and addressed those comments in the Federal Register of January 27, 1981 (46 FR 8958), “Protection of Human Subjects: Standards for Institutional Review Boards for Clinical Investigations, Final Rule.” Specifically, several comments suggested that any lesser regulatory actions should be listed (46 FR 8958 at 8973). FDA accepted these comments and revised § 56.120(b) to set forth the lesser administrative actions that the Agency may take if FDA finds deficiencies in the operation of an IRB and to describe the circumstances in which these lesser administrative actions may be used by the Agency. FDA’s longstanding interpretation of § 56.120(b) is that FDA may impose these restrictions on a noncompliant IRB until the IRB takes appropriate corrective action. The text of the regulation, however, suggests that it is the Agency that would withhold approval of studies that have been reviewed by a noncompliant IRB, rather than authorizing FDA to direct the IRB to stop approving new studies until the IRB comes back into compliance.

This proposed rule would amend § 56.120(b) to read that, in addition, until the IRB or the parent institution takes appropriate corrective action, the Agency may require the IRB to withhold approval of new studies, direct that no new subjects be added to ongoing studies, or terminate ongoing studies. This will ensure that the activities are suspended until the IRB takes appropriate corrective action to address
its noncompliance. We believe revising § 56.120(b) will improve the clarity and accuracy of the regulations. We are also proposing to redesignate § 56.120(b)(4) as § 56.120(c), and § 56.120(c) as § 56.120(d).

FDA may notify relevant State and Federal regulatory Agencies when warranted to assure that organizations with a need to know about the IRB’s apparent noncompliance are appropriately informed. The revision would eliminate confusion by stating clearly that FDA is authorized to notify others about the IRB’s noncompliance. We believe these changes will ensure clarity and improve the accuracy of the regulations.

II. Why is FDA publishing this proposed rule?

This proposed rule is a companion to a direct final rule affirming FDA’s longstanding interpretation of § 56.120(b), i.e., that FDA may impose these restrictions on a noncompliant IRB until the IRB takes appropriate corrective action. The direct final rule is published in the final rules section of this issue of the Federal Register. The direct final rule and this companion proposed rule are substantively identical. This companion proposed rule will serve the purpose of issuing a proposed rule under usual notice-and-comment procedures in the event we withdraw the direct final rule because we receive significant adverse comment. We are publishing the direct final rule because we believe it is noncontroversial, and we do not anticipate any significant adverse comments. If we do not receive any significant adverse comments in response to the direct final rule, we will not take any further action on this proposed rule. Instead, within 30 days after the comment period ends, we intend to publish a notice that confirms the effective date of the direct final rule.

If FDA receives any significant adverse comment regarding the direct final rule, we will publish a notice of significant adverse comment and withdraw the direct final rule within 30 days after the comment period ends. We will then proceed to final rulemaking using our usual notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The comment period for this companion proposed rule runs concurrently with the direct final rule’s comment period. We will consider any comments that we receive in response to this companion proposed rule to be comments also regarding the direct final rule and vice versa. We do not intend to provide additional opportunity for comment.

A significant adverse comment is one that explains why the rule would be inappropriate (including challenges to the rule’s underlying premise or approach), or would be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether an adverse comment is significant and warrants withdrawing a direct final rule, we consider whether the comment raises an issue serious enough to warrant a substantive response in a notice-and-comment process in accordance with section 553 of the APA (5 U.S.C. 553). Comments that are frivolous, insubstantial, or outside the scope of the rule will not be considered adverse. A comment recommending a rule change in addition to the rule would not be considered a significant adverse comment, unless the comment states why the rule would be ineffective without the additional change. In addition, if a significant adverse comment applies to part of a rule and that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those parts of the rule that are not the subject of a significant adverse comment.


III. Legal Authority

This proposed rule, if finalized, would amend § 56.120(b). FDA’s authority to modify § 56.120(b) arises from the same authority under which FDA initially issued this regulation, the IRB regulations, and general administrative provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321, 343, 346, 346a, 348, 350a, 350b, 351, 352, 353, 355, 360, 360c–360f, 360h, 360i, 360j, 360hh–360ss, 371, 379e, 381; 42 U.S.C. 216, 241, 262).

IV. Analysis of Environmental Impact

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.30(h) and 25.34(a) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

V. Economic Analysis of Impacts

We have examined the impacts of the proposed rule under Executive Order 12866.


FDAs tentatively concludes that this proposed rule contains no collection of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.
VII. Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. We have determined that the rule does not contain policies that have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Accordingly, we conclude that the rule does not contain policies that have federalism implications as defined in the Executive Order and, consequently, a federalism summary impact statement is not required.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 56

Human research subjects, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Safety.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, it is proposed that 21 CFR part 56 is amended as follows:

PART 56—INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 56 is revised to read as follows:


2. In §56.120, redesignate paragraphs (b)(4) and (c) as paragraphs (c) and (d), respectively, and revise paragraph (b) and newly designated paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 56.120 Lesser administrative actions.

(b) On the basis of the IRB’s or the institution’s response, FDA may schedule a reinspection to confirm the adequacy of corrective actions. In addition, until the IRB or the parent institution takes appropriate corrective action, the Agency may require the IRB to:

(1) Withhold approval of new studies subject to the requirements of this part that are conducted at the institution or reviewed by the IRB;

(2) Direct that no new subjects be added to ongoing studies subject to this part; or

(3) Terminate ongoing studies subject to this part when doing so would not endanger the subjects.

(c) When the apparent noncompliance creates a significant threat to the rights and welfare of human subjects, FDA may notify relevant State and Federal regulatory agencies and other parties with a direct interest in the Agency’s action of the deficiencies in the operation of the IRB.

Dated: March 29, 2016.

Leslie Kux,
Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–07524 Filed 4–1–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 330

[Docket No. FDA–2016–N–0543]

RIN 0910–AH30

Food and Drug Administration Review and Action on Over-the-Counter Time and Extent Applications

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.
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SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is proposing to amend its nonprescription (over-the-counter or OTC) drug regulations. The proposed rule, if finalized as proposed, would supplement the time and extent application (TEA) process for OTC drugs by establishing timelines and performance metrics for FDA’s review of non-sunscreen TEAs, as required by the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA). We are also proposing other changes to make the TEA process more efficient.

DATES: Submit either electronic or written comments on the proposed rule by June 3, 2016. Submit comments on information collection issues under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 by June 3, 2016, (see the “Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995” section of this document).

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to http://www.regulations.gov will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else’s Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on http://www.regulations.gov.

If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see “Written/Paper Submissions” and “Instructions”).

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

• Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions): Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

• For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in “Instructions.”

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2016–N–0543 for “Food and Drug Administration Review and Action on Over-the-Counter Time and Extent Applications.” Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as “Confidential Submissions,” publicly viewable at http://www.regulations.gov or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states “THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.” The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on http://www.regulations.gov. Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be