to employees of the importer across the enterprise, whether they interface with CBP or customs brokers or whether they are the employees who file certifications for the importer in CCMS. For DOE to adopt this approach, the importer would have to provide the same identifier in the corresponding CCMS report. DOE also welcomes comments as to other alternatives that would minimize importer burden while still allowing DOE to confirm that a covered import does not belong to a basic model that DOE has previously found to be noncompliant.

Commenters have expressed concern with respect to DOE's proposal to require certain information related to covered products or equipment that are a component of another finished product, due to the fact that an importer may use more than one basic model of component part in its finished product, and may not know which basic model is contained in a given shipment. DOE notes that the purpose of this proposal is to allow quick identification by CBP of a noncompliant product. DOE welcomes comments on alternatives, including alternatives that would reduce importer burden, such as allowing the importer to identify the range of possible component part basic models, but importers should be aware that this approach could potentially result in a greater impact by having CBP stop shipments that may not contain noncompliant products due to the importer's choice to group multiple basic models into a single identifier.

In addition, DOE understands that characterizing its proposed requirement as a ''certificate of admissibility'' may have created the mistaken impression that it was proposing a conformity assessment procedure as described in the Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement administered by the World Trade Organization. DOE wishes to emphasize, however, that it is not proposing to mandate any additional testing [1] or to require submission of information unnecessarily redundant of that already provided in accordance with those regulations. Instead, DOE only seeks in its proposal to collect the minimum information necessary to trace the covered import to the certified basic model to which it belongs.

Moreover, it is not DOE's intent to delay in any way the importation of any covered product or equipment, aside from that for which DOE has already, separately, made a final determination that the basic model to which the covered import belongs is not compliant with applicable energy conservation standards. The importation of such a product is already prohibited. In addition, DOE notes that, although the information it proposes to collect would allow it to determine whether a covered import has been properly certified to DOE in CCMS, DOE is not proposing to delay the importation of a covered product subject to energy conservation standards solely due to a failure to certify the covered import. With this in mind, DOE welcomes comments on possible alternatives to the term ''certification of admissibility'' in reference to what is, in essence, a limited collection of information for purposes of traceability.

Finally, DOE seeks comments on alternatives to the proposed compliance date for the rule of 2 years after the date of publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**, such as a delayed or phased-in compliance date.

DOE will accept comments, data, and information in response to the NOPR received no later than June 15, 2016. DOE will consider any comments in response to the NOPR received by midnight of June 15, 2016, and deems any comments received by that time to be timely submitted. Based on the comments received, DOE will determine whether it will need to issue a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking or proceed to a final rule.

## Public Participation

### *A. Submission of Comments*

Any comments submitted must identify the NOPR for Import Data Collection, and provide docket number EERE–2015–BT–CE–0019 and/or regulatory information number (RIN) number 1990–AA44. Comments may be submitted using any of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal: www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

2. *Email: ImportData2015CE0019@ee.doe.gov.* Include the docket number and/or RIN in the subject line of the message.

3. *Mail:* Ms. Brenda Edwards, U.S. Department of Energy, Building Technologies Program, Mailstop EE–5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585–0121. If possible, please submit all items on a CD. It is not necessary to include printed copies.

4. *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Ms. Brenda Edwards, U.S. Department of Energy, Building Technologies Program, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Suite 600, Washington, DC 20024. Telephone: (202) 586–2945. If possible, please submit all items on a CD. It is not necessary to include printed copies.

*Docket:* The docket, which includes **Federal Register** notices, public meeting attendee lists and transcripts, comments, and other supporting documents/materials, is available for review at *regulations.gov*. All documents in the docket are listed in the *regulations.gov* index. However, some documents listed in the index, such as those containing information that is exempt from public disclosure, may not be publicly available.

A link to the docket Web page can be found at: *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=EERE-2015-BT-CE-0019.* This Web page will contain a link to the docket for this notice on the *regulations.gov* site. The *regulations.gov* Web page will contain simple instructions on how to access all documents, including public comments, in the docket.

For further information on how to submit a comment, review other public comments and the docket, or to request a public meeting, contact Ms. Brenda Edwards at (202) 586–2945 or by email: *Brenda.Edwards@ee.doe.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 6, 2016.

**Kathleen B. Hogan,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2016–11468 Filed 5–13–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450–01–P**

[1] Existing DOE regulations require testing to ensure compliance with energy conservation standards.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 93

**[Docket No.: FAA–2014–1073; Notice No. 16–03]**

**RIN 2120–AJ89**

## Slot Management and Transparency for LaGuardia Airport, John F. Kennedy International Airport, and Newark Liberty International Airport

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The DOT is withdrawing a previously published Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) that would have replaced the Orders limiting scheduled operations at John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFK), Newark Liberty International Airport (EWR), and LaGuardia Airport (LGA)

with longer-term limits on scheduled and unscheduled operations at JFK, EWR, and LGA, and requested comment on options to establish a secondary market for the purchase, sale, lease, or trade of slots at these airports, as well as procedures that would codify the review of slot transactions arising from the secondary market for public interest and anti-competitive effects.

**DATES:** As of May 16, 2016, the NPRM published on January 8, 2015 (80 FR 1274) is withdrawn.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 2006, the FAA issued an Order imposing temporary limits on operations at LGA (71 FR 77854), and in 2008, issued Orders imposing temporary limits on operations at JFK (73 FR 3510) and EWR (73 FR 29550). These Orders have been extended and are in effect until October 29, 2016. On April 6, 2016, the FAA announced that the current Order at EWR will expire on October 29, 2016, and that EWR will be a Level 2, schedule-facilitated airport under the Worldwide Slot Guidelines effective for the Winter 2016 scheduling season (81 FR 19861). By this same announcement, the FAA indicated that slot-controlled restrictions at JFK and LGA remain necessary and that the FAA will extend these Orders, by separate **Federal Register** notices, until October 27, 2018.

On January 8, 2015, the FAA and DOT published an NPRM (80 FR 1274) that would replace the FAA's Orders limiting scheduled operations at JFK, EWR, and LGA with a long-term comprehensive approach to slot management at these airports. The NPRM proposed the continuation of the limits on scheduled and unscheduled operations in place at each of these airports under the Orders, and would have required use of an allocated slot 80% of the time for the same flight or series of flights. The NPRM also requested public comment about five alternatives for a secondary market for the purchase, sale, lease, or trade of slots and proposed procedures to codify the exercise of DOT's existing authority to review slot transactions for anti-competitive and public interest effects arising from those secondary market transactions that would have been permitted by the implementation of a bulletin board for the proposed secondary market.

Since the FAA and DOT first initiated this rulemaking effort there have been significant changes in circumstances affecting New York City area airports, including changes in competitive effects from ongoing industry consolidation, slot utilization and transfer behavior, and actual operational performance at the three airports. Furthermore, the FAA recently announced that slot controls are no longer needed at EWR (81 FR 19861). The NPRM proposed an approach to manage slots and the efficient use of airspace at JFK, EWR, and LGA that would have treated all three New York City area airports similarly. In light of the changes in market conditions and operational performance, and particularly the potential impact of EWR's change in status, the Department is withdrawing the NPRM to allow for further evaluation of these changes. Withdrawal of this NPRM (80 FR 1274, January 8, 2015) does not preclude the agency from issuing future rulemakings on this issue, nor does it commit the agency to any course of action in the future. The FAA will continue to monitor the operational performance at these airports. Further, if the Department detects unfair or anticompetitive behavior, we will not hesitate to continue to use our existing authority to take corrective action. We will also continue to cooperate with the U.S. Department of Justice on any reviews it undertakes.

Issued under authority provided by 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 40101, 40103, 40105, and 41712 in Washington, DC on May 6, 2016.

**Jenny T. Rosenberg,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.*

**Nan Shellabarger,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Policy, International Affairs, and Environment.*

[FR Doc. 2016–11455 Filed 5–13–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

### 21 CFR Parts 117 and 507

**[Docket No. FDA–2016–D–1164]**

### Qualified Facility Attestation Using Form FDA 3942a (for Human Food) or Form FDA 3942b (for Animal Food); Draft Guidance for Industry; Availability; Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notification of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA, we, or Agency) is announcing the availability of a draft guidance for industry entitled ''Qualified Facility Attestation Using Form FDA 3942a (for Human Food) or Form FDA 3942b (for Animal Food).'' This draft guidance explains our current thinking on how to determine whether a business is a ''qualified facility'' that is subject to modified requirements under our rule entitled ''Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food'' (the Preventive Controls for Human Food Rule) or under our rule entitled ''Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Food for Animals'' (the Preventive Controls for Animal Food Rule). This draft guidance also explains our current thinking on how a business would submit Form FDA 3942a attesting to its status as a qualified facility under the Preventive Controls for Human Food Rule and how a business would submit Form FDA 3942b attesting to its status as a qualified facility under the Preventive Controls for Animal Food Rule. We also are announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed collection of information embodied in Forms FDA 3942a and 3942b. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Federal Agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information and allow 60 days for public comment in response to the notice.

**DATES:** Although you can comment on any guidance at any time (see 21 CFR 10.115(g)(5)), to ensure that we consider your comment on this draft guidance before we begin work on the final version of the guidance, submit either electronic or written comments by November 14, 2016. Submit either electronic or written comments on the proposed collection of information by July 15, 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