

the airport and its location, the procedure, and the amendment number.

Availability and Summary of Material Incorporated by Reference

The material incorporated by reference is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section.

The material incorporated by reference describes SIAPS, Takeoff Minimums and/or ODPs as identified in the amendatory language for part 97 of this final rule.

The Rule

This amendment to 14 CFR part 97 is effective upon publication of each separate SIAP, Takeoff Minimums and ODP as amended in the transmittal. Some SIAP and Takeoff Minimums and textual ODP amendments may have been issued previously by the FAA in a Flight Data Center (FDC) Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) as an emergency action of immediate flights safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts.

The circumstances that created the need for some SIAP and Takeoff Minimums and ODP amendments may require making them effective in less than 30 days. For the remaining SIAPs and Takeoff Minimums and ODPs, an effective date at least 30 days after publication is provided.

Further, the SIAPs and Takeoff Minimums and ODPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS). In developing these SIAPs and Takeoff Minimums and ODPs, the TERPS criteria were applied to the conditions existing or anticipated at the affected airports. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs, Takeoff Minimums and ODPs, and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are impracticable and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d), good cause exists for making some SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

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.

Lists of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 97

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

Issued in Washington, DC on August 30, 2024.

Thomas J. Nichols,
Standards Section Manager, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, Flight Technologies and Procedures Division, Office of Safety Standards, Flight Standards Service, Aviation Safety, Federal Aviation Administration.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, 14 CFR part 97 is amended by establishing, amending, suspending, or removing Standard Instrument Approach Procedures and/or Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure 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(f), 106(g), 40103, 40106, 40113, 40114, 40120, 44502, 44514, 44701, 44719, 44721–44722.

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

Effective 3 October 2024

Lakeland, FL, KLAL, RNAV (GPS) Y RWY 28, Orig
Lakeland, FL, KLAL, RNAV (RNP) Z RWY 28, Orig

Effective 31 October 2024

Shungnak, AK, SHG/PAGH, RNAV (GPS) RWY 28, Amdt 4
Shungnak, AK, PAGH, Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle DP, Amdt 2
Shungnak, AK, PAGH, TOMPY ONE, Graphic DP
San Francisco, CA, SFO, RNAV (GPS) Z RWY 28R, Amdt 8
Atlanta, GA, ATL, RNAV (GPS) RWY 8R, Amdt 5
Sandersville, GA, OKZ, RNAV (GPS) RWY 13, Amdt 3A
Grayling, MI, GOV, NDB RWY 14, Amdt 9

Jefferson City, MO, JEF, ILS OR LOC RWY 30, Amdt 7
Jefferson City, MO, JEF, RNAV (GPS) RWY 12, Amdt 1C
Jefferson City, MO, JEF, RNAV (GPS) RWY 30, Orig-C
Reidsville, NC, SIF, RNAV (GPS) RWY 13, Amdt 1
Reidsville, NC, SIF, RNAV (GPS) RWY 31, Amdt 1
Reidsville, NC, KSIF, Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle DP, Amdt 4
Broken Bow, NE, BBW, RNAV (GPS) RWY 14, Orig-C
Follett, TX, T93, Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle DP, Orig, CANCELED
Fort Worth, TX, 50F, RNAV (GPS) RWY 17, Amdt 1
Fort Worth, TX, 50F, RNAV (GPS) RWY 35, Amdt 3
Lago Vista, TX, RYW, RNAV (GPS) RWY 15, Amdt 1A
Navasota, TX, 60R, RNAV (GPS) RWY 17, Amdt 1
Navasota, TX, 60R, RNAV (GPS) RWY 35, Amdt 1
San Antonio, TX, KSAT, Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle DP, Amdt 1B
Abingdon, VA, VJI, LOC RWY 24, Amdt 6
Abingdon, VA, VJI, RNAV (GPS) RWY 6, Amdt 2
Abingdon, VA, VJI, RNAV (GPS) RWY 24, Amdt 3
Abingdon, VA, KVJI, Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle DP, Amdt 4

[FR Doc. 2024–20810 Filed 9–13–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

15 CFR Part 744

Addition of Entities to the Entity List

CFR Correction

This rule is being published by the Office of the Federal Register to correct an editorial or technical error that appeared in the most recent annual revision of the Code of Federal Regulations.

In Title 15 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 300 to 799, revised as of January 1, 2024, in supplement number 4 to part 744, in the table, under NETHERLANDS, restore the entry for “Kapil Raj Arora”, and under PAKISTAN, restore the entry for “Orion Eleven Pvt. Ltd.”, to read as set forth below:

Supplement No. 4 to Part 744—Entity List

* * * * *

Country	Entity	License requirement	License review policy	Federal Register citation
NETHERLANDS	Kapil Raj Arora, Breukelsestraat 44, 2574 RC, The Hague, Netherlands; and Knobbelswaansingel 19, 2496 LN, The Hague, Netherlands.	For all items subject to the EAR. (See § 744.11 of the EAR).	Presumption of denial	81 FR 14958, 3/21/16.
PAKISTAN	Orion Eleven Pvt. Ltd., Street 11 Valley Road, Westridge Rawalpindi, Pakistan.	For all items subject to the EAR. (See § 744.11 of the EAR).	Presumption of denial	79 FR 56003, 9/18/14.

* * * * *
 [FR Doc. 2024–21109 Filed 9–13–24; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 0099–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

15 CFR Parts 764 and 766

[Docket No. 240911–0236]

RIN 0694–AJ84

Administrative and Enforcement Provisions

AGENCY: Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: With this final rule, the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) amends the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) by making certain revisions and clarifications. This final rule revises provisions related to the voluntary self-disclosure process for exporters who believe that they may have violated the EAR, or any order, license or authorization issued thereunder. This final rule also provides clarified guidance on charging and penalty determinations in settlement of administrative enforcement cases.

DATES: This rule is effective September 16, 2024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general questions, contact Tracy Martin, Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of Commerce at (202) 482–1208 or by email: Tracy.Martin@bis.doc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

With this rule BIS revises § 764.5 of the EAR regarding the procedures for submitting voluntary self-disclosures (VSDs) and supplement No. 1 to part 766, which includes guidance on charging and penalty determinations in

settlement of administrative enforcement cases. As discussed in more detail below, these revisions implement certain policies related to the VSD process that BIS has announced in policy memoranda since 2022, and also makes changes to how BIS calculates penalties in administrative cases.

1. Relevant Statutory Authority and Regulatory Framework

On August 13, 2018, the President signed into law the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, which included the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (ECRA) (50 U.S.C. 4801–4852). Section 1760(c) of ECRA (50 U.S.C. 4819(c)) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to impose civil penalties for violations of ECRA, its implementing regulations, or any order or license issued thereunder. Specifically, ECRA authorizes the Secretary to impose the following civil penalties for each violation:

(A) A fine of not more than \$300,000 or an amount that is twice the value of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed, whichever is greater.

(B) Revocation of a license issued under [ECRA] to the person.

(C) A prohibition on the person’s ability to export, reexport, or in-country transfer any items controlled under [ECRA].

50 U.S.C. 4819(c)(1). The amount of the maximum civil penalty per violation under ECRA is subject to adjustment under the Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 (28 U.S.C. 2461) and is currently \$364,992. See 15 CFR 6.3(c)(6). Within these limits, 50 U.S.C. 4819(c)(3) authorizes the Secretary to issue regulations to “provide standards for establishing levels of civil penalty . . . based upon factors such as the seriousness of the violation, the culpability of the violator, and such mitigating factors as the violator’s

record of cooperation with the Government in disclosing the violation.” The Secretary’s authority under ECRA is delegated to BIS (see section 1781 of ECRA, 50 U.S.C. 4851) and is implemented through the EAR.

Consistent with these authorities, BIS has implemented regulations providing standards for establishing levels of civil penalties in supplement No. 1 to part 766, titled “Guidance on Charging and Penalty Determinations in Settlement of Administrative Enforcement Cases” (“BIS Penalty Guidelines”). Last revised in the rule entitled “Guidance on Charging and Penalty Determinations in Settlement of Administrative Enforcement Cases” published in the **Federal Register** on June 22, 2016 (81 FR 40506), the BIS Penalty Guidelines describe how BIS’s Office of Export Enforcement (OEE), the organizational unit of BIS that is responsible for enforcing the provisions of the EAR, makes penalty determinations in administrative enforcement cases. The BIS Penalty Guidelines describe various factors—including aggravating, general, and mitigating factors—that OEE will consider in determining how to respond to apparent export violations in administrative cases. Specifically, the BIS Penalty Guidelines outline how OEE calculates monetary penalties for a particular violation, which includes determination of the relevant base penalty, and how the various aggravating, general, and mitigating factors justify an upward or downward departure from that base penalty. As discussed in the BIS Penalty Guidelines, the presence of significant aggravating factors may lead OEE to consider the conduct to be egregious, which may result in considerably higher monetary penalties. Conversely, the presence of significant mitigating factors may result in a lower monetary penalty.

One factor given significant weight in the BIS Penalty Guidelines is whether a party submitted a VSD regarding the violation. BIS encourages parties who