

We have developed a comprehensive Preliminary Economic Analysis of Impacts that assesses the impacts of the proposed rule. The full preliminary analysis of economic impacts is available in the docket for this proposed rule (Ref. 1) and at <https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/economics-staff/regulatory-impact-analyses-ria>.

VIII. Analysis of Environmental Impact

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.31(h) 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.

IX. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

FDA 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.

X. Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. We have determined that this proposed 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.

XI. Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

We have analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13175. We have tentatively determined that the rule does not contain policies that would 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. The Agency solicits comments from tribal officials on any potential impact on Indian Tribes from this proposed action.

XII. Reference

The following reference is on display at the Dockets Management Staff (see **ADDRESSES**) and is available for viewing

by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday; it is also available electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Although FDA verified the website addresses in this document, please note that websites are subject to change over time.

1. FDA/Economics Staff, "Revocation of Regulations Regarding the Mutual Recognition of Pharmaceutical Good Manufacturing Practice Reports, Medical Device Quality System Audit Reports, and Certain Medical Device Product Evaluation Reports: United States and The European Community Preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis, Preliminary Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Unfunded Mandates Reform Act Analysis," 2020. (Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/ReportsManualsForms/Reports/EconomicAnalyses/default.htm>.)

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 26

Animal, Animal drugs, Biologics, Drugs, Exports, Imports.

For reasons stated in the preamble, and under the authority of 21 U.S.C. 393 and delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, FDA proposes to remove 21 CFR part 26.

Dated: September 12, 2024.

Robert M. Califf,

Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

[FR Doc. 2024-21559 Filed 9-19-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 3

[Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0099]

RIN 0790-AK98

Transactions Other Than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects; Correction

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On September 4, 2024, the DoD published a proposed rule titled Transactions Other Than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects. Subsequent to publication of the proposed rule, DoD discovered that the docket identifier in the published proposed rule was incorrect. All other information in the September 4, 2024, remains the same.

DATES: This correction is effective on September 20, 2024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Toppings, 571-372-0485.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. 2024-19457, published in the **Federal Register** on September 4, 2024 (89 FR 71865) make the following correction:

On page 71865, in the first column, in the document heading, the docket number "Docket ID: DoD-2021-OS-0071" is corrected to read "Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0099".

Dated: September 17, 2024.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2024-21551 Filed 9-19-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001-FR-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[WC Docket Nos. 12-375, 23-62; FCC 24-75; FR ID 237560]

Incarcerated People's Communication Services; Implementation of the Martha Wright-Reed Act; Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (Commission) seeks additional comment on establishing permanent rate caps for video incarcerated people's communications services (IPCS) that are just and reasonable, and will fairly compensate IPCS providers, including comment on the video IPCS marketplace and the types of data needed to support its efforts to adopt permanent video IPCS rate caps in the future. It also seeks comment on the possibility of further disaggregating the very small jail rate tier and the types of cost or other data that would identify any additional distinctions within this rate tier. The Commission seeks comment on its authority to address quality of service issues raised in this proceeding and whether it should develop minimum Federal quality of service standards. It again seeks comment on whether to expand the definitions of "Prison" and "Jail" to capture the full universe of confinement facilities and specifically, the costs providers incur in providing service to confinement facilities that are not correctional institutions. It also seeks comment on whether to