

responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify this AD:

- (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866,
- (2) Is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979),
- (3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska to the extent that it justifies making a regulatory distinction, and
- (4) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

#### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

#### Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

#### PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

##### § 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

**2014–22–02 Rolls-Royce plc:** Amendment 39–18006; Docket No. FAA–2014–0705; Directorate Identifier 2014–NE–13–AD.

##### (a) Effective Date

This AD is effective November 14, 2014.

##### (b) Affected ADs

None.

##### (c) Applicability

This AD applies to all Rolls-Royce plc (RR) Trent 1000–A, 1000–C, 1000–D, 1000–E, 1000–G, and 1000–H turbofan engines.

##### (d) Reason

This AD was prompted by a finding that an intermediate pressure (IP) shaft failure may not be detected by engine electronic controller (EEC) software earlier than standard MB6.15. We are issuing this AD to detect IP shaft failure and prevent IP compressor turbine burst, uncontained engine failure, and damage to the airplane.

##### (e) Actions and Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(1) Within 30 days or 180 flight cycles after the effective date of this AD, whichever

occurs first, remove from the engine any EEC software standard earlier than software standard MB6.15.

(2) Install EEC software eligible for installation.

##### (f) Installation Prohibition

After the effective date of this AD, do not install any EEC containing a software standard earlier than software standard of MB6.15, into any engine.

##### (g) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

The Manager, Engine Certification Office, FAA, may approve AMOCs to this AD. Use the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19 to make your request. You may email your request to: [ANE-AD-AMOC@faa.gov](mailto:ANE-AD-AMOC@faa.gov).

##### (h) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Kenneth Steeves, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: 781–238–7765; fax: 781–238–7199; email: [kenneth.steeves@faa.gov](mailto:kenneth.steeves@faa.gov).

(2) Refer to MCAI European Aviation Safety Agency AD 2014–0192, dated September 1, 2014, for more information. You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating it in Docket No. FAA–2014–0705.

(3) RR Alert Service Bulletin No. TRENT 1000 73–AH914, dated July 23, 2014, which is not incorporated by reference in this AD, can be obtained from RR using the contact information in paragraph (h)(4) of this AD.

(4) For service information identified in this AD, contact Rolls-Royce plc, Corporate Communications, P.O. Box 31, Derby, England, DE248BJ; phone: 011–44–1332–242424; fax: 011–44–1332–249936; email: [http://www.rolls-royce.com/contact/civil\\_team.jsp](http://www.rolls-royce.com/contact/civil_team.jsp); Internet: <https://www.aeromanager.com>.

(5) You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

##### (i) Material Incorporated by Reference

None.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 17, 2014.

**Colleen M. D'Alessandro,**

*Assistant Directorate Manager, Engine & Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2014–25739 Filed 10–29–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DoD–2014–OS–0091]

### 32 CFR Part 311

#### Privacy Act; Implementation

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, DoD.

**ACTION:** Direct final rule with request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the Secretary of Defense is exempting those records contained in DWHS E05, entitled "Mandatory Declassification Review Files," pertaining to requests and/or appeals from individuals for the mandatory review of classified documents. The exemption will allow DoD to provide protection against releasing any documents that remain properly classified and not available for release.

**DATES:** The rule is effective on January 8, 2015 unless adverse comments are received by December 29, 2014. If adverse comment is received, the Department of Defense will publish a timely withdrawal of the rule in the **Federal Register**.

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

- *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Federal Docket Management System Office, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350–3100.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Cindy Allard at (571) 372–0461.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This direct final rule makes nonsubstantive changes to the Office of the Secretary Privacy Program rules. These changes will allow the Department to add an exemption rule to the Office of the Secretary of Defense Privacy Program rules that will exempt applicable Department records and/or material from certain portions of the Privacy Act. This is being published as a direct final rule as the Department of Defense does

not expect to receive any adverse comments, and so a proposed rule is unnecessary.

### Direct Final Rule and Significant Adverse Comments

DoD has determined this rulemaking meets the criteria for a direct final rule because it involves nonsubstantive changes dealing with DoD's management of its Privacy Programs. DoD expects no opposition to the changes and no significant adverse comments. However, if DoD receives a significant adverse comment, the Department will withdraw this direct final rule by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**. A significant adverse comment is one that explains: (1) Why the direct final rule is inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or (2) why the direct final rule will be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a comment necessitates withdrawal of this direct final rule, DoD will consider whether it warrants a substantive response in a notice and comment process.

### Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" and Executive Order 13563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review"

It has been determined that this rule is not a significant rule. This rule does not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in these Executive orders.

### Public Law 96-354, "Regulatory Flexibility Act" (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)

It has been certified that this rule does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense. A Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required.

### Public Law 96-511, "Paperwork Reduction Act" (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that this rule does not impose additional information collection requirements on the public under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

### Section 202, Public Law 104-4, "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act"

It has been determined that this rule does not involve a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more and that it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

### Executive Order 13132, "Federalism"

It has been determined that this rule does not have federalism implications. This rule does not 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. Therefore, no Federalism assessment is required.

### List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 311

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 311 is amended as follows:

### PART 311—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND JOINT STAFF PRIVACY PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 311 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 522a.

■ 2. Section 311.8 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(21) to read as follows:

#### § 311.8 Procedures for exemptions.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(21) System identifier and name: DWHS E05, Mandatory Declassification Review Files.

(i) *Exemption:* Information classified under E.O. 13526, as implemented by DoD 5200.1-R, may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1).

(ii) *Authority:* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1).

(iii) *Reasons:* From subsection 5 U.S.C. 552a(d) because granting access to information that is properly classified pursuant to E.O. 13526, as implemented by DoD 5200.1-R, may cause damage to the national security.

Dated: October 27, 2014.

Aaron Siegel,

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2014-25819 Filed 10-29-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### 32 CFR Part 311

[Docket ID: DoD-2014-OS-0126]

#### Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, DoD.  
**ACTION:** Direct final rule with request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the Secretary of Defense is exempting those records contained in DPFPA 05, entitled "Computer Aided Dispatch and Records Management System (CAD/RMS)," pertaining to investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes (under (j)(2) of the Act) to enable OSD to conduct certain investigations and relay law enforcement information without compromise of the information, and protect investigative techniques and efforts employed, as well as investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes (under (k)(2) of the Act), other than material within the scope of subsection (k)(2) of the Privacy Act to enable the protection of identities of confidential sources who might not otherwise come forward and who furnished information under an express promise that the sources' identity would be held in confidence. The exemption will allow DoD to provide protection against notification of investigatory material including certain reciprocal investigations which might alert a subject to the fact that an investigation of that individual is taking place, and the disclosure of which would weaken the on-going investigation, reveal investigatory techniques, and place confidential informants in jeopardy who furnished information under an express promise that the sources' identity would be held in confidence. Further, requiring OSD to grant access to records and amend these records would unfairly impede the investigation of allegations of unlawful activities. To require OSD to confirm or deny the existence of a record pertaining to a requesting individual may in itself provide an answer to that individual relating to an on-going investigation. The investigation of possible unlawful activities would be jeopardized by agency rules requiring verification of