

incidents associated with manipulating the AS Path attribute, including distorting or falsifying the Origin AS, or the originated route specificity. Some of the relatively more well-known routing incidents have involved these attack vectors.

5. Internet addressing conventions have implications for BGP routing, since BGP routers advertise the reachability of destination addresses to which they can find a path. Reachability information exchange occurs by exchanging BGP protocol data units or packets that contain the necessary information using the formats and semantics specified in BGP standard documents. To allow BGP routing to scale, Internet Service Providers (ISPs) are required to aggregate the IP address space in the route advertisements they originate into a compacted contiguous block that forms the “network prefix.” Doing so reduces the number of route table entries needed to cover the full scope of available internet destinations, thus diminishing the size of the routing table in those routers central to routing topology in the so-called “default-free zone.” Since memory and route look up speeds both affect router operation, this form of aggregation allows the number of addressable endpoints to grow and the internet to scale while still retaining acceptable performance in the routers that carry the most comprehensive sets of routes, in effect constituting a connectivity core for the internet. However, a route that is more specific than one that is aggregated is preferred by the BGP state machine, so announcing this will preferentially attract traffic relative to a route advertising an aggregate. This attack vector is somewhat distinct from AS PATH manipulation and has been used in prior BGP hijack incidents as well.

6. Details of the concepts introduced above are further explained in several accessible reference works, including the primer entitled “Security of the Internet’s Routing Infrastructure,” issued by the Broadband Internet Technical Advisory Group (BITAG). For more information beyond the summary descriptions in this section, readers are referred to the text on “Network Routing” in the Morgan Kaufman series in Networking or, for simplified review, the BITAG document as well as the OECD publication on routing security.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2024–13048 Filed 6–14–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 90 and 95

[ET Docket No. 19–138, DA 24–538; FR ID 225149]

Use of the 5.850–5.925 GHz Band

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Office of Engineering and Technology invites supplemental comment to address issues regarding the use of geofencing in cellular-vehicle-to-everything on-board units to reduce out-of-band emission power limits around specified federal radiolocation services.

DATES: Interested parties may file comments on or before July 5, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before the dates provided in the “Dates” section of this Proposed Rule. Comments may be filed using the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS). You may submit comments, identified by ET Docket No. 19–138 and referencing this public notice, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the ECFS: <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/>.

- *Paper Filers:* Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.

- Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by First-Class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- All hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission’s Secretary are accepted between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. at 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.
- Commercial overnight deliveries (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- U.S. Postal Service First-Class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

- *People with Disabilities:* Contact the Commission to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by email: FCC504@fcc.gov or phone: 202–418–0530 or TTY: 202–418–0432.

- *Availability of Documents:* Comments and *ex parte* submissions will be available via ECFS. Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Microsoft Word, and/or Adobe Acrobat.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Butler of the Office of Engineering and Technology, at Brian.Butler@fcc.gov or 202–418–2702.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Office of Engineering and Technology’s Public Notice in ET Docket No. 19–138, DA 24–538, released June 11, 2024. The full text of this document is available for public inspection at the following internet address: <https://www.fcc.gov/document/oet-seeks-comment-board-unit-power-limits-c-v2x-operations>.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis. The *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM)* in ET Docket No. 19–138 included an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (“IRFA”) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 603, exploring the potential impact on small entities of the Commission’s proposals. *Use of the 5.850–5.925 GHz Band*, 86 FR 23323, 23333–36 (May 3, 2021). We invite parties to file supplemental comments on the IRFA in light of this request to refresh the record.

Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis. This document does not contain any new or modified information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. Thus, it does not contain any new or modified information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, see 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

Ex Parte Presentations. This proceeding shall be treated as “permit-but-disclose” in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2)

summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act: The Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, Public Law 118–9, requires each agency, in providing notice of a rulemaking, to post online a brief plain-language summary of the proposed rule. The required summary of this Public Notice is available at <https://www.fcc.gov/proposedrulemakings>.

Synopsis

By this Proposed Rule, the Office of Engineering and Technology invites supplemental comment to the *FNPRM* in the Commission's proceeding titled *Use of the 5.850–5.925 GHz Band*, 86 FR 23323 (May 3, 2021), to address issues raised by a commenter regarding the use of geofencing to allow for higher power limits in devices operating in certain areas while ensuring that their power is sufficiently limited in locations near specified federal radiolocation service sites. Specifically, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) recently filed a letter in this proceeding making recommendations to address three specific areas related to the protection of federal radiolocation systems: general provisions for cellular vehicle-to-everything (C–V2X) technical and service rules; C–V2X roadside unit (RSU) equivalent isotropically-radiated

power (EIRP) limits; and EIRP limits for C–V2X on-board units (OBUs). Letter from Charles Cooper, Associate Administrator, Office of Spectrum Management, NTIA, to Ronald T. Repasi, Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology and Joel Taubenblatt, Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, FCC, ET Docket No. 19–138 (filed June 7, 2024) (NTIA Letter). The NTIA suggestions regarding EIRP limits for C–V2X OBUs present a proposal to allow for higher power limits in devices equipped with geofencing than in devices not so equipped. We specifically request comment on this proposal.

In the *First Report and Order* of this proceeding, *Use of the 5.850–5.925 GHz Band*, 86 FR 23281 (May 3, 2021), the Commission adopted provisions requiring Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) operators to move Dedicated Short-Range Communications (DSRC) operations out of the lower 45 megahertz of the 5.850–5.925 GHz band (5.9 GHz band) and the transition of those operations to C–V2X technology. At the same time, in the *FNPRM*, the Commission sought comment on numerous proposals aimed at finalizing the technical parameters for C–V2X operations. With regard to OBU device power limits, the Commission proposed to limit C–V2X OBUs' output power to no more than 20 dBm and EIRP to no more than 23 dBm.

NTIA's recommendations focus on ensuring that the power levels of C–V2X operations are limited as necessary to protect federal radiolocation services. Under current Commission rules, the federal radiolocation service site locations for which protection is sought are specified in 47 CFR 90.371(b), and the DSRC RSU facilities within certain radii relative to these locations ("coordination zones") must be coordinated with the NTIA prior to authorization. 47 CFR 90.371. The existing rules addressing power limits for both RSUs and OBUs are agnostic regarding operations relative to the coordination zones.

Among other things, in its letter, NTIA suggests that the Commission adopt power requirements for OBUs to ensure federal radiolocation service sites are protected within the coordination zones, including optionally incorporating geofencing that would enable OBUs to operate at variable levels depending on location. "Geofencing" is used to create a virtual boundary around a physical location by enabling a radiofrequency device using a geolocation capability to determine whether its geographic coordinates are within a defined geographic area. As

proposed by NTIA, an OBU could incorporate a geolocation capability to respond to the appropriate areas around federal radiolocation sites, currently enumerated in 47 CFR 90.371(b), by dynamically reducing power when entering any of those areas. NTIA suggests that such OBUs would be able to operate without such power restrictions in areas outside the coordination zones, provided that they are programmed with information about these sites—geographic coordinates and a predetermined radius—ensuring that they operate with reduced EIRP levels within the relevant areas. NTIA suggests that OBU devices not incorporating a geolocation capability be required to comply with the more restrictive EIRP limits.

Accordingly, considering the need to protect the federal radiolocation service through the optional use of geofencing techniques, NTIA suggests the following EIRP power spectral density (PSD) limits for C–V2X OBUs operating without a geofencing capability at all locations and those that incorporate a geofencing capability when operating inside of a coordination zone:

- 10 megahertz channel (5.895–5.905 GHz): 23 dBm/10 MHz EIRP; 10 megahertz channel (5.905–5.915 GHz): 33 dBm/10 MHz EIRP, reduced to 27 dBm within ±5 degrees of horizontal;
- 10 megahertz channel (5.915–5.925 GHz): 33 dBm/10 MHz EIRP, reduced to 27 dBm within ±5 degrees of horizontal;
- 20 megahertz channel (5.895–5.915 GHz): 23 dBm/20 MHz EIRP;
- 20 megahertz channel (5.905–5.925 GHz): 33 dBm/20 MHz EIRP, reduced to 27 dBm within ±5 degrees of horizontal; and
- 30 megahertz channel (5.895–5.925 GHz): 23 dBm/30 MHz EIRP.

NTIA suggests the following EIRP PSD limits for C–V2X OBUs that incorporate a geofencing capability when operating outside of a coordination zone:

- 10 megahertz channel (5.895–5.905 GHz): 33 dBm/10 MHz EIRP;
- 10 megahertz channel (5.905–5.915 GHz): 33 dBm/10 MHz EIRP;
- 10 megahertz channel (5.915–5.925 GHz): 33 dBm/10 MHz EIRP;
- 20 megahertz channel (5.895–5.915 GHz): 33 dBm/20 MHz EIRP;
- 20 megahertz channel (5.905–5.925 GHz): 33 dBm/20 MHz EIRP; and
- 30 megahertz channel (5.895–5.925 GHz): 33 dBm/30 MHz EIRP.

NTIA also suggests that manufacturers implementing a geofencing capability would need to specifically demonstrate and certify compliance of the capability within the equipment certification process specified in part 2 of the

Commission's rules. In addition, NTIA suggests that responsible parties should provide a mechanism to update the OBUs with new information within a reasonable timeframe if geofencing locations and parameters are subsequently modified.

Through this Proposed Rule, we seek comment on NTIA's recommendations that the Commission modify its part 95 rules to adopt power limit rules for C-V2X OBUs that include provisions for the optional use of geofencing techniques. Given that using geofencing would be an option and not required, we seek comment on the likelihood of manufacturers incorporating such a capability. What performance gains would be expected for C-V2X devices and the ITS overall when a geolocation capability is used as compared to if it is not? Are NTIA's recommendations regarding the power limits for C-V2X devices inside and outside the coordination areas appropriate? Would NTIA's recommendations provide benefits for C-V2X devices and ITS as compared to the Commission's C-V2X OBU rules originally proposed in this proceeding? What would be the relative complexity for adding a geolocation capability and the associated logic necessary for the OBU to adjust its power when in a coordination zone compared to devices without such capability? Would there be increased costs? If so, what would be the expected cost increase? What is the likelihood that manufacturers would incorporate a geofencing capability into their devices given any increased device complexity, additional compliance requirements, and increased cost? Conversely, would the proposed limits have a detrimental effect on operations or compliance? What methods could be used to update deployed OBUs to reflect revised geofencing locations and parameters?

Federal Communications Commission.

Ronald T. Repasi,

Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2024-13266 Filed 6-14-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 240610-0154]

RIN 0648-BM98

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Lane Snapper Catch Limits

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes to implement management measures described in an abbreviated framework action under the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (FMP) as prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council). This proposed rule would modify the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) lane snapper catch limits. The purpose of this proposed rule is to modify the Gulf lane snapper catch limits based on the best scientific information available. This proposed rule would also revise reporting and compliance requirements for Gulf reef fish commercial permit holders using vessel monitoring systems (VMS).

DATES: Written comments must be received by July 17, 2024.

ADDRESSES: A plain language summary of this proposed rule is available at <https://www.regulations.gov/docket/NOAA-NMFS-2024-0049>. You may submit comments on this document, identified by [NOAA-NMFS-2024-0049] by either of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Visit <https://www.regulations.gov> and type NOAA-NMFS-2024-0049, in the Search box. Click on the "Comment" icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

- *Mail:* Submit all written comments to Dan Luers, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on <https://www.regulations.gov>

without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name, address), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Electronic copies of the abbreviated framework action, which includes a Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) analysis and a regulatory impact review, may be obtained from the Southeast Regional Office website at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/gulf-mexico-lane-snapper-catch-limits-abbreviated-framework>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Luers, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, telephone: 727-824-5305, email: daniel.luers@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS and the Council manage the Gulf reef fish fishery, which includes lane snapper, under the FMP. The FMP was prepared by the Council, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and is implemented by NMFS through regulations at 50 CFR part 622 under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

Background

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NMFS and regional fishery management councils to prevent overfishing and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield (OY) from federally managed fish stocks. These mandates are intended to ensure fishery resources are managed for the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to providing food production and recreational opportunities, and protecting marine ecosystems.

Unless otherwise noted, all weights in this proposed rule are in round weight.

Lane snapper occur in estuaries and shelf waters of the Gulf, and are particularly abundant off south and southwest Florida. Lane snapper in the Gulf exclusive economic zone are managed as a single stock, with a combined annual catch limit (ACL) for the commercial and recreational sectors that is set equal to the acceptable biological catch (ABC). The fishing season is open year-round, January 1 through December 31. Currently, the lane snapper overfishing limit (OFL) is 1,053,834 pounds (lb) (478,011 kilograms (kg)) and the ABC is 1,028,973 lb (466,734 kg). These catch limits are based on the results of an update to the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review 49 (SEDAR 49)