and take appropriate action or make the proposed Order final.

II. The Respondents

Respondents, Planned Building Services, Inc. (''PBS''), Planned Lifestyle Services Inc. (''PLS''), Planned Security Services, Inc. (''PSS''), and Planned Technologies Services, Inc. (''PTS''), are divisions of Planned Companies Holdings, Inc. Planned Companies Holdings, Inc., is a non-wholly owned, loosely controlled subsidiary of FirstService Corporation, a publicly traded Canadian company and one of the largest property management companies in North America. PBS provides cleaning and maintenance services at residential and commercial buildings; PLS provides doorperson and concierge services at residential buildings; PSS provides security guard services at residential and commercial buildings; and PTS provides technology related services. Respondents are headquartered in New Jersey and employ more than 3,000 building services workers, primarily in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic, but also in the metro regions of Boston, the District of Columbia, Atlanta, San Francisco, and Florida. The complaint focuses on Respondents' conduct in New York and New Jersey.

III. The Complaint

The complaint alleges that Respondents sell building services to building owners and property management companies, primarily consisting of the labor of janitors, security guards, maintenance workers, and concierge desk workers who are directly employed by Respondents. These employees perform their work at residential and commercial buildings in various States, but predominantly in New York City and Northern New Jersey.

The complaint also alleges that Respondents and their building owner and property manager customers are direct competitors in labor markets for building services workers. These include the markets for workers to perform concierge, security, janitorial, maintenance, and related services.

As alleged in the complaint, Respondents use standard-form agreements with their customers that include No-Hire Agreements. The No-Hire Agreements restrict the ability of Respondents' customers to (1) directly hire workers employed by Respondents, and (2) indirectly hire workers employed by Respondents through a competing building services contractor after the competitor wins the customers' business away from Respondents. These restrictions apply during the term of Respondents' contracts and for six months thereafter. Earlier versions of the No-Hire Agreements applied not just to Respondents' employees staffed to provide services for a particular customer, but to all of Respondents' building services employees.

The complaint alleges that Respondents' No-Hire Agreements are facially anticompetitive because they are horizontal agreements among competitors not to compete. Respondents and their customer building owners and property managers are competitors for the labor of building services workers like Respondents' employees. The No-Hire Agreements are horizontal agreements that prohibit buildings and property management companies from hiring building services workers, thereby undermining competition for labor, reducing worker bargaining power, and suppressing wages. For these reasons, the complaint alleges that the No-Hire Agreements constitute unreasonable restraints of trade that are unlawful under section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1, and are thus unfair methods of competition in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45.

Independent of the Sherman Act, the complaint alleges that Respondents' conduct constitutes an unfair method of competition with a tendency or likelihood to harm competition, consumers, and employees in the building services industry, in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act. According to the complaint, the No-Hire Agreements limit the ability of building owners and managers to hire Respondents' employees. This harms Respondents' employees because it limits their ability to negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, and improved working conditions. Employees may suffer further hardship if the building they work at brings services in-house because the No-Hire Agreements force them to leave their jobs in some circumstances. The complaint further alleges that the No-Hire Agreements harm building owners and managers because they may be foreclosed from bringing services in-house due to the prospect of losing long-serving workers with extensive, building-specific experience.

IV. Proposed Order

The proposed Order seeks to remedy Respondents' unfair methods of competition. Section II of the proposed Order prohibits Respondents from entering into, maintaining, or enforcing a No-Hire Agreement, or communicating to a customer or any other person that any Planned employee is subject to a No-Hire Agreement.

Paragraph III.A of the proposed Order requires Respondents to provide written notice to customers that are subject to No-Hire Agreements that (i) the restriction is null and void, and (ii) any customer or a subsequent building services contractor for a customer is no longer subject to the restrictions or penalties related to the No-Hire Agreements in Respondents' contracts.

Paragraph III.B of the proposed Order requires Respondents to provide written notice to employees who are subject to a No-Hire Agreement. Paragraph III.C requires that Respondents post clear and conspicuous notice that employees are not subject to No-Hire Agreements and may seek or accept a job with the building directly, or any company that wins the building's business.

Paragraphs IV.A and IV.B of the proposed Order provide a timeline according to which the obligations enumerated in Section III must be met. Paragraphs IV.C–E set forth Respondents' ongoing compliance obligations.

Other paragraphs contain standard provisions regarding compliance reports, requirements for Respondents to provide notice to the FTC of material changes to their business, and access for the FTC to documents and personnel. The term of the proposed Order is ten years.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the Consent Agreement and proposed Order to aid the Commission in determining whether it should make the proposed Order final. This analysis is not an official interpretation of the proposed Order and does not modify its terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

April J. Tabor,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2024–31763 Filed 1–3–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[Notice–Q–2024–07; Docket No. 2024–0002; Sequence No. 58]

Federal Secure Cloud Advisory Committee Request for Applications

AGENCY: Federal Acquisition Service (Q), General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: GSA is seeking applications to fill three (3) membership seats on the

Federal Secure Cloud Advisory Committee (hereinafter ''the Committee'' or ''the FSCAC''), a Federal advisory committee required by statute.

DATES: GSA will consider complete applications that are received no later than 5 p.m. eastern standard time on Monday, January 20, 2025. Applications will be accepted via the application form online at *https://forms.gle/Aezt29xYzqy7Q4gv5,* which can also be found on FSCAC's website, *https://gsa.gov/fscac.*

ADDRESSES: Applications will be accepted electronically. Please submit applications via *https://forms.gle/Aezt29xYzqy7Q4gv5,* and email accompanying documents to *fscac@gsa.gov* with the subject line: FSCAC APPLICATION—[Applicant Name]. The form and associated instructions will be available online at *https://gsa.gov/fscac.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle White, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), FSCAC, GSA, 703–489–4160, *fscac@gsa.gov.* Additional information about the Committee is available online at *https://gsa.gov/fscac.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

GSA, in compliance with the FedRAMP Authorization Act of 2022, established the FSCAC, an advisory committee in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. ch. 10). The Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) within GSA is responsible for providing a standardized, reusable approach to security assessment and authorization for cloud computing products and services that process unclassified information used by agencies.

The FSCAC will provide advice and recommendations to the Administrator of GSA, the FedRAMP Board, and agencies on technical, financial, programmatic, and operational matters regarding the secure adoption of cloud computing products and services. The FSCAC will ensure effective and ongoing coordination of agency adoption, use, authorization, monitoring, acquisition, and security of cloud computing products and services to enable agency mission and administrative priorities. The purposes of the Committee are:

- To examine the operations of FedRAMP and determine ways that authorization processes can continuously be improved, including the following:
  - Measures to increase agency reuse of FedRAMP authorizations.
  - Proposed actions that can be adopted to reduce the burden, confusion, and cost associated with FedRAMP authorizations for cloud service providers.
  - Measures to increase the number of FedRAMP authorizations for cloud computing products and services offered by small businesses concerns (as defined by section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)).
  - Proposed actions that can be adopted to reduce the burden and cost of FedRAMP authorizations for agencies.
- Collect information and feedback on agency compliance with, and implementation of, FedRAMP requirements.
- Serve as a forum that facilitates communication and collaboration among the FedRAMP stakeholder community.

The FSCAC will meet no fewer than three (3) times a calendar year. Meetings shall occur as frequently as needed, called, and approved by the DFO. Meetings may be held virtually or in person. Members will serve without compensation and may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5703.

The Committee shall be comprised of not more than 15 members who are qualified representatives from the public and private sectors, appointed by the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of OMB, as follows:

i. The GSA Administrator or the GSA Administrator's designee, who shall be the Chair of the Committee.

ii. At least one representative each from the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

iii. At least two officials who serve as the Chief Information Security Officer within an agency, who shall be required to maintain such a position throughout the duration of their service on the Committee.

iv. At least one official serving as Chief Procurement Officer (or equivalent) in an agency, who shall be required to maintain such a position throughout the duration of their service on the Committee.

v. At least one individual representing an independent assessment organization.

vi. At least five representatives from unique businesses that primarily provide cloud computing services or products, including at least two representatives from a small business (as defined by section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a))).

vii. At least two other representatives from the Federal Government as the Administrator determines to be necessary to provide sufficient balance, insights, or expertise to the Committee.

Each member shall be appointed for a term of three (3) years, except the initial terms, which were staggered into one (1), two (2) or three (3) year terms to establish a rotation in which one third of the members are selected. No member shall be appointed for more than two (2) consecutive terms nor shall any member serve for more than six (6) consecutive years. GSA values opportunities to increase diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility on its federal advisory committees.

Members will be designated as Regular Government Employees (RGEs) or Representative members as appropriate and consistent with Section 3616(d) of the FedRAMP Authorization Act of 2022. GSA's Office of General Counsel will assist the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) to determine the advisory committee member designations. Representatives are members selected to represent a specific point of view held by a particular group, organization, or association. Members who are full time or permanent part-time Federal civilian officers or employees shall be appointed to serve as Regular Government Employee (RGE) members. In accordance with OMB Final Guidance published in the **Federal Register** on October 5, 2011 and revised on August 13, 2014, federally registered lobbyists may not serve on the Committee in an individual capacity to provide their own individual best judgment and expertise, such as RGEs members. This ban does not apply to lobbyists appointed to provide the Committee with the views of a particular group, organization, or association, such as Representative members.

Applications

Applications are being accepted to fill the remaining term of one (1) vacant seat as an RGE member and to fill two (2) seats with upcoming expiring terms as Representative members.

One (1) seat for an official who serves as the Chief Information Security Officer within an agency, who shall be required to maintain such a position throughout the duration of their service on the Committee, will be appointed to serve for the remainder of the vacant term, scheduled to end on May 14, 2026.

One (1) seat for a representative of a unique business that primarily provides cloud computing products or services will be appointed for a three year term.

One (1) seat for a representative of an independent assessment service will be appointed for a three year term.

Applications for membership on the Committee will be accepted until 5 p.m. eastern standard time on Monday, January 20, 2025.

There are two parts to submitting an application. First, complete the information requested via this electronic form *https://forms.gle/Aezt29xYzqy7Q4gv5.* Next, email your CV or resume and a letter of endorsement from your organization or organization's leadership, endorsing you to represent your company, in .PDF format to *fscac@gsa.gov* with the subject line: FSCAC APPLICATION—[Applicant Name]. The letter of endorsement must come from your organization or organization's leadership. If you are the CEO, then it must come from another member of the executive team of your organization, as you cannot endorse yourself. The letter must be signed and specifically state that you are authorized to apply to FSCAC as a representative of your organization.

Applications that do not include the completion of the above instructions will not be considered.

Letters of Recommendation may also be submitted if desired by the applicant; however, please note they may or may not have an impact on final appointments and are not required for an application to be considered.

Margaret Dugan,

Service-Level Liaison, Federal Acquisition Service, General Services Administration.

[FR Doc. 2024–31554 Filed 1–3–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2021–N–0403]

Food Contact Notifications That Are No Longer Effective

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is announcing its determination that the Food Contact Notifications (FCNs) listed in this notice are no longer effective. Several manufacturers notified FDA in writing that they ceased producing, supplying, or using the listed food contact substances (FCSs) for their intended use in the United States. We are taking this action in accordance with the process set out in our regulations, by which FDA may determine that an FCN is no longer effective.

DATES: *Applicable date:* This determination for the FCNs listed in table 1 and table 2 is effective January 6, 2025.

Compliance date: June 30, 2025, is the compliance date for the FCSs listed in table 2 that were produced, supplied, or used by the manufacturer or supplier prior to the effective date of this determination.

ADDRESSES: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts, and/or go to the Dockets Management Staff, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lillian Mawby, Office of Food Chemical Safety, Dietary Supplements, and Innovation, Human Foods Program, Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740, 301–796–4041 or Carrol Bascus, Office of Policy, Regulations and Information, Human Foods Program, Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740, 240–402–2378.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In the **Federal Register** of March 22, 2024 (89 FR 20306), FDA issued a final rule to amend its regulations at § 170.105 (21 CFR 170.105) to provide additional reasons, other than safety, that may form the basis to determine that an FCN is no longer effective. One reason we may determine that an FCN is no longer effective is when the manufacturer or supplier has ceased or will cease the production, supply, or use of the food contact substance for its intended use authorized by the FCN (referred to as ''abandonment'').

Several manufacturers or suppliers notified FDA, through voluntary commitment letters (Ref. 1), that they have ceased producing, supplying, or using authorized FCSs for their intended food contact use in the United States. FDA received this information before issuing the final rule. After the final rule's effective date of May 21, 2024, consistent with § 170.105(a)(2)(ii)(A), we contacted the manufacturers or suppliers to inform them that their voluntary commitment letters demonstrate that they had ceased, and did not intend to resume in the future, producing, supplying, or using the subject FCSs for their intended food contact use. We provided the manufacturers or suppliers an opportunity to respond and did not receive any responses that disagreed with our findings. Therefore, in accordance with § 170.105(a)(2)(ii)(B), we determined that the FCNs are no longer effective based on abandonment. This notice constitutes the detailed summary of the basis for FDA's determination that these specific FCNs are no longer effective in accordance with § 170.105(b).

Tables 1 and 2 identify FCNs that are no longer effective, as well as the FCSs no longer authorized by these FCNs, as of the publication date of this notice. Based on the end of sales dates provided by the manufacturers for the FCSs listed in FCNs in table 1, we expect any existing stocks of these FCSs to have already been exhausted from the U.S. market. For the FCSs listed in the FCNs in table 2, we are providing a compliance date for existing stocks of products that were produced, supplied, or used by the manufacturer or supplier before January 6, 2025. Based on the information provided in the voluntary commitment letter from that manufacturer, we expect any existing stocks of these products to be exhausted by June 30, 2025. We have determined that providing a compliance date of June 30, 2025, to exhaust these existing stocks would be protective of public health. For this reason, in accordance with § 170.105(b) we are establishing a compliance date of June 30, 2025, for the use of FCSs listed in table 2 in food contact articles if the FCSs were produced, supplied, or used by the manufacturer or supplier before January 6, 2025.

TABLE 1—FOOD CONTACT NOTIFICATIONS (FCNs) NO LONGER EFFECTIVE AS OF JANUARY 6, 2025

FCN No.	FCS	Manufacturer/supplier
59	Glycine, N,N-bis[2-hydroxy-3-(2-propenyloxy)propyl]-, monosodium salt, reaction products with ammonium hydroxide and pentafluoroiodoethane-tetrafluoroethylene telomer (CAS Reg. No. 220459–70–1).	BASF Corporation.