and naming be accommodated for 5G? Are stakeholders working to evolve any of today’s numbering schemas to encompass 5G? What practical steps should 5G planners take in order to ensure that the functions discussed in this NOI, and any other relevant functions, are properly considered and implemented within their respective organizations?

4. Benefits and Costs

41. Please comment on the public harm expected to result from failure to integrate confidentiality, integrity and availability into 5G networks through authentication, encryption, physical and device security, protecting against DoS attacks, patch management and risk segmentation. Could failure to implement these measures decrease broadband adoption and detract from its productive economic use? Could it reduce the risk of loss of competitively sensitive information for businesses? Could it prevent the loss of consumers’ personally identifiable information? Could it play a role in preventing the unnecessary loss of life or property by, for example, preventing malicious intrusion into critical infrastructure? How should the FCC quantify these benefits in terms of their economic impact? What other benefits would likely stem from an appropriately secure 5G network?

42. Please comment on the costs associated with the implementation of the measures discussed above as investments early in the design and build plans of networks, as opposed to “bolt-on” security after deployment. Are there opportunities for 5G implementation that would only be realized if networks are perceived to be secure? Are there some security elements that, by plan, should be “just in time” or reactive investments, based on realized threats, after 5G implementation? Would these costs include those associated with updating existing hardware, firmware, software, and applications? How would the costs of system updates compare to the costs of adding entirely new elements for a totally new security posture? Do benefits and costs vary depending on the use of open-source software compared to proprietary software? If so, to what extent are open-source solutions available that could reduce costs? Are there scale economies observed across local, regional and nationwide 5G networks? Please comment on specific costs associated with authentication, encryption, physical and device security against DoS attacks, patch management and risk segmentation in the 5G environment.

C. 5G Implications for Public Safety

43. Many public safety services and technologies are undergoing radical change as underlying networks transition from legacy to IP-based modes. Will any new categories of public safety sensors or other machine-based tools become an included part of 5G public safety communications architecture? The development of 5G networks will potentially contribute new capabilities to these IP-based public safety platforms while also creating new challenges, including security challenges, for public safety entities.

44. Please comment on the security implications of linking or integrating 5G networks with IP-based public safety communications platforms. Could this create new security risks or vulnerabilities for NG911, first responder communications, or emergency alerting? What responsibility should 5G service providers have for mitigating and managing these risks? Conversely, could 5G networks help reduce security risks that public safety faces in migrating from legacy to IP-based technologies? Could 5G services support ICAM in a manner that reduces these security risks? Should public safety anticipate a need for unmanned, unattended device ICAM? Are there special considerations for standards development for public safety services and technologies for 5G, and if so, are standards bodies addressing these issues? Is there a need for additional standards body involvement?

III. Procedural Matters

A. Ex Parte Rules

45. This proceeding shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding 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 written 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.

Federal Communications Commission.

David Grey Simpson,

[FR Doc. 2017–01325 Filed 1–19–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the “Government in the Sunshine Act” (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 10:01 a.m. on Wednesday, January 18, 2017, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider matters related to the Corporation’s supervision, corporate, and resolution activities.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Vice Chairman Thomas M. Hoenig, seconded by Director Thomas J. Curry (Comptroller of the Currency), concurred in by Director Richard Cordray (Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau), and Chairman Martin J. Gruenberg, that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters which were to be the subject of this meeting on less than seven days’ notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matters could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of
subsections (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8),
(c)(9)(A)(ii), and (c)(9)(B) of the
“Government in the Sunshine Act” (5
U.S.C. 552(b)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8),
(c)(9)(A)(ii) and (c)(9)(B).

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Robert E. Feldman,
Executive Secretary:

[FR Doc. 2017–01523 Filed 1–18–17; 4:15 pm]
BILLING CODE P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission

DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC (Ninth Floor).

STATUS: This meeting will be open to
the public.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED:
Correction and Approval of Minutes for December 1, 2016
Draft Advisory Opinion 2016–26: Green Party of Florida
Draft Advisory Opinion 2016–25: Mike Pence for Indiana
Management and Administrative Matters
Individuals who plan to attend and require special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact Dayna C. Brown, Acting Secretary and Clerk, at (202) 694–1040, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting date.

PERSON TO CONTACT FOR INFORMATION:
Judith Ingram, Press Officer, Telephone: (202) 694–1220.
Dayna C. Brown,
Acting Secretary and Clerk of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017–01505 Filed 1–18–17; 11:15 am]
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GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[Notice-PBS–2016–02; Docket No. 2016–0002; Sequence No. 27]

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Department of Labor Headquarters Consolidation and Exchange of the Frances Perkins Building

AGENCY: Public Building Service (PBS), General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement and public meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), GSA plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Department of Labor Headquarters (DOL HQ) Consolidation to guide the evaluation of alternatives for a new permanent location for the DOL HQ. GSA also will be initiating related consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 36 CFR part 800 (Protection of Historic Properties) for the project.

GSA intends to prepare an EIS to analyze the potential impacts resulting from the proposed action, which encompasses two parts: (1) Acquisition of a consolidated DOL HQ at a new permanent location; and (2) exchange of the Frances Perkins Building parcel.

Background

The purpose of the proposed action is to: (1) Consolidate the existing DOL HQ offices and divisions into one location in Washington, DC; and (2) provide the DOL with a headquarters facility that meets the Interagency Security Council (ISC) Level III security standards.

A consolidated DOL HQ is needed to consolidate approximately 4,400 DOL personnel currently scattered in both federally-owned and leased locations into one federally-owned building. Currently, the Frances Perkins building is outdated with inefficient floor plates and support spaces that impede more than aid the agency in performing its missions. In addition to the age of the property and the building’s inefficiencies, there are significant costs for repair and replacement of major building systems.

GSA is the lead agency for the DOL HQ consolidation and exchange of Frances Perkins, and associated NEPA and NHPA compliance. DOL and the National Capital Planning Commission

3. Frances Perkins Building location:

Thursday, February 9, 2017 from 6:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. eastern standard time. Address: Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library, 901 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Alexis Gray, NEPA Compliance Specialist, GSA, National Capital Region, at 202–260–6895. Also, please call this number if special assistance is needed to attend and participate in the scoping meeting.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4321–4347; the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 40, chapter V, parts 1500–1508); and the GSA Public Buildings Service NEPA Desk Guide, dated October 1999, GSA plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed DOL HQ Consolidation to guide the evaluation of alternatives for a new permanent location for the DOL HQ. GSA also will be initiating related consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 36 CFR part 800 (Protection of Historic Properties) for the project.

GSA intends to prepare an EIS to analyze the potential impacts resulting from the proposed action, which encompasses two parts: (1) Acquisition of a consolidated DOL HQ at a new permanent location; and (2) exchange of the Frances Perkins Building parcel.

Background

The purpose of the proposed action is to: (1) Consolidate the existing DOL HQ offices and divisions into one location in Washington, DC; and (2) provide the DOL with a headquarters facility that meets the Interagency Security Council (ISC) Level III security standards.

A consolidated DOL HQ is needed to consolidate approximately 4,400 DOL personnel currently scattered in both federally-owned and leased locations into one federally-owned building. Currently, the Frances Perkins building is outdated with inefficient floor plates and support spaces that impede more than aid the agency in performing its missions. In addition to the age of the property and the building’s inefficiencies, there are significant costs for repair and replacement of major building systems.

GSA is the lead agency for the DOL HQ consolidation and exchange of Frances Perkins, and associated NEPA and NHPA compliance. DOL and the National Capital Planning Commission