

excluded. The airspace within Restricted Areas R-5002A, R-5002C, R-5002D, and R-5002F is excluded during their times of use.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### V-103 [Amended]

From Chesterfield, SC; Greensboro, NC; to INT of Greensboro 357° and South Boston, VA, 247° radials. From Elkins, WV; Clarksburg, WV; Bellaire, OH; INT Bellaire 327° and Akron, OH, 181° radials; to Akron.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### V-375 [Amended]

From Gordonsville, VA; to INT Gordonsville 034° and Casanova, VA, 142° radials.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### V-473 [Amended]

From Montebello, VA; to Gordonsville, VA.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 12, 2025.

**Brian Eric Konie,**

*Manager (A), Rules and Regulations Group.*

[FR Doc. 2025-04395 Filed 3-19-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 91

[Docket No. FAA-2011-0246; Amdt. No. 91-321G]

RIN 2120-AM03

### Extension of the Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Libya

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action extends the prohibition against certain flight operations in the territory and airspace of Libya by all: U.S. air carriers; U.S. commercial operators; persons exercising the privileges of an airman certificate issued by the FAA, except when such persons are operating U.S.-registered aircraft for a foreign air carrier; and operators of U.S.-registered civil aircraft, except when the operator of such aircraft is a foreign air carrier for an additional three years, from March 20, 2025, to March 20, 2028. The FAA finds this action necessary to address continuing risks to persons and aircraft engaged in such flight operations. The FAA also republishes the approval process and exemption information for this Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR), consistent with other recently published flight prohibition SFARs.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective March 19, 2025.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bill Petrak, Flight Standards Service, through the Washington Operations Center, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267-3203; email [9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov](mailto:9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Executive Summary

This action extends the expiration date of SFAR No. 112, title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), 91.1603, from March 20, 2025, to March 20, 2028. SFAR No. 112 prohibits certain flight operations in the territory and airspace of Libya by all: U.S. air carriers; U.S. commercial operators; persons exercising the privileges of an airman certificate issued by the FAA, except when such persons are operating U.S.-registered aircraft for a foreign air carrier; and operators of U.S.-registered civil aircraft, except when the operator of such aircraft is a foreign air carrier. The FAA finds this action necessary to address the continuing unacceptable safety-of-flight risks to U.S. civil aviation in the territory and airspace of Libya due to the unstable political and security environment in Libya. Consistent with other recently published flight prohibition SFARs, this action also republishes the approval process and exemption information for this flight prohibition SFAR.

##### II. Authority and Good Cause

###### A. Authority

The FAA is responsible for the safety of flight in the U.S. and for the safety of U.S. civil operators, U.S.-registered civil aircraft, and U.S.-certificated airmen throughout the world. Section 106(f) of title 49, U.S. Code (U.S.C.), subtitle I, establishes the FAA Administrator's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle VII of title 49, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority. Section 40101(d)(1) provides that the Administrator shall consider in the public interest, among other matters, assigning, maintaining, and enhancing safety and security as the highest priorities in air commerce. Section 40105(b)(1)(A) requires the Administrator to exercise this authority consistently with the obligations of the U.S. Government under international agreements.

The FAA is promulgating this rule under the authority described in 49 U.S.C. 44701, General requirements. Under that section, the FAA is charged

broadly with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing, among other things, regulations and minimum standards for practices, methods, and procedures that the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce and national security.

This regulation is within the scope of the FAA's authority because it continues to prohibit the persons described in paragraph (a) of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, from conducting flight operations in the territory and airspace of Libya due to the continuing hazards to the safety of U.S. civil flight operations, as described in the preamble to this final rule.

###### B. Good Cause for Immediate Adoption

Section 553(b)(B) of title 5, U.S. Code, authorizes agencies to dispense with notice and comment procedures for rules when the agency for "good cause" finds that those procedures are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Also, section 553(d) permits agencies, upon a finding of good cause, to issue rules with an effective date less than 30 days from the date of publication. In this instance, the FAA finds good cause to forgo notice and comment and the delayed effective date because they would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

Providing notice and the opportunity for the public to comment here would be impracticable. The FAA's flight prohibitions, and any amendments thereto, need to include appropriate boundaries that reflect the agency's current understanding of the risk environment for U.S. civil aviation. This allows the FAA to protect the safety of U.S. operators' aircraft and the lives of their passengers and crews without over-restricting or under-restricting U.S. operators' routing options. However, the risk environment for U.S. civil aviation in airspace managed by other countries with respect to safety of flight is fluid in circumstances involving fighting, violent extremist and militant activity, or periods of heightened tensions, particularly where weapons capable of targeting or otherwise negatively affecting U.S. civil aviation are or may be present. This fluidity, and the potential for rapid changes in the risks to U.S. civil aviation, significantly limits how far in advance of a new or amended flight prohibition the FAA can usefully assess the risk environment. The delay that would be occasioned by providing an opportunity to comment on this action would significantly increase the risk that the resulting final action would not accurately reflect the current risks to

U.S. civil aviation associated with the situation and thus would not establish boundaries for the flight prohibition commensurate with those risks.

While the FAA sought and responded to public comments, the boundaries of the area in which unacceptable risks to the safety of U.S. civil aviation existed might change due to evolving military or political circumstances; violent extremist and militant group activity; the introduction, removal, or repositioning of more advanced anti-aircraft weapon systems; or other factors. As a result, if the situation improved while the FAA sought and responded to public comments, the rule the FAA finalized might be over-restrictive, unnecessarily limiting U.S. operators' routing options and potentially causing them to incur unnecessary additional fuel and operations-related costs, as well as potentially causing passengers to incur unnecessarily some costs attributed to their time. Conversely, if the situation deteriorated while the FAA sought and responded to public comments, the rule the FAA finalized might be under-restrictive, allowing U.S. civil aviation to continue operating in areas where unacceptable risks to their safety had developed. Such an outcome would endanger the safety of these aircraft, as well as their passengers and crews, exposing them to unacceptable risks of death, injury, and property damage that could occur if a U.S. operator's aircraft were shot down (or otherwise damaged) while operating in the territory and airspace of Libya.

Alternatively, if the FAA made changes to the area in which U.S. civil aviation operations would be prohibited between a notice of proposed rulemaking and a final rule due to changed conditions, the version of the rule the public commented on would no longer reflect the FAA's current assessment of the risk environment for U.S. civil aviation.

In addition, seeking comment would be contrary to the public interest because some of the rational basis for the rulemaking is based upon classified information and controlled unclassified information not authorized for public release. In order to meaningfully provide comment on a proposal, the public would need access to the basis for the agency's decision-making, which the FAA cannot provide. Disclosing classified information or controlled unclassified information not authorized for public release in order to seek meaningful comment on the proposal would harm the public interest. Accordingly, the FAA meaningfully

seeking comment on the proposal is contrary to the public interest.

Therefore, providing notice and the opportunity for comment would be impracticable as it would hinder the FAA's ability to maintain appropriate flight prohibitions based on up-to-date risk assessments of the risks to the safety of U.S. civil aviation operations in airspace managed by other countries. It would also be contrary to the public interest, as the FAA cannot protect classified information and controlled unclassified information not authorized for public release and meaningfully seek public comment.

For the same reasons discussed above, the potential safety impacts and the need for prompt action on up-to-date information that is not public would make delaying the effective date impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

Accordingly, the FAA finds good cause exists to forgo notice and comment and any delay in the effective date for this rule.

### III. Background

In its March 21, 2023, final rule amending and extending the prohibition against certain flights in the territory and airspace of Libya, the FAA continued to assess the situation in the territory and airspace of Libya as hazardous for U.S. civil aviation.<sup>1</sup> Representatives of the Libyan Army of the Government of National Accord (GNA) and the Libyan National Army (LNA) General Command of the Armed Forces signed a United Nations (UN)-backed ceasefire agreement on October 23, 2020. Among other things, the

<sup>1</sup> *Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Libya* final rule, 88 FR 16871 (Mar. 21, 2023; effective, Mar. 17, 2023). The FAA notes that, in its March 21, 2023, final rule, the FAA assessed the risk to U.S. civil aviation operations in the portions of the Tripoli FIR (HLLL) outside the territory and airspace of Libya at altitudes below Flight Level (FL) 300 had diminished and the situation had stabilized sufficiently to permit U.S. civil aviation operations to resume in that airspace. Foreign actors had significantly reduced weapons shipments and military activities off the coast of Libya. Previously, these activities included targeting suspected weapons shipments destined for the opposing side or their foreign sponsors. As a result, the risk of either side or their foreign sponsors misidentifying civil aircraft operations in the overwater portion of the Tripoli FIR as carrying weapons shipments destined for the other side or their foreign sponsors and mistakenly targeting them had diminished. The reduction of widespread conflict had also reduced the risk to U.S. civil aviation operations in the small portion of the Tripoli FIR (HLLL) that extends into Chad's territorial airspace. Therefore, due to the diminished risks to the safety of U.S. civil aviation operations and stabilized situation in those portions of the Tripoli FIR (HLLL) outside the territory and airspace of Libya, the FAA amended SFAR No. 112, 14 CFR 91.1603, to remove the prohibition on U.S. civil aviation operations in those areas.

October 2020 ceasefire provided for: an immediate ceasefire, effective upon signature of the agreement; the departure of all mercenaries and foreign fighters from Libya, including its land, air, and sea territory; and the suspension of all military training agreements and departure of all training crews until a new unified government assumed its functions.

Between the October 2020 ceasefire agreement and the issuance of the 2023 final rule, the FAA assessed combat operations in Libya had significantly decreased, with only intermittent ground clashes between opposing factions. In addition, Russian-backed Vagner Group (also referred to as private military company (PMC) Wagner) had reduced the number of its air defense systems and forces deployed in Libya, with more than 1,300 Vagner personnel having departed the country. However, protests and the intermittent clashes between the various armed factions in Libya continued. Unrest in the capital, in particular, was driven by militia infighting and multiple failed attempts by the Government of National Stability (GNS) to enter Tripoli and contributed to the lack of progress on key milestones set forth in the ceasefire agreement.

When the FAA issued the 2023 final rule, the provisions of the ceasefire agreement relating to departure of all mercenaries and foreign fighters from Libya and the suspension of all military training agreements and departure of all training crews until the Government of National Unity (GNU) assumed its functions had not been fully implemented. At the time the FAA issued the 2023 final rule, airspace deconfliction challenges also remained a safety of flight concern in the territory and airspace of Libya. Various armed groups operating in Libya continued to have access to advanced anti-aircraft weapons systems. The FAA assessed that these groups likely lacked comprehensive airspace awareness sufficient to enable effective aircraft identification and deconfliction of civil and military flights. These circumstances created the potential for localized operational control and use of anti-aircraft systems, rather than a coordinated air defense command and control structure, posing an enduring inadvertent risk to civil aviation operations in the territory and airspace of Libya. The FAA assessed that forces aligned with the GNA and the LNA could quickly increase force protection measures, such as global positioning system (GPS) jamming, air strikes, and the deployment of surface-to-air missile (SAM) systems capable of reaching as high as 49,000 feet. In addition to

foreign-operated air defense capabilities, both GNA and LNA forces had access to anti-aircraft artillery and advanced man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS), some of which have a maximum altitude of 25,000 feet.

In August 2022, LNA air defense forces claimed to have shot down a U.S. MQ-9 UAS operating in the vicinity of Benghazi during a period of increased tensions and threats of renewed violence between competing militias vying for control of Tripoli. The MQ-9 was operating in support of diplomatic engagements, and the operator had conducted pre-mission coordination with Libyan authorities. While this incident involved a military UAS, it demonstrates the potential for inadequate aircraft identification and deconfliction procedures leading to an inadvertent shoot down. In addition, despite a reduction in foreign presence, tensions in Libya remained elevated, and warring factions in Libya and their affiliated foreign sponsors maintained access to advanced weapons. Within their respective strongholds in various areas of the country, Libya's armed factions had either gained access to, or had foreign sponsors equipped with, tactical aircraft, long-range weaponized UAS, air defense systems, and GPS jammers.

Given the tenuous security environment in Libya at the time, the FAA remained concerned when it issued the 2023 final rule about the continued risk of rapid escalation involving these systems during spikes in tensions, which would pose safety-of-flight risks to U.S. civil aviation outside the capital region. As a result of the continuing unacceptable risks to the safety of U.S. civil aviation operations in Libya's airspace at that time, the FAA maintained the prohibition on U.S. civil aviation operations at all altitudes in the territory and airspace of Libya and extended the expiration date of SFAR No. 112, 14 CFR 91.1603, from March 20, 2023, until March 20, 2025.

#### IV. Discussion of the Final Rule

The FAA continues to assess the situation in the territory and airspace of Libya as being hazardous for U.S. civil aviation. Since the 2023 final rule, U.S. civil aviation operations in Libya continue to be exposed to safety of flight risks associated with political and security instability and intermittent clashes between rival armed factions, including as recently as December 2024. Despite attempts to resolve the discord and implement the 2020 UN-brokered ceasefire between factions aligned with the Tripoli-based, UN-recognized GNU and the self-declared LNA based in

eastern Libya, many terms of the ceasefire agreement have not been fulfilled and tensions remain elevated.

Prior to the 2020 ceasefire, forces supporting both the GNA, which preceded the GNU, and the LNA employed indirect fire to strike airfields and airports across northern Libya. Since the ceasefire, both sides have employed manned and unmanned aircraft, SAMs, and/or MANPADs, as well as electronic warfare capabilities, to target manned and unmanned aircraft and to target or protect airfields/airports and other strategic sites. Armed groups continue to compete for control of critical infrastructure and resources, such as Tripoli's Mitiga International Airport (HLLM), due to the facilities' strategic importance and utility for military operations and facilitating lucrative illicit activity. The political and security environment continues to spur factional clashes, which have been observed as recently as mid-December 2024, when clashes included rocket fire near Zawiya oil refinery in western Libya.

The FAA also remains concerned about the adequacy of deconfliction of anti-aircraft-capable weapons systems in the hands of various third parties with civil air traffic in the territory and airspace of Libya. Various third parties, including state actors such as Russia and Türkiye, continue to maintain a physical presence and operate their own anti-aircraft-capable weapons systems in Libya; however, the command and control of these systems, adequacy of airspace deconfliction, and to what extent Libyan authorities are involved in their employment is unclear. Russian private military contractors with questionable training and likely limited access to a complete airspace picture, operating advanced weapons systems—including anti-aircraft capabilities outside of state control—further contribute to the significant airspace deconfliction challenges and unacceptable level of risk to civil aviation operations in Libya's territorial airspace.

Additionally, in 2024, foreign entities continued to deploy and proliferate additional weapons systems into Libya, further demonstrating the complex security and safety environment for civil aviation in the country. For example, in July 2024, according to media reports, Italian authorities seized two large Chinese military-grade UAS that were being smuggled into Libya in violation of a United Nations arms embargo. Italian authorities reportedly stated that these UAS were over 10 meters (33 feet) long, had a wingspan of approximately 20 meters (66 feet), and weighed more

than three tons. They may have been destined for a Libyan faction in eastern Libya.

Violent extremist organizations (VEOs), including the Islamic State of Iraq and ash-Sham (ISIS)-Libya and al-Qa'ida (AQ)-linked groups remain active in Libya, but they likely do not possess the capability to identify, track, and engage an aircraft at overflight cruising altitudes in the territory and airspace of Libya. Although the FAA assesses VEOs lack the resources and access to advanced weapons systems necessary to pose a risk to civil aircraft overflight operations, they likely maintain the intent to target civil aviation as a target of opportunity. Remaining VEOs are likely scattered in southwest Libya and focused on supporting Sahel-based associates but could pose a hazard to U.S. civil aviation operations in other parts of Libya. Nevertheless, VEOs pose a continued, though somewhat diminished, risk to low-altitude flight operations below 25,000 feet.

Therefore, as a result of the continuing, unacceptable risks to the safety of U.S. civil aviation operations in the territory and airspace of Libya, the FAA extends the expiration date of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, from March 20, 2025, until March 20, 2028. The ongoing political and security instability in Libya does not appear likely to subside in the reasonably foreseeable future and a three-year extension will provide ample time for observing any potential sustained changes and reassessment.

Further amendments to SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, might be appropriate if the risk to U.S. civil aviation safety and security changes. In this regard, the FAA will continue to monitor the situation and evaluate the extent to which persons described in paragraph (a) of this rule might be able to operate safely in the territory and airspace of Libya.

The FAA also republishes the details concerning the approval and exemption processes in sections V and VI of this preamble, consistent with other recently published flight prohibition SFARs, to enable interested persons to refer to this final rule for comprehensive information about requesting relief from the FAA from the provisions of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603.

## V. Approval Process Based on a Request From a Department, Agency, or Instrumentality of the United States Government

### A. Approval Process Based on an Authorization Request From a Department, Agency, or Instrumentality of the United States Government

In some instances, U.S. Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities may need to engage U.S. civil aviation to support their activities in the territory and airspace of Libya. If a department, agency, or instrumentality of the U.S. Government determines that it has a critical need to engage any person described in paragraph (a) of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, including a U.S. air carrier or commercial operator, to transport civilian or military passengers or cargo or conduct other operations in the territory and airspace of Libya, that department, agency, or instrumentality may request the FAA to approve persons described in paragraph (a) of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, to conduct such operations.

The requesting U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality must submit the request for approval to the FAA's Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety in a letter signed by an appropriate senior official of the requesting department, agency, or instrumentality.<sup>2</sup> The FAA will not accept or consider requests for approval from anyone other than the requesting U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality. In addition, the senior official signing the letter requesting FAA approval must be sufficiently positioned within the requesting department, agency, or instrumentality to demonstrate that the organization's senior leadership supports the request for approval and is committed to taking all necessary steps to minimize aviation safety and security risks to the proposed flights. The senior official must also be in a position to: (1) attest to the accuracy of all representations made to the FAA in the request for approval, and (2) ensure that any support from the requesting U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality described in the request for approval is in fact brought to bear and is maintained over time. Unless justified by exigent

circumstances, requesting U.S. Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities must submit requests for approval to the FAA no less than 30 calendar days before the date on which the requesting department, agency, or instrumentality wishes the operator(s) to commence the proposed operation(s).

The requestor must send the request to the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591. Electronic submissions are acceptable, and the requesting entity may request that the FAA notify it electronically as to whether the FAA grants the request for approval. If a requestor wishes to make an electronic submission to the FAA, the requestor should contact the Washington Operations Center by telephone at (202) 267-3203 or by email at [9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov](mailto:9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov) for submission instructions. The requestor must not submit its letter requesting FAA approval or related supporting documentation to the Washington Operations Center. Rather, the Washington Operations Center will refer the requestor to an appropriate staff member of the Flight Standards Service for further assistance.

A single letter may request approval from the FAA for multiple persons described in SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, or for multiple flight operations. To the extent known, the letter must identify the person(s) the requester expects the SFAR to cover on whose behalf the U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality seeks FAA approval, and it must describe—

- The proposed operation(s), including the nature of the mission being supported;
- The service the person(s) covered by the SFAR will provide;
- To the extent known, the specific locations in the territory and airspace of Libya where the proposed operation(s) will occur, including, but not limited to, the flight path and altitude of the aircraft while it is operating in the territory and airspace of Libya and the airports, airfields, or landing zones at which the aircraft will take off and land;
- The method by which the requesting department, agency, or instrumentality will provide, or how the operator will otherwise obtain, current threat information and an explanation of how the operator will integrate this information into all phases of the proposed operations (*i.e.*, the pre-mission planning and briefing, in-flight, and post-flight phases).

The request for approval must also include a list of operators with whom

the U.S. Government department, agency, or instrumentality requesting FAA approval has a current contract(s), grant(s), or cooperative agreement(s) (or its prime contractor has a subcontract(s)) for specific flight operations in the territory and airspace of Libya. The requestor may identify additional operators to the FAA at any time after the FAA issues its approval. Neither the operators listed in the original request, nor any operators the requestor subsequently seeks to add to the approval, may commence operations under the approval until the FAA issues them an Operations Specification (OpSpec) or Letter of Authorization (LOA), as appropriate, for operations in the territory and airspace of Libya. The approval conditions discussed below apply to all operators. Requestors should contact the Washington Operations Center by telephone at (202) 267-3203 or by email at [9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov](mailto:9-FAA-OverseasFlightProhibitions@faa.gov) for instructions on how to submit the names of additional operators the requestor wishes to add to an existing approval to the FAA. The requestor must not submit the names of additional operators it wishes to add to an existing approval to the Washington Operations Center. Rather, the Washington Operations Center will refer the requestor to an appropriate staff member of the Flight Standards Service for further assistance.

If an approval request includes classified information or controlled unclassified information not authorized for public release, requestors may contact the Washington Operations Center for instructions on submitting it to the FAA. The Washington Operations Center's contact information appears in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this final rule.

FAA approval of an operation under SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, does not relieve persons subject to this SFAR of the responsibility to comply with all other applicable FAA rules and regulations. Operators of civil aircraft must comply with the conditions of their certificates, OpSpecs, and LOAs, as applicable. Operators must also comply with all rules and regulations of other U.S. Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities that may apply to the proposed operation(s), including, but not limited to, regulations issued by the Transportation Security Administration.

### B. Approval Conditions

If the FAA approves the request, the FAA's Aviation Safety organization will send an approval letter to the requesting U.S. Government department, agency, or

<sup>2</sup> This approval procedure applies to U.S. Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities; it does not apply to the public. The FAA describes this procedure in the interest of providing transparency with respect to the FAA's process for interacting with U.S. Government departments, agencies, or instrumentalities that seek to engage U.S. civil aviation to operate in the area in which this SFAR would prohibit their operations in the absence of specific FAA approval.

instrumentality informing it that the FAA's approval is subject to all of the following conditions:

(1) The approval will stipulate those procedures and conditions that limit, to the greatest degree possible, the risk to the operator while still allowing the operator to achieve its operational objectives.

(2) Before any approval takes effect, the operator must submit to the FAA:

(a) A written release of the U.S. Government from all damages, claims, and liabilities, including without limitation legal fees and expenses, relating to any event arising out of or related to the approved operations in the territory and airspace of Libya; and

(b) The operator's written agreement to indemnify the U.S. Government with respect to any and all third-party damages, claims, and liabilities, including without limitation legal fees and expenses, relating to any event arising out of or related to the approved operations in the territory and airspace of Libya.

(3) Other conditions the FAA may specify, including those the FAA might impose in OpSpecs or LOAs, as applicable.

The release and agreement to indemnify do not preclude an operator from raising a claim under an applicable non-premium war risk insurance policy the FAA issues under chapter 443 of title 49, U.S. Code.

If the FAA approves the proposed operation(s), the FAA will issue an OpSpec or LOA, as applicable, to the operator(s) identified in the original request and any operators the requestor subsequently adds to the approval, authorizing them to conduct the approved operation(s). In addition, as stated in paragraph (3) of this section V.B., the FAA notes that it may include additional conditions beyond those contained in the approval letter in any OpSpec or LOA associated with a particular operator operating under this approval, as necessary in the interests of aviation safety. U.S. Government departments, agencies, and instrumentalities requesting FAA approval on behalf of entities with which they have a contract or subcontract, grant, or cooperative agreement should request a copy of the relevant OpSpec or LOA directly from the entity with which they have any of the foregoing types of arrangements, if desired.

## VI. Information Regarding Petitions for Exemption

Any operations not conducted under an approval the FAA issues through the approval process set forth previously

may only occur in accordance with an exemption from SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603. A petition for exemption must comply with 14 CFR part 11. The FAA will consider whether exceptional circumstances exist beyond those described in the approval process in the previous section. To determine whether a petition for exemption from the prohibition this SFAR establishes fulfills the standards described in 14 CFR 11.81, the FAA consistently finds necessary the following information:

- The proposed operation(s), including the nature of the operation;
- The service the person(s) covered by the SFAR will provide;
- The specific locations in the territory and airspace of Libya where the proposed operation(s) will occur, including, but not limited to, the flight path and altitude of the aircraft while it is operating in the territory and airspace of Libya and the airports, airfields, or landing zones at which the aircraft will take off and land;
- The method by which the operator will obtain current threat information and an explanation of how the operator will integrate this information into all phases of its proposed operations (*i.e.*, the pre-mission planning and briefing, in-flight, and post-flight phases); and
- The plans and procedures the operator will use to minimize the risks identified in this preamble to the proposed operations to support the relief sought and demonstrate that granting such relief would not adversely affect safety or would provide a level of safety at least equal to that provided by this SFAR. The FAA has found comprehensive, organized plans and procedures of this nature to be helpful in facilitating the agency's safety evaluation of petitions for exemption from flight prohibition SFARs.

The FAA includes, as a condition of each such exemption it issues, a release and agreement to indemnify, as described previously.

The FAA recognizes that, with the support of the U.S. Government, the governments of other countries could plan operations that may be affected by SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603. While the FAA will not permit these operations through the approval process, the FAA will consider exemption requests for such operations on an expedited basis and in accordance with the order of preference set forth in paragraph (c) of SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603.

If a petition for exemption includes information that is sensitive for security reasons or proprietary information, requestors may contact the Washington Operations Center for instructions on submitting it to the FAA. The

Washington Operations Center's contact information is listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this final rule. Requestors must not submit their petitions for exemption or related supporting documentation to the Washington Operations Center. Rather, the Washington Operations Center will refer the requestor to the appropriate staff member of the Flight Standards Service or the Office of Rulemaking for further assistance.

## VII. Regulatory Notices and Analyses

### A. Regulatory Evaluation

This rule has been determined to be a significant regulatory action pursuant to section 3(f)(4) of Executive Order 12866. This rule continues to prohibit U.S. civil flights in the territory and airspace of Libya due to the significant hazards to U.S. civil aviation described in this preamble. While alternative flight routes result in some additional fuel and operations costs to the operators, as well as some costs attributed to passenger time, the benefits of this rule in prohibiting unsafe flights will exceed the minimal flight deviation costs. Therefore, the FAA finds that the incremental costs of extending SFAR No. 112, § 91.1603, will be minimal and are exceeded by the benefits of avoided risks of deaths, injuries, and property damage that could occur if a U.S. operator's aircraft were shot down (or otherwise damaged) while operating in the territory and airspace of Libya.

This rule is exempt from Executive Order 14192 (Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation) as it is a regulation issued with respect to a national security or homeland security function of the United States.

### B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), in 5 U.S.C. 603, requires an agency to prepare an initial regulatory flexibility analysis describing impacts on small entities whenever 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law requires an agency to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking for any proposed rule. Similarly, 5 U.S.C. 604 requires an agency to prepare a final regulatory flexibility analysis when an agency issues a final rule under 5 U.S.C. 553 after that section or any other law requires publication of a general notice of proposed rulemaking. The FAA concludes good cause exists to forgo notice and comment and to not delay the effective date for this rule. As 5 U.S.C. 553 does not require notice and comment in this situation, 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604 similarly do not require regulatory flexibility analyses.

### C. International Trade Impact Assessment

The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–39) prohibits Federal agencies from establishing standards or engaging in related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. Pursuant to this Act, the establishment of standards is not considered an unnecessary obstacle to the foreign commerce of the United States, so long as the standard has a legitimate domestic objective, such as the protection of safety, and does not operate in a manner that excludes imports that meet this objective. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards.

The FAA has assessed the potential effect of this final rule and determined that its purpose is to protect the safety of U.S. civil aviation from risks to their operations in the territory and airspace of Libya, a location outside the U.S. Therefore, the rule complies with the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.

### D. Unfunded Mandates Assessment

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4) requires each Federal agency to prepare a written statement assessing the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule that may result in an expenditure of \$100 million or more (in 1995 dollars) in any one year by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector; such a mandate is deemed to be a “significant regulatory action.” The FAA currently uses an inflation-adjusted value of \$183 million in lieu of \$100 million.

This final rule does not contain such a mandate. Therefore, the requirements of Title II of the Act do not apply.

### E. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507(d)) requires the FAA to consider the impact of paperwork and other information collection burdens it imposes on the public. The FAA has determined no new requirement for information collection is associated with this final rule.

### F. International Compatibility and Cooperation

In keeping with U.S. obligations under the Convention on International Civil Aviation, the FAA’s policy is to conform to International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Standards and Recommended Practices to the maximum extent practicable. The FAA has determined no ICAO Standards and

Recommended Practices correspond to this regulation. The FAA finds this action is fully consistent with the obligations under 49 U.S.C. 40105(b)(1)(A) to ensure the FAA exercises its duties consistently with the obligations of the United States under international agreements.

While the FAA’s flight prohibition does not apply to foreign air carriers, DOT codeshare authorizations prohibit foreign air carriers from carrying a U.S. codeshare partner’s code on a flight segment that operates in airspace for which the FAA has issued a flight prohibition for U.S. civil aviation. In addition, foreign air carriers and other foreign operators may choose to avoid, or be advised or directed by their civil aviation authorities to avoid, airspace for which the FAA has issued a flight prohibition for U.S. civil aviation.

### IX. Executive Order Determinations

#### A. Executive Order 13132, Federalism

The FAA has analyzed this rule under the principles and criteria of Executive Order 13132. The agency has determined this action will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, or the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, this rule will not have federalism implications.

#### B. Executive Order 13211, Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

The FAA analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211. The agency has determined it is not a “significant energy action” under the executive order and will not be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy.

#### C. Executive Order 13609, Promoting International Regulatory Cooperation

Executive Order 13609 promotes international regulatory cooperation to meet shared challenges involving health, safety, labor, security, environmental, and other issues and to reduce, eliminate, or prevent unnecessary differences in regulatory requirements. The FAA has analyzed this action under the policies and agency responsibilities of Executive Order 13609 and has determined that this action will have no effect on international regulatory cooperation.

### X. Additional Information

#### A. Electronic Access

Except for classified and controlled unclassified material not authorized for public release, all documents the FAA considered in developing this rule, including economic analyses and technical reports, may be accessed from the internet through the docket for this rulemaking.

Those documents may be viewed online at <https://www.regulations.gov> using the docket number listed above. A copy of this rule will be placed in the docket. Electronic retrieval help and guidelines are available on the website. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. An electronic copy of this document may also be downloaded from the Office of the Federal Register’s website at <https://www.federalregister.gov> and the Government Publishing Office’s website at <https://www.govinfo.gov>. A copy may also be found on the FAA’s Regulations and Policies website at [https://www.faa.gov/regulations\\_policies](https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies).

Copies may also be obtained by sending a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–1, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–9677.

#### B. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA) (Pub. L. 104–121) (set forth as a note to 5 U.S.C. 601) requires FAA to comply with small entity requests for information or advice about compliance with statutes and regulations within its jurisdiction. A small entity with questions regarding this document may contact its local FAA official or the persons listed under the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** heading at the beginning of the preamble. To find out more about SBREFA on the internet, visit [http://www.faa.gov/regulations\\_policies/rulemaking/sbre\\_act/](http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/rulemaking/sbre_act/).

#### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 91

Air traffic control, Aircraft, Airmen, Airports, Aviation safety, Freight, Libya.

#### The Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends chapter I of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

#### PART 91—GENERAL OPERATING AND FLIGHT RULES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 91 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 40101, 40103, 40105, 40113, 40120, 44101, 44111, 44701, 44704, 44709, 44711, 44712, 44715, 44716, 44717, 44722, 46306, 46315, 46316, 46504, 46506–46507, 47122, 47508, 47528–47531, 47534, Pub. L. 114–190, 130 Stat. 615 (49 U.S.C. 44703 note); articles 12 and 29 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation (61 Stat. 1180), (126 Stat. 11).

■ 2. Amend § 91.1603 by revising paragraph (e) to read as follows:

**§ 91.1603 Special Federal Aviation Regulation No. 112—Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Libya.**

(e) *Expiration.* This SFAR will remain in effect until March 20, 2028. The FAA may amend, rescind, or extend this SFAR, as necessary.

Issued in Washington, DC, under the authority of 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 40101(d)(1), 40105(b)(1)(A), and 44701(a)(5).

**Christopher J. Rocheleau,**  
*Acting Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2025–04846 Filed 3–19–25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**17 CFR Parts 230, 232, 239, 270 and 274**

[Release No. 33–11368; 34–102680; IC–35500; File No. S7–16–22]

**RIN 3235–AM72**

**Investment Company Names; Extension of Compliance Date**

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; extension of compliance date.

**SUMMARY:** The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) is extending the compliance dates for the amendments to the rule under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (“Investment Company Act”) that addresses certain broad categories of investment company names that are likely to mislead investors about the investment company’s investments and risks, as well as related enhanced prospectus disclosure requirements and Form N–PORT reporting requirements, that were adopted on September 20, 2023. The compliance date is extended from December 11, 2025 to June 11, 2026, for fund groups with net assets of \$1 billion or more as of the end of their most recent fiscal year; and from June 11, 2026 to December 11, 2026, for fund groups with less than \$1 billion in net assets as of the end of their most recent

fiscal year. In addition, the Commission is modifying the operation of the compliance dates to allow for compliance based on the timing of certain annual disclosure and reporting obligations that are tied to the fund’s fiscal year-end.

**DATES:**

*Effective date:* The effective date for this release is March 20, 2025. The effective date for the amendments to 17 CFR 270.35d–1 (“rule 35d–1”) under the Investment Company Act and related prospectus disclosure and reporting requirements, as adopted September 20, 2023, remains December 11, 2023.

*Compliance date:* The compliance date for the amendments to rule 35d–1 under the Investment Company Act, and related prospectus disclosure and reporting requirements, adopted September 20, 2023 is extended to June 11, 2026 for fund groups with net assets of \$1 billion or more as of the end of their most recent fiscal year and to December 11, 2026 for fund groups with less than \$1 billion in net assets as of the end of their most recent fiscal year. As discussed in section I, the operation of the compliance date is modified to allow for compliance based on the timing of certain annual fund disclosure and reporting obligations that are tied to the fund’s fiscal year-end.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Pamela K. Ellis, Senior Counsel; Bradley Gude, Branch Chief; Amanda Hollander Wagner, Senior Special Counsel; or Brian McLaughlin Johnson, Assistant Director, at (202) 551–6792, Investment Company Regulation Office, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–8549.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission is extending the compliance date for the Commission’s 2023 amendments to rule 35d–1 under the Investment Company Act; amendments to Form N–1A [referenced in 17 CFR 239.15A and 17 CFR 274.11A], Form N–2 [referenced in 17 CFR 239.14 and 17 CFR 274.11a–1], Form N–8B–2 [referenced in 17 CFR 274.12], and Form S–6 [referenced in 17 CFR 239.16] under the Investment Company Act and the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) [15 U.S.C. 77a *et seq.*]; amendments to Form N–PORT [referenced in 17 CFR 274.150] under the Investment Company Act; amendments to 17 CFR 232.11 (“rule 11 of Regulation S–T”) and 17 CFR 232.405 (“rule 405 of Regulation S–T”) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) [15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*].

**I. Discussion**

On September 20, 2023, the Commission adopted amendments to rule 35d–1 under the Investment Company Act, the “names rule,” designed to modernize and enhance the protections that the rule provides.<sup>1</sup> This rule addresses the names of registered investment companies and business development companies (“BDCs”) that the Commission defines as materially misleading or deceptive.<sup>2</sup> The amendments broadened the scope of the requirement for certain funds to adopt a policy to invest at least 80 percent of the value of their assets in accordance with the investment focus that the fund’s name suggests.<sup>3</sup> The Commission also adopted amendments that updated other names-related regulatory requirements, including by providing enhanced disclosure and reporting requirements related to terms used in fund names and by establishing additional recordkeeping requirements (collectively, “names rule amendments”).<sup>4</sup> The Commission

<sup>1</sup> Investment Company Names, Investment Company Act Release No. 35000 (Sept. 20, 2023) [88 FR 70436 (Oct. 11, 2023)], Investment Company Names; Correction, Investment Company Act Release No. 35000A (Oct. 24, 2023) [88 FR 73755 (Oct. 27, 2023)] (the “Adopting Release”).

<sup>2</sup> This release refers to registered investment companies and BDCs collectively as “funds.”

<sup>3</sup> As adopted in 2001, the names rule generally requires that if a fund’s name suggests a focus in a particular type of investment, or in investments in a particular industry or geographic focus, the fund must adopt a policy to invest at least 80% of the value of its assets in the type of investment, or in investments in the industry, country, or geographic region suggested by its name. In this release, as in the Adopting Release, we refer to a policy that a fund must adopt under the names rule as an “80% investment policy.” The amendments to the names rule expanded the rule’s 80% investment policy requirement to any fund name with terms suggesting that the fund focuses in investments that have, or investments whose issuers have, particular characteristics.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the expansion of the scope of the 80% investment policy requirement described in footnote 3 *supra*, the names rule amendments, among other things: require a fund to review its portfolio assets’ inclusion in its 80% basket (the fund’s investments invested in accordance with its 80% investment policy) at least quarterly and include specific time frames—generally 90 days—for getting back into compliance if a fund departs from its 80% investment requirement; generally require funds to use a derivatives instrument’s notional amount to determine the fund’s compliance with its 80% investment policy; generally prohibit an unlisted registered closed-end fund or BDC that is required to adopt an 80% investment policy from changing that policy without a shareholder vote (but permit these funds to change their 80% investment policies without such a vote if the fund conducts a tender or repurchase offer in advance of the change, and if certain other conditions are met); require prospectus disclosure defining the terms used in a fund’s name, including the criteria the fund uses to select the investments that the term describes; effectively require that any terms used in the fund’s names that suggest either an investment focus, or