

Civil Rights will convene a business meeting on Thursday, March 16, 2023, 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The purpose of the meeting is to continue to review, edit, and vote on a draft report on the civil rights implications of algorithms.

**DATES:** March 16, 2023, Thursday; 12:00 p.m. (ET).

**ADDRESSES:** Meeting will be held via Zoom.

**Meeting Link (Audio/Visual):** <https://tinyurl.com/2p9b2mde>; password: USCCR-CT

**Join by Phone (Audio Only):** 1-551-285-1373; Meeting ID: 161 850 4257#

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Evelyn Bohor, at [ebohor@usccr.gov](mailto:ebohor@usccr.gov) or 202-381-8915.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Members of the public can listen to these discussions. Committee meetings are available to the public through the above call-in number. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. An open comment period will be provided to allow members of the public to make a statement as time allows. Callers can expect to incur regular charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, according to their wireless plan. The Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Individuals who are deaf, deafblind and hard of hearing may also follow the proceedings by first calling the Federal Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 and providing the Service with the conference call number and conference ID number.

Members of the public are also entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office within 30 days following the meeting. Written comments may be emailed to Evelyn Bohor at [ebohor@usccr.gov](mailto:ebohor@usccr.gov). Persons who desire additional information may contact the Regional Programs Unit at (312) 353-8311.

Records generated from the meetings may be inspected and reproduced at the Regional Programs Unit Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meeting will be available via [www.facadatabase.gov](http://www.facadatabase.gov) under the Commission on Civil Rights, Connecticut Advisory Committee link. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's website, <http://www.usccr.gov>, or may contact the Regional Programs Unit at the above email or street address.

**Agenda**

- I. Roll Call
- II. Review, Edit, Vote—Draft Report on Civil Rights Implications of Algorithms
- III. Discuss Next Steps
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Adjournment

Dated: February 9, 2023.

**David Mussatt,**

*Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.*

[FR Doc. 2023-03112 Filed 2-13-23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Economic Development Administration**

**Request for Information on Implementation of the Regional Technology and Innovation Hub Program**

**AGENCY:** Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Request for information.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce, through the Economic Development Administration (EDA), is seeking information to inform the planning and design of the Regional Technology and Innovation Hub (Tech Hubs) program. Responses to this Request for Information (RFI) will inform planning for the implementation of the Tech Hubs program.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by 5 p.m. Eastern Time on March 16, 2023. Submissions received after that date may not be considered. Written comments in response to this RFI should be submitted in accordance with the instructions in the Addresses and Supplementary Information sections below.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit written comments by email to [techhubs@eda.gov](mailto:techhubs@eda.gov). Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eric Smith, Director, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, via email at [techhubs@eda.gov](mailto:techhubs@eda.gov) or via telephone at (202) 482-5081. Please reference "Tech Hubs RFI" in the subject line of your correspondence. You may find additional information on EDA at [www.eda.gov](http://www.eda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

Section 10621 of the Research and Development, Competition, and

Innovation Act authorizes the Department of Commerce to designate geographically distributed regional technology and innovation hubs and to award strategy development grants and strategy implementation grants to eligible consortia (15 U.S.C. 3722a; Pub. L. 117-167, Division B, Title VI, Subtitle C, Sec. 10621(a)(2), 136 Stat. 1642). Tech Hubs will focus on technology development, job creation, entrepreneurial development, and expanding U.S. innovation capacity. Of the \$10 billion authorized for the Tech Hubs program from Federal fiscal year 2023 through Federal fiscal year 2027, \$500 million has been made available for the Tech Hubs program as of the publication of this RFI.

Section 10621 of the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act provides that the Tech Hubs program shall:

(A) Encourage constructive collaborations among a wide range of new and traditional economic development stakeholders, including public and private sector entities;

(B) Support the development and implementation of regional innovation strategies;

(C) Designate regional technology and innovation hubs and facilitate the following implementation activities:

(i) Enable United States leadership in technology and innovation sectors critical to national and economic security.

(ii) Support regional economic development and resilience, including in small cities and rural areas, and promote increased geographic diversity of innovation across the United States;

(iii) Promote the benefits of technology development and innovation for all Americans, including underserved communities and vulnerable communities;

(iv) Support the modernization and expansion of United States manufacturing based on advances in technology and innovation;

(v) Support domestic job creation and broad-based economic growth; and

(vi) Improve the pace of market readiness, industry maturation, and overall commercialization and domestic production of innovative research;

(D) Ensure that the regional technology and innovation hubs address the intersection of emerging technologies and either regional challenges or national challenges; and

(E) Conduct ongoing research, evaluation, analysis, and dissemination of best practices for regional development and competitiveness in technology and innovation.

The Tech Hubs program is an economic development initiative to drive technology- and innovation-centric growth that leverages existing R&D strengths and technology demonstration and deployment capacities (public and private) within a region to catalyze the creation of good jobs for American workers at all skill levels equitably and inclusively.

EDA intends to run a rigorous, fair, and evidence-driven competition informed by the vision and experiences of all stakeholders, technology practitioners, and relevant policy research to guide program design, structure, and evaluation, and to aim for the strongest geographic and demographic diversity among hubs. This RFI seeks to encourage the field of regional innovation and economic development to provide evidence-based input that will be used to inform the design and implementation of the Tech Hubs program to maximize American competitiveness. The following sections provide specific requests for information, group into a number of categories.

#### **Specific Request for Information: Tech Hubs Characteristics**

1. What are the indicia of a successful future Tech Hub?

a. What are the defining features of a region that indicate that a Tech Hub will take hold, and how will EDA know if Tech Hubs succeed?

b. What existing assets and resources that generate, support, and enable technology innovation, demonstration, and deployment should Tech Hubs have? How does a Tech Hub leverage those assets and resources collaboratively?

c. When designating Tech Hubs, what additional geographic, demographic, or other place-specific factors or data should EDA consider?

d. Are there specific metrics that EDA should consider for designating Tech Hubs?

e. What are the technological considerations that EDA should consider?

2. How might EDA determine how the size and timing of investments will best accelerate a future Tech Hub's evolution into a global leader in an industry of the future that strengthens its region and our economic and national security? What data and information are important to that determination?

3. What are historical and existing examples of successful regional hub programs and what can be learned from these examples?

4. How might EDA determine the relative competitiveness of proposed

Tech Hubs in the context of current and future global competition, in addition to domestic competition?

#### **Specific Request for Information: Tech Hubs Program Design**

##### *Models for Program Design*

5. Please share specific examples of evidence-based or evidence-informed investments, interventions, or policies, including those implemented in other countries, that would support technology-based economic development, particularly at the scale required to enable U.S. leadership in technology and innovation sectors critical to economic and national security.

a. What limitations currently prevent EDA from investing, intervening, or making policies in these ways? For example, are there statutory, regulatory, policy, design, or implementation issues with current EDA programs or operations that inhibit or prohibit EDA in some way? Are there other Federal organizations that have overcome these issues?

6. Are there specific workforce and labor development, business and entrepreneurial development, technology development and maturation, or infrastructure activities that EDA should emphasize through the program?

7. How should EDA consider worker and community input in Tech Hub design?

8. What are some of the most innovative approaches to commercialization at research institutions (e.g., universities, national labs) and what evidence exists on the effectiveness of these approaches?

9. What are some of the most innovative approaches to ensuring the growth of globally competitive industries occurs in an inclusive and equitable manner? Where possible, please provide examples of evidence-based and/or evidence-informed investments, interventions, or policies that drive inclusive and equitable outcomes.

##### *Funding and Support*

10. Please share best-in-class ideas for inclusive and accessible competition processes for the Tech Hubs program, including examples of best-in-class regional competitions in the United States or internationally.

11. How should EDA evaluate the extent to which certain technology and innovation sectors are critical to national and economic security? How should EDA take into account whether a consortium would help promote

increased geographic diversity of innovation?

12. How can Federal designations and Federal grants be structured to maximize the desired impacts of the Tech Hubs program?

13. What other existing Federal programs can complement Tech Hubs?

14. In addition to existing Federal programs, what types of benefits or support could be helpful for "designated" regional Tech Hubs?

15. What should EDA consider in designing the program for its current appropriation of \$500 million given the \$10 billion vision in the program's statutory authorization? How should those considerations affect EDA's design of the program now and potentially into future years?

16. How should EDA evaluate the effectiveness and return on public-private partnerships or other collaborative arrangements that may emerge from the Tech Hubs?

17. What criteria should EDA use to shift investments within or between Tech Hubs to maximize the impact of the program?

18. What else should EDA consider when building this program, including but not limited to alignment with other Federal programs?

#### **Specific Request for Information: Tech Hubs Program Administration**

19. How should EDA measure whether the Tech Hubs program has been successful in achieving these outcomes, and how might EDA capture those data?

a. What are the indicia of successful investments under the Tech Hubs program? What, if any, earlier-in-time proxies are predictive of those indicia?

b. What is a realistic time horizon over which to evaluate the economic development, national security, and global competitiveness impacts of Tech Hubs? Which measures are meaningful over which time horizons (e.g., five, ten, fifteen years)?

20. What desirable organizational and institutional changes within and among tech hubs' participants, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders could the Tech Hubs program competition incentivize? How could those changes be incentivized, and how could those changes be measured?

21. How can EDA ensure input from, and engagement with, community members in the administration of the Tech Hubs program, particularly for underserved community members?

22. What are unique challenges faced by Established Program to Stimulate

Competitive Research (EPSCoR) <sup>1</sup> state-based consortia or rural consortia that EDA should be aware of and account for in program administration?

Dated: February 8, 2023.

**Eric Smith,**

*Director, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship.*

[FR Doc. 2023-03022 Filed 2-13-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-24-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Bureau of Industry and Security

#### In the Matter of: Arash Yousefi Jam, 24 Great Heron Court, King City, Ontario, Canada; Order Denying Export Privileges

On October 14, 2021, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Arash Yousefi Jam (“Arash Jam”) was convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. 371. Specifically, Arash Jam was convicted of conspiring to export goods from the United States to Iran through the United Arab Emirates without having first obtained the required licenses from the Office of Foreign Assests Control. As a result of his conviction, the Court sentenced Arash Jam time served, one year of supervised release and a \$100 assessment.

Pursuant to Section 1760(e) of the Export Control Reform Act (“ECRA”), <sup>1</sup> the export privileges of any person who has been convicted of certain offenses, including, but not limited to, 18 U.S.C. 371, may be denied for a period of up to ten (10) years from the date of his/her conviction. 50 U.S.C. 4819(e). In addition, any Bureau of Industry and Security (“BIS”) licenses or other authorizations issued under ECRA, in which the person had an interest at the time of the conviction, may be revoked. *Id.*

BIS received notice of Arash Jam’s conviction for violating 18 U.S.C. 371. As provided in Section 766.25 of the Export Administration Regulations (“EAR” or the “Regulations”), BIS provided notice and opportunity for Arash Jam to make a written submission

to BIS. 15 CFR 766.25. <sup>2</sup> BIS has not received a written submission from Arash Jam.

Based upon my review of the record and consultations with BIS’s Office of Exporter Services, including its Director, and the facts available to BIS, I have decided to deny Arash Jam’s export privileges under the Regulations for a period of seven years from the date of Arash Jam’s conviction. The Office of Exporter Services has also decided to revoke any BIS-issued licenses in which Arash Jam had an interest at the time of his conviction. <sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, it is hereby *ordered*:

*First*, from the date of this Order until October 14, 2028, Arash Yousefi Jam, with a last known address of 24 Great Heron Court, King City, Ontario, Canada, and when acting for or on his behalf, his successors, assigns, employees, agents or representatives (“the Denied Person”), may not directly or indirectly participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as “item”) exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, license exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or engaging in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or from any other activity subject to the Regulations.

*Second*, no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export, reexport, or transfer (in-country) to or on behalf of the Denied Person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item

subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

*Third*, pursuant to Section 1760(e) of ECRA and Sections 766.23 and 766.25 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Arash Jam by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade or business may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order in order to prevent evasion of this Order.

*Fourth*, in accordance with part 756 of the Regulations, Arash Jam may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of part 756 of the Regulations.

*Fifth*, a copy of this Order shall be delivered to Arash Jam and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

*Sixth*, this Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until October 14, 2028.

**John Sonderman,**

*Director, Office of Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 2023-03103 Filed 2-13-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P

<sup>1</sup> EPSCoR states are determined annually by the National Science Foundation (NSF) based on the proportion of NSF funding each state receives within certain periods of time. See 42 U.S.C. 13503(b)(3) (2021); Nat’l Sci. Found., EPSCoR Criteria for Eligibility, <https://beta.nsf.gov/funding/initiatives/epscor/epscor-criteria-eligibility> (last visited Jan. 26, 2023).

<sup>2</sup> ECRA was enacted on August 13, 2018, as part of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, and as amended is codified at 50 U.S.C. 4801–4852.

<sup>2</sup> The Regulations are currently codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2022).

<sup>3</sup> The Director, Office of Export Enforcement, is the authorizing official for issuance of denial orders pursuant to amendments to the Regulations (85 FR 73411, November 18, 2020).