

§ 201.323 until July 26, 2004. This delay applies to all products subject to § 201.323.

III. Changes From the Proposed Rule

The final rule delays the effective date of § 201.323 to July 26, 2004. The final rule also changes § 201.323(c)(3) to reflect the fact that the effective date has been delayed. Section 201.323(c)(3) provides that a manufacturer may state the maximum level of aluminum in terms of historical levels, but only until completion of production of the first five batches after the effective date of the January 2000 final rule. That effective date is the date by which manufacturers are to submit supplements describing the validated assay method used to determine aluminum content. Because manufacturers now have until July 26, 2004, to submit supplements, the final rule changes the date in § 201.323(c)(3) to July 26, 2004. The final rule also slightly modifies the introductory language in § 201.323(c) to clarify that the language "except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section" applies to both the second and third sentences in § 201.323(c). That is, the "exception" language applies generally to SVPs and PBP used in the preparation of TPN and also to SVPs and PBPs that are lyophilized powders that are reconstituted and used in the preparation of TPN.

IV. Environmental Impact

The agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.30(h) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

V. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

FDA concludes that this final rule contains no collections of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.

VI. Analysis of Impacts

FDA has examined the impacts of this amendment to § 201.323 under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*). Executive Order 12866 directs agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential

economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). The agency believes that this final rule is consistent with the regulatory philosophy and principles identified in the Executive order and in these two statutes.

The purpose of this final rule is to relax the requirements of the January 2000 final rule for labeling aluminum content in SVPs and PBPs used in TPN. Specifically, this final rule allows manufacturers to use a standard statement of quantity of aluminum content in place of the exact amount for affected products that contain no more than 25 µg/L of aluminum. FDA determined that the proposed rule would not be a significant action as defined by the Executive order. FDA received one comment to the proposed rule, but the comment did not address the Analysis of Impacts section of the proposed rule.

In the Analysis of Impacts section of the January 2000 final rule, the agency relied on the Eastern Research Group (ERG) report entitled "Addendum to Compliance Cost Analysis for a Regulation for Parenteral Drug Products Containing Aluminum." In that report, ERG calculated the total relabeling costs for SVPs and PBPs to be about \$523,000, or about \$3,500 per product (equivalent to annualized costs totaling \$128,000, or about \$850 per product, discounted at 7 percent over 5 years). To the extent that manufacturers of SVPs and PBPs containing no more than 25 µg/L of aluminum use the added flexibility in labeling that this final rule provides, the compliance burden cited above could be reduced.

The single comment to the proposed rule requested that an additional 18 months be added to the effective date of § 201.323. FDA has complied with this request. Since this additional time would allow for more flexibility in implementing the compliance methods for all parts of § 201.323, it could further reduce the compliance burden.

Because this final rule could slightly decrease current compliance costs for the affected industry without imposing any additional costs, FDA has determined that the final rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined by the Executive order and thus is not subject to review under the Executive order.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to analyze regulatory options that would minimize any significant impact of a rule on small entities. FDA made the determination for the January 2000 final rule that very few small firms, if any, would be

significantly impacted. Thus, the agency certified that the final rule would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. This final rule could slightly lessen the economic impact of the January 2000 final rule. Accordingly, FDA certifies that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. No further analysis is required under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (as amended).

Section 202(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4) requires that agencies prepare a written statement of anticipated costs and benefits before finalizing any rule that may result in an expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year (adjusted annually for inflation).

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act does not require FDA to prepare a statement of costs and benefits for the final rule because the rule is not expected to result in any 1-year expenditure that would exceed \$100 million adjusted for inflation. The current inflation-adjusted statutory threshold is \$110 million.

VII. Federalism

FDA has analyzed this final rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. FDA has determined that the rule does not contain policies that have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Accordingly, the agency has concluded that the rule does not contain policies that have federalism implications as defined in the Executive order and, consequently, a federalism summary impact statement is not required.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 201

Drugs, Labeling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 201 is amended as follows:

PART 201—LABELING

■ 1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 201 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321, 331, 351, 352, 353, 355, 358, 360, 360b, 360gg–360ss, 371, 374, 379e; 42 U.S.C. 216, 241, 262, 264.