

Terrazas Export S.A.

The following companies remain subject to this administrative review: Olmue, VBM, Valles Andinos, Vitafoods, Arlavan and Valle Frio. As discussed in the *Background* section, above, we have deferred for one year an administrative review for 2005–2006 with respect to SANCO. We intend to issue our preliminary results in this administrative review for Olmue, VBM, Valles Andinos, Vitafoods, Arlavan, and Valle Frio by April 2, 2007.

#### Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For those companies for which this review is rescinded, antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of this notice.

#### Cash Deposit Rates

For the companies for which this review is rescinded, the cash deposit rate will continue to be 6.33 percent, the “all others” rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: IQF Red Raspberries from Chile*, 67 FR 40270 (June 12, 2002).

These cash deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of this administrative review.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

#### Notification Regarding APOs

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (“APOs”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary

information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: December 6, 2006.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6–21129 Filed 12–11–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S**

---

### PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

*Title:* Patent Cooperation Treaty.

*Form Number(s):* PCT RO/101, PCT/RO/134, PTO–1382, PTO–1390, PCT/IPEA/401, PTO/SB/61/PCT, PTO/SB/64/PCT, PCT/Model of power of attorney, PCT/Model of general power of attorney.

*Agency Approval Number:* 0651–0021.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Burden:* 347,891 hours annually.

*Number of Respondents:* 355,658 responses per year.

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 15 minutes (0.25 hours) to 8 hours to gather the necessary information; prepare the appropriate form, petition, or other request; and submit the information to the USPTO.

*Needs and Uses:* The general purpose of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) is to standardize the format and filing procedures so that applicants may file one international application in one location, in one language, and pay one initial set of fees to seek protection for an invention in more than 100 designated countries. This collection of information is necessary so that respondents can apply for an international patent and so that the USPTO can fulfill its duties to process,

search, and examine international patent applications under the provisions of the PCT. The USPTO is submitting this collection in support of a final rulemaking entitled “Changes to Facilitate Electronic Filing of Patent Correspondence” (RIN 0651–AB92), which will provide applicants with a new process for showing that national stage correspondence submitted electronically was actually received by the Office. A new petition to support this process is being added to this collection.

*Affected Public:* Businesses or other for-profits, and not-for-profit institutions.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent’s Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by any of the following methods:

- *E-mail:* Susan.Brown@uspto.gov. Include “0651–0021 copy request” in the subject line of the message.
- *Fax:* 571–273–0112, marked to the attention of Susan Brown.
- *Mail:* Susan K. Brown, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Architecture, Engineering and Technical Services, Data Architecture and Services Division, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before January 11, 2007 to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: December 5, 2006.

**Susan K. Brown,**

*Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Architecture, Engineering and Technical Services, Data Architecture and Services Division.*

[FR Doc. E6–21121 Filed 12–11–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–16–P**

---

### CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Petition HP 07–1]

#### Petition for Labeling Amendment of Blasting Caps

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Consumer Product Safety Commission

(Commission or CPSC) has received a petition (HP 07-1) requesting that the Commission amend its regulation under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA) to allow the use of the term "detonator" to be used interchangeably with the term "blasting cap." The Commission solicits written comments concerning the petition.<sup>1</sup>

**DATES:** The Office of the Secretary must receive comments on the petition by February 12, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the petition may be filed by e-mail to [cpsc-os@cpsc.gov](mailto:cpsc-os@cpsc.gov). Comments may also be filed by facsimile to (301) 504-0127, or delivered or mailed, preferably in five copies, to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814, telephone (301) 504-7923. Comments should be captioned "Petition HP 07-1, Petition Requesting Labeling Amendment of Blasting Caps." The petition is available on the CPSC Web site at <http://www.cpsc.gov>. A request for a hard copy of the petition may be directed to the Office of the Secretary.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rockelle Hammond, Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504-6833, e-mail [rhammond@cpsc.gov](mailto:rhammond@cpsc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Institute of Makers of Explosives (IME) submitted correspondence requesting that the Commission amend its regulation at 16 CFR 1500.83(a)(35), to allow the use of the term "detonator" to be used interchangeably with the term "blasting cap." IME requests the addition of the term "detonator" to the regulation as follows (added text is underlined):

Individual *detonators* or blasting caps are exempt from bearing the statement "Keep out of the reach of children," or its practical equivalent, if:

(i) Each *detonator* or cap bears conspicuously in the largest type size practicable the statement "DANGEROUS—BLASTING CAPS—EXPLOSIVE" or "DANGEROUS—DETONATOR—EXPLOSIVE";

IME states that the terms "detonator" and "blasting cap" are generally synonymous in the explosive community. IME asserts that the term "detonator" may be interpreted as being more inclusive and is more commonly used than the term "blasting cap." In

order to minimize the possibility that an individual may not take recommended precautions when handling initiating devices, IME states that it has encouraged the use of the term "detonator" instead of the term "blasting cap" whenever possible. According to IME, there is no practical benefit to requiring the use of both the term "detonator" and "blasting cap" on printed warnings given the limited space available on small detonators. IME also does not believe there is any practical benefit to replacing the term "blasting cap" with "detonator" at this time.

Interested parties may obtain a copy of the petition on the CPSC Web site at <http://www.cpsc.gov> or by writing or calling the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504-7923.

Dated: December 6, 2006.

**Todd A. Stevenson,**

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-21023 Filed 12-11-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6355-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

[No. DoD-2006-OS-0212]

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Defense Security Service, Office of the Secretary, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Defense Security Service (DSS) announces the proposed extension of a public information collection and seeks public comments on the provision thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the information to be collected; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**DATES:** Consideration will be given to all comments received by February 12, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by document number and title, by any of the following methods:

- Federal Rule Making Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- Mail: Federal Docket Management System Office, 1160 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1160.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instrument, please write to Defense Security Service, ATTN: Mr. Stephen Lewis, Deputy Director, Policy, Industrial Security Program Office, 1340 Braddock Place, Alexandria, VA 22314-1650, or call, (703) 325-6034.

*Title, and OMB Number:* "Defense Security Service Industrial Security Review Data" and "Defense Security Service Industrial Security Facility Clearance Survey Data," OMB No. 0704-0427.

*Needs and Uses:* The conduct of an Industrial Security Review and/or Industrial Security Facility Security Survey assists in determining whether a contractor is eligible to establish its facility security clearance and/or retain its participation in the National Industrial Security Program (NISP). It is also the basis for verifying whether contractors are appropriately implementing NISP security requirements. These requirements are necessary in order to preserve and maintain the security of the United States through establishing standards to prevent the improper disclosure of classified information.

In accordance with Department of Defense (DoD), 5220.22-R, "Industrial Security Regulation," DSS is required to maintain a record of the results of surveys and security reviews. Documentation for each survey and/or security review will be compiled addressing areas applicable to the contractor's security program. Portions of the data collected will be stored in databases. All data collected will be handled and marked, "For Official Use Only."

<sup>1</sup> Commissioner Thomas H. Moore filed a statement which is available from the Office of the Secretary or on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.cpsc.gov>.