

AMENDED ANTIDUMPING DUTY CASH DEPOSIT RATES (PERCENT)—LAMINATED WOVEN SACKS FROM THE PRC—
Continued

Exporter	Producer	Weighted-average dumping margin (investigation) ²⁷	Revised AD cash deposit rate ²⁸
Changle Baodu Plastic Co. Ltd	Changle Baodu Plastic Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Zibo Linzi Shuaiqiang Plastics Co. Ltd	Zibo Linzi Shuaiqiang Plastics Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Zibo Linzi Qitianli Plastic Fabric Co. Ltd	Zibo Linzi Qitianli Plastic Fabric Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Shandong Youlian Co. Ltd	Shandong Youlian Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Zibo Linzi Luitong Plastic Fabric Co. Ltd	Zibo Linzi Luitong Plastic Fabric Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Wenzhou Hotson Plastics Co. Ltd	Wenzhou Hotson Plastics Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Jiangsu Hotson Plastics Co. Ltd	Jiangsu Hotson Plastics Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
Cangnan Color Make The Bag	Cangnan Color Make The Bag	64.28	20.19
Zibo Qigao Plastic Cement Co. Ltd	Zibo Qigao Plastic Cement Co. Ltd	64.28	20.19
PRC-Wide Entity ²⁹	91.73	47.64

AMENDED ANTIDUMPING DUTY CASH DEPOSIT RATES (PERCENT)—LIGHT-WALLED RECTANGULAR PIPE AND TUBE FROM THE PRC

Exporter	Producer	Weighted-average dumping margin (investigation) ³⁰	Revised AD cash deposit rate ³¹
Zhangjiagang Zhongyuan Pipe-Making Co., Ltd	Zhangjiagang Zhongyuan Pipe-Making Co., Ltd	264.64	255.07
Kunshan Lets Win Steel Machinery Co., Ltd	Kunshan Lets Win Steel Machinery Co., Ltd	249.12	247.90
Wuxi Baishun Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	Wuxi Baishun Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	249.12	247.90
Guangdong Walsall Steel Pipe Industrial Co., Ltd.	Guangdong Walsall Steel Pipe Industrial Co., Ltd.	249.12	247.90
Wuxi Worldunion Trading Co., Ltd	Wuxi Hongcheng Bicycle Material Co., Ltd	249.12	247.90
Weifang East Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	Weifang East Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	249.12	247.90
Jiangyin Jianye Metal Products Co., Ltd	Jiangyin Jianye Metal Products Co., Ltd	249.12	247.90
PRC-Wide Entity ³²	264.64	255.07

Implementation of the Revised Cash Deposit Requirements

On August 21, 2012, in accordance with sections 129(b)(4) and 129(c)(1)(B) of the URAA and after consulting with the Department and Congress, the USTR directed the Department to implement these final determinations. With respect to each of these proceedings, unless the applicable cash deposit rate has been superseded by intervening administrative reviews, the Department will instruct U. S. Customs and Border Protection to require a cash deposit for estimated antidumping and countervailing duties at the appropriate rate for each exporter/producer specified above, for entries of subject merchandise, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after August 21, 2012. This notice of implementation of these section 129 final determinations is published in

accordance with section 129(c)(2)(A) of the URAA.

Dated: August 23, 2012.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2012-21322 Filed 8-29-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration****Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part**

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (“the Department”) has received requests to conduct administrative

reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with July anniversary dates. In accordance with the Department’s regulations, we are initiating those administrative reviews. The Department also received a request to revoke one antidumping duty order in part.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 30, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brenda E. Waters, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Customs Unit, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4735.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

The Department has received timely requests, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), for administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing

Rectangular Pipe and Tube from the People’s Republic of China, 73 FR 35652, 35654 (June 24, 2008).

²⁷ See *Laminated Woven Sacks from the People’s Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Partial Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 73 FR 35646, 35648 (June 24, 2008).

²⁸ See *Sacks Section 129 Final Determinations at 39.*

²⁹ The PRC-Wide Entity includes Shandong Shouguang Jianyuanchun Co., Ltd. (“SSJ”); Han Shing Chemical Co., Ltd.; Ningbo Yong Feng packaging Co., Ltd.; and Shandong Qilu Plastic Fabric Group, Ltd.

³⁰ See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, in Part: Light-Walled*

³¹ See LWRPT Section 129 Final Determinations at 35.

³² The PRC-Wide Entity includes Qingdao Xiangxing Steel Pipe Co., Ltd.

duty orders and findings with July anniversary dates. The Department also received a timely request to revoke in part the antidumping duty order on Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands for one exporter.

All deadlines for the submission of various types of information, certifications, or comments or actions by the Department discussed below refer to the number of calendar days from the applicable starting time.

Notice of No Sales

If a producer or exporter named in this notice of initiation had no exports, sales, or entries during the period of review (“POR”), it must notify the Department within 60 days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. All submissions must be filed electronically at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011). Such submissions are subject to verification in accordance with section 782(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“Act”). Further, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f)(3)(ii), a copy of each request must be served on the petitioner and each exporter or producer specified in the request.

Respondent Selection

In the event the Department limits the number of respondents for individual examination for administrative reviews, the Department intends to select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) data for U.S. imports during the POR. We intend to release the CBP data under Administrative Protective Order (“APO”) to all parties having an APO within seven days of publication of this initiation notice and to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 21 days of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The Department invites comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection within five days of placement of the CBP data on the record of the applicable review.

In the event the Department decides it is necessary to limit individual examination of respondents and conduct respondent selection under section 777A(c)(2) of the Act:

In general, the Department has found that determinations concerning whether particular companies should be “collapsed” (*i.e.*, treated as a single entity for purposes of calculating

antidumping duty rates) require a substantial amount of detailed information and analysis, which often require follow-up questions and analysis. Accordingly, the Department will not conduct collapsing analyses at the respondent selection phase of this review and will not collapse companies at the respondent selection phase unless there has been a determination to collapse certain companies in a previous segment of this antidumping proceeding (*i.e.*, investigation, administrative review, new shipper review or changed circumstances review). For any company subject to this review, if the Department determined, or continued to treat, that company as collapsed with others, the Department will assume that such companies continue to operate in the same manner and will collapse them for respondent selection purposes. Otherwise, the Department will not collapse companies for purposes of respondent selection. Parties are requested to (a) identify which companies subject to review previously were collapsed, and (b) provide a citation to the proceeding in which they were collapsed. Further, if companies are requested to complete the Quantity and Value Questionnaire for purposes of respondent selection, in general each company must report volume and value data separately for itself. Parties should not include data for any other party, even if they believe they should be treated as a single entity with that other party. If a company was collapsed with another company or companies in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding where the Department considered collapsing that entity, complete quantity and value data for that collapsed entity must be submitted.

Deadline for Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), a party that has requested a review may withdraw that request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. The regulation provides that the Department may extend this time if it is reasonable to do so. In order to provide parties additional certainty with respect to when the Department will exercise its discretion to extend this 90-day deadline, interested parties are advised that, with regard to reviews requested on the basis of anniversary months on or after August 2011, the Department does not intend to extend the 90-day deadline unless the requestor demonstrates that an extraordinary circumstance has prevented it from submitting a timely withdrawal request.

Determinations by the Department to extend the 90-day deadline will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Separate Rates

In proceedings involving non-market economy (“NME”) countries, the Department begins with a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and, thus, should be assigned a single antidumping duty deposit rate. It is the Department’s policy to assign all exporters of merchandise subject to an administrative review in an NME country this single rate unless an exporter can demonstrate that it is sufficiently independent so as to be entitled to a separate rate.

To establish whether a firm is sufficiently independent from government control of its export activities to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each entity exporting the subject merchandise under a test arising from the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People’s Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991), as amplified by *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People’s Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994). In accordance with the separate rates criteria, the Department assigns separate rates to companies in NME cases only if respondents can demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* government control over export activities.

All firms listed below that wish to qualify for separate rate status in the administrative reviews involving NME countries must complete, as appropriate, either a separate rate application or certification, as described below. For these administrative reviews, in order to demonstrate separate rate eligibility, the Department requires entities for whom a review was requested, that were assigned a separate rate in the most recent segment of this proceeding in which they participated, to certify that they continue to meet the criteria for obtaining a separate rate. The Separate Rate Certification form will be available on the Department’s Web site at <http://www.trade.gov/ia> on the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. In responding to the certification, please follow the “Instructions for Filing the Certification” in the Separate Rate Certification. Separate Rate Certifications are due to the Department no later than 60 calendar days after publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The deadline and requirement for submitting a Certification applies

equally to NME-owned firms, wholly foreign-owned firms, and foreign sellers who purchase and export subject merchandise to the United States.

Entities that currently do not have a separate rate from a completed segment of the proceeding¹ should timely file a Separate Rate Application to demonstrate eligibility for a separate rate in this proceeding. In addition, companies that received a separate rate in a completed segment of the proceeding that have subsequently made changes, including, but not limited to, changes to corporate structure, acquisitions of new companies or facilities, or changes to their official company name,² should timely file a Separate Rate Application to demonstrate eligibility for a separate

rate in this proceeding. The Separate Rate Status Application will be available on the Department's Web site at <http://www.trade.gov/ia> on the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. In responding to the Separate Rate Status Application, refer to the instructions contained in the application. Separate Rate Status Applications are due to the Department no later than 60 calendar days of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The deadline and requirement for submitting a Separate Rate Status Application applies equally to NME-owned firms, wholly foreign-owned firms, and foreign sellers that purchase and export subject merchandise to the United States.

For exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate status application or certification and subsequently are selected as mandatory respondents, these exporters and producers will no longer be eligible for separate rate status unless they respond to all parts of the questionnaire as mandatory respondents.

Initiation of Reviews

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we are initiating administrative reviews of the following antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings. We intend to issue the final results of these reviews not later than July 31, 2013.

	Period to be Reviewed
Antidumping duty proceedings	
Finland: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose, A-405-803	7/1/11-6/30/12
CP Kelco Oy	
CP Kelco U.S. Inc	
J.M. Huber Corporation	
India: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, A-533-824	7/1/11-6/30/12
Ester Industries Limited	
Garware Polyester Ltd	
Jindal Poly Films Limited	
Polplex Corporation Ltd	
SRF Limited	
Italy: Certain Pasta, A-475-818	7/1/11-6/30/12
Alberto Poiatti S.p.A	
Delverde Industrie Alimentari S.p.A	
Industria Alimentare Colavita, S.p.A	
Pasta Lensi S.r.l	
Pastificio Attilio Mastromarco-Pasta Granoro S.r.l	
Pastificio Gallo Natale & F. Ili S.r.l	
Fiamma Vesuviana S.r.l	
Pastificio Zaffiri S.r.l	
Rummo S.p.A. Molino e Pastificio	
Tandoi Filippo e Adalberto Fratelli S.p.A	
Valdigrano di Flavio Pagani S.r.l	
Russia Federation: Solid Urea, A-821-801	7/1/11-6/30/12
OJSC MCC EuroChem, and production affiliates, OJSC Nevinnomyssky Azot and OJSC Novomoskovskaya Azot	
Taiwan: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, A-583-837	7/1/11-6/30/12
Nan Ya Plastics Corporation	
Shinkong Materials Technology Corporation	
The Netherlands: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose, A-421-811	7/1/11-6/30/12
Akzo Nobel Functional Chemicals, B.V	
CP Kelco B.V	
The People's Republic Of China: Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe, ³ A-570-910	7/1/11-6/30/12
³ If the above-named company does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe from the PRC who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.	
Adler Steel Ltd	
Al Jazeera Steel Products Co. SAOG	
Baoshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd	
Benxi Northern Steel Pipes, Co. Ltd	
CNOOC Kingland Pipeline Co., Ltd	
ETCO (China) International Trading Co., Ltd	
Guangzhou Juyi Steel Pipes Co., Ltd	
Hefei Zijin Steel Tube Manufacturing Co., Ltd	

¹ Such entities include entities that have not participated in the proceeding, entities that were preliminarily granted a separate rate in any currently incomplete segment of the proceeding (e.g., an ongoing administrative review, new

shipper review, *etc.*) and entities that lost their separate rate in the most recently complete segment of the proceeding in which they participated.

² Only changes to the official company name, rather than trade names, need to be addressed via

a Separate Rate Application. Information regarding new trade names may be submitted via a Separate Rate Certification.

	Period to be Reviewed
Huludao City Steel Pipe Industrial Jiangsu Changbao Steel Tube Co., Ltd Jiangsu Yulong Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Liaoning Northern Steel Pipe Co., Ltd MCC Liaoning Dragon Pipe Industries Shanghai Zhongyou TIPO Steel Pipe Co., Ltd SPAT Steel International SteelFORCE Far East Ltd Tianjin Baolai International Trade Co., Ltd Tianjin Huilitong Steel Tube Co., Ltd Tianjin Longshenghua Import & Export Tianjin Shuangjie Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Tianjin Uniglory International Trade Co., Ltd. Weifang East Steel Pipe Co., Ltd WISCO & CRM Wuhan Material & Trade Wuxi Fastube Industry Co., Ltd Xuzhou Global Pipe & Fitting Manufacturing Co., Ltd Zhejiang Kingland Pipeline Industry Co., Ltd Zhongjian Jinpei Steel Pipe Co. Ltd	
Countervailing Duty Proceedings	
India: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, C-533-825	1/1/11-12/31/11
Ester Industries Limited Garware Polyester Ltd Jindal Poly Films Limited Polyplex Corporation Ltd SRF Limited	
Italy: Certain Pasta, C-475-819	1/1/11-12/31/11
Delverde Industrie Alimentari S.p.A Molino e Pastificio Tomasello S.p.A Valdigrano di Flavio Pagani S.r.L	
The People Republic Of China: Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Pipe, C-570-911	1/1/11-12/31/11
Adler Steel Ltd Al Jazeera Steel Products Co. SAOG Baoshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd Benxi Northern Steel Pipes, Co. Ltd CNOOC Kingland Pipeline Co., Ltd ETCO (China) International Trading Co., Ltd Guangzhou Juyi Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Hefei Zijin Steel Tube Manufacturing Co., Ltd Huludao City Steel Pipe Industrial Jiangsu Changbao Steel Tube Co., Ltd Jiangsu Yulong Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Liaoning Northern Steel Pipe Co., Ltd MCC Liaoning Dragon Pipe Industries Shanghai Zhongyou Tipo Steel SteelFORCE Far East Ltd Tianjin Huilitong Steel Tube Co., Ltd Tianjin Longshenghua Import & Export Tianjin Shuangjie Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Tianjin Uniglory International Trade Co., Ltd. Weifang East Steel Pipe Co., Ltd Wuxi Fastube Industry Co., Ltd Xuzhou Global Pipe & Fitting Manufacturing Co., Ltd Zhejiang Kingland Pipeline Industry Co., Ltd Zhongjian Jinpei Steel Pipe Co. Ltd	
Turkey: Certain Pasta, C-489-806	1/1/11-12/31/11
Marsan Gida Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S Bellini Gida Sanaya A.S Eksper Gida Pazarlama San. ve Tic A.S	

Suspension Agreements

None.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under 19 CFR 351.211 or a determination under 19 CFR

351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, consistent with *FAG Italia v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed Cir. 2002), as appropriate, whether

antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures “gap” period, of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the period of review.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures*, 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Those procedures apply to administrative reviews included in this notice of initiation. Parties wishing to participate in any of these administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

Any party submitting factual information in an antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information. See section 782(b) of the Act. Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials as well as their representatives in all segments of any antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceedings initiated on or after March 14, 2011. See *Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Interim Final Rule*, 76 FR 7491 (February 10, 2011) (“*Interim Final Rule*”), amending 19 CFR 351.303(g)(1) and (2). The formats for the revised certifications are provided at the end of the *Interim Final Rule*. The Department intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments initiated on or after March 14, 2011 if the submitting party does not comply with the revised certification requirements.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: August 20, 2012.

Gary Taverman,

Senior Advisor for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2012-21499 Filed 8-29-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 070321067-2100-03]

NIST Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140-3 (Second Draft), Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules; Request for Additional Comments

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) seeks additional comments on specific sections of Federal Information Processing Standard 140-3 (Second Draft), *Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules*, to clarify and resolve inconsistencies in the public comments received in response to the **Federal Register** (74 FR 91333) notice of December 11, 2009. The draft standard is proposed to supersede FIPS 140-2.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 1, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be sent to: Chief, Computer Security Division, Information Technology Laboratory, Attention: Dr. Michaela Iorga, 100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 8930, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930. Electronic comments may also be sent to: FIPS140-3@nist.gov, with a Subject: “Additional Comments-FIPS 140-3 (Second Draft).”

The current FIPS 140-2 standard can be found at: <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/PubsFIPS.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Michaela Iorga, Computer Security Division, 100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 8930, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930, Telephone (301) 975-8431.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FIPS 140-1, *Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules*, was issued in 1994 and was superseded by FIPS 140-2 in 2001. FIPS 140-2 identifies requirements for four security levels for cryptographic modules to provide for a wide spectrum of data sensitivity (e.g., low value administrative data, million dollar funds transfers, and life protecting data), and a diversity of application environments.

In 2005, NIST announced that it planned to develop FIPS 140-3 and solicited public comments on new and revised requirements for cryptographic systems. On January 12, 2005, a notice

was published in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 2122), soliciting public comments on a proposed revision of FIPS 140-2. The comments received by NIST supported reaffirmation of the standard, but suggested technical modifications to address advances in technology that had occurred after the standard had been approved. Using these comments, NIST prepared a Draft FIPS 140-3 (hereafter referred to as the “2007 Draft”), which was announced in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 38566) for review and comment on July 13, 2007.

Using the comments received in response to the July 13, 2007, notice and the feedback on requirements for software cryptographic modules obtained during the March 18, 2008, “FIPS 140-3 Software Security Workshop,” NIST developed the “Revised Draft FIPS 140-3” (hereafter referred to as “2009 Draft”), that was announced in the **Federal Register** (74 FR 65753) on December 11, 2009. The 2009 Draft and its Annexes and can be found at: <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/PubsDrafts.html>.

The comments received in response to the December 11, 2009, request for comments suggested either modifying requirements or applying the requirements at a different security level. Some comments asked for clarification of the text of the standard, and some recommended editorial and formatting changes. None of the comments received opposed the approval of a revised standard.

During the process of addressing the public comments received in response to the Request for Comments published in the **Federal Register** on December 11, 2009 (74 FR 65753), NIST determined that additional feedback is required to resolve gaps and inconsistencies between the comments for particular sections of the “Second Draft FIPS 140-3.” As a result, NIST is requesting additional public comments on several sections, as indicated below in the Request for Comments section of this notice, to support comment resolution. Comments on any sections of the “Second Draft FIPS 140-3” not identified in the Request for Comments section will not be considered.

Request for Comments: Even though NIST has resolved a majority of the issues raised by the public comments on the “2009 Draft,” NIST is requesting additional comments only on the following sections and sub-sections to resolve gaps and inconsistencies between the comments.

4.2.2 Trusted Channel—the comments suggested that NIST should not mandate the implementation of a trusted channel at Security Level 3 and