

continues to find that Sidenor is the successor-in-interest to Gerdau, and is entitled to Gerdau's cash deposit rate with respect to entries of merchandise subject to the AD order on SSB from Spain.⁴

Instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Based on these final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect estimated antidumping duties for all shipments of subject merchandise exported by Sidenor and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** at the current AD cash deposit rate for Gerdau (*i.e.*, 0 percent). This case deposit requirement shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as a final reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). 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 sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this final results notice in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: November 29, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016-28982 Filed 12-1-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XF015

Fishing Capacity Reduction Program for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) King and Tanner Crab Fisheries

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of loan repayment.

⁴ For a complete discussion of the Department's findings, which remain unchanged in these final results and which are herein incorporated by reference and adopted by this notice, see generally *Preliminary Results*.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues this notice to inform interested parties that the Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab (a/k/a WAG and EAG) sub-loan in the fishing capacity reduction program for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) King and Tanner Crab Fisheries has been repaid. Therefore, buyback fee collections on Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab will cease for all landings after October 31, 2016.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before 5 p.m. EST December 19, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Send comments about this notice to Paul Marx, Chief, Financial Services Division, NMFS, Attn: Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab Buyback, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910 (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael A. Sturtevant at (301) 427-8799 or Michael.A.Sturtevant@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 28, 2005, NMFS published a **Federal Register** document (69 FR 67100) proposing regulations to implement an industry fee system for repaying the reduction loan. The final rule was published September 16, 2005 (70 FR 54652) and fee collection began on October 17, 2005. Interested persons should review these for further program details.

The Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab sub-loan of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) King and Tanner Crab Capacity Reduction (Buyback) loan in the amount of \$6,380,837.19 will be repaid in full upon receipt of buyback fees on landings through October 31, 2016. NMFS has received \$10,004,785.86 to repay the principal and interest on this sub-loan since fee collection began October 17, 2005. Based on buyback fees received to date, landings after October 31, 2016, will not be subject to the buyback fee. Therefore, buyback loan fees will no longer be collected in the Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab fishery on future landings.

Buyback fees not yet forwarded to NMFS for Aleutian Island Golden (Brown) King crab landings through October 31, 2016, should be forwarded to NMFS immediately. Any overpayment of buyback fees submitted to NMFS will be refunded on a pro-rata basis to the fish buyers/processors based upon best available fish ticket landings data. The fish buyers/processors should return excess buyback fees collected to the harvesters, including buyback fees collected but not yet remitted to NMFS for landings after October 31, 2016. Any discrepancies in fees owed and fees paid must be resolved immediately.

After the sub-loan is closed, no further adjustments to fees paid and fees received can be made.

Dated: November 28, 2016.

Brian Pawlak,

Director, Office of Management and Budget, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-28900 Filed 12-1-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XF060

Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) will host a webinar meeting of the Area 2A Pacific halibut governmental management entities, which will be open to the public.

DATES: The Area 2A manager's webinar will be held on Wednesday, December 14, 2016, from 8:30 a.m. until 10:30 a.m., or until business for the day is complete.

ADDRESSES: To attend the webinar (1) join the meeting by visiting this link <http://www.joinwebinar.com>; (2) enter the Webinar ID: 811-687-419, and (3) enter your name and email address (required). After logging in to the webinar, please (1) dial this TOLL number +1 (914) 614-3221 (not a toll-free number); (2) enter the attendee phone audio access code 867-903-330; and (3) then enter your audio phone pin (shown after joining the webinar). Participants are required to use their telephone, as this is the best practice to avoid technical issues and excessive feedback. Technical Information and System Requirements: PC-based attendees are required to use Windows® 7, Vista, or XP; Mac®-based attendees are required to use Mac OS® X 10.5 or newer; Mobile attendees are required to use iPhone®, iPad®, Android™ phone or Android tablet (See the GoToMeeting WebinarApps). You may send an email to Kris.Kleinschmidt@noaa.gov or contact him at (503) 820-2280, extension 425 for technical assistance. A public listening station will also be available at the Pacific Council office.

Council address: Pacific Council, 7700 NE. Ambassador Place, Suite 101, Portland, OR 97220-1384.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kelly Ames, Pacific Council; telephone: (503) 820-2426.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The primary purpose of the Area 2A Pacific halibut manager's meeting is to prepare and develop recommendations for the January 23-27, 2017 International Pacific Halibut Commission's (IPHC) annual meeting in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Recommendations generated from the meeting would be communicated to the IPHC by the Pacific Council's representative, Mr. Phil Anderson. Attendees may also address other assignments relating to Pacific halibut management. No management actions will be decided by the attendees. The meeting will be open to the public, and the agenda, which will be available one week before the meeting, will provide for a public comment period.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in the meeting agenda may be discussed, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during these meetings. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this document and any issues arising after publication of this document that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

The public listening station is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Mr. Kris Kleinschmidt at (503) 820-2425 at least 10 business days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: November 28, 2016.

Tracey L. Thompson,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-28918 Filed 12-1-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

CPSC Litigation Guidance and Recommended Best Practices for Protective Orders and Settlement Agreements in Private Civil Litigation

AGENCY: U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or the Commission) is publishing this Litigation Guidance to provide recommendations for best practices to all parties in relevant litigation related to providing an exemption in protective orders and settlement agreements for reporting information to the CPSC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd A. Stevenson, Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of the Secretary, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814, Room 820, 301-504-7923; email *tstevenson@cpsc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background ¹

The CPSC is a public-health authority with a broad mandate to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products. *See* 15 U.S.C. 2051 (2014); *See also* Public Health Authority Notification, 79 FR 11769 (March 3, 2014). The Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA) defines consumer products broadly, making the Commission responsible for ensuring the public's safety from thousands of different ever-evolving product lines. *See* 15 U.S.C. 2052 (2014). The timely collection of information regarding consumer product-related safety hazards is essential for carrying out the Commission's public health and safety mission.

Mandatory self-reporting of potential product hazards by manufacturers (including importers), retailers, and distributors (Industry Stakeholders) is a key element of CPSC's ability to identify potential substantial product hazards and subsequently take corrective action to protect the public. Such Industry Stakeholders are best situated to discover a potential product hazard and, thus, are statutorily required to report immediately to the CPSC when they obtain information that reasonably supports the conclusion that a product fails to comply with an applicable rule or standard, contains a defect which could create a substantial product hazard, or creates an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death. 15 U.S.C. 2064(b) (2014).

Despite the mandatory reporting requirement, the Commission believes

¹ The Commission voted (3-2) to publish this notice in the *Federal Register*. Chairman Elliot F. Kaye and Commissioners Robert S. Adler and Marietta S. Robinson voted to approve publication of the notice. Commissioner Ann Marie Buerkle and Joseph P. Mohorovic voted against publication of the notice.

Industry Stakeholders do not always meet their reporting obligations. Industry Stakeholders may fail to report potential product hazards altogether, may fail to report them in a timely manner and/or may fail to report new incidents that occur after the initial hazard has been reported.²

If Industry Stakeholders fail to report, CPSC has limited alternative means of obtaining this critical safety information. It is therefore possible that a product hazard will never come to CPSC's attention. Information in private litigation could, thus, be a key resource for the CPSC when Industry Stakeholders have not satisfied their reporting obligations. However, in some instances, confidentiality provisions imposed or enforced by the courts or agreed upon by private litigants may have prevented parties that are not industry stakeholders from sharing with the CPSC important product safety information they have discovered. *See* S. REP. NO. 110-439, at 6-8 (2008); *see also* Footnote 2 *infra*.

The motions and hearings involved in obtaining protective orders in private litigation for specific documents may result in enormous associated costs both in terms of money and time. This often leads to the use of "blanket" or "umbrella" protective orders covering the entirety of pre-trial discovery. *See Zenith Radio Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co.*, 529 F. Supp. 866, 879 (E.D. Pa. 1981) (finding that without blanket protective orders, a judge becomes a "veritable hostage" required to spend years on motions for individual documents). Rather than requiring a series of individual rulings for a large number of documents, blanket protective orders may create a presumption against disclosure for all or certain groups of information that then may be challenged individually for lack of good cause. *See* MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION § 11.432 (2004). Such umbrella protective orders have become fairly common. *See Zenith Radio Corp.*, 529 F. Supp. 866, 889 (E.D. Pa. 1981) ("We are unaware of any case in the past half-dozen years of even a modicum of complexity where an umbrella protective order . . . has not been agreed to by the parties); *see also Jepson, Inc. v. Makita Elec. Works, LTD.*, 30 F.3d 854, 858 (7th Cir. 1994) ("stipulated protective orders are relatively common."). Additionally, if incriminating documents outside the

² The CPSA recognizes that failures to report and delays in reporting may occur, and authorizes civil penalties up to \$15,150,000 for any related series of violations for stakeholders who violate their reporting obligations. *See* 15 U.S.C. 2068-2069 (2014).