assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). Commerce intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction 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. This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: November 7, 2018.

James Maeder,
Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations performing the duties of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Institute of Standards and Technology

For further information contact: For questions about this RFI contact: Naomi Lefkovitz, U.S. Department of Commerce, NIST, MS 2000, 100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2000, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, telephone (301) 975–2924, email privacyframework@nist.gov. Please direct media inquiries to NIST’s Public Affairs Office at (301) 975–NIST.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Genesis for the Privacy Framework’s Development

It is a challenge to design, operate, or use technologies in ways that are mindful of diverse privacy needs in an increasingly connected and complex environment. Current and cutting-edge technologies such as mobile devices, social media, the Internet of Things and artificial intelligence are giving rise to increased concerns about their impacts which analyzes the problems that individuals might experience as a result of the processing of their information, and the impact if they were to occur. on individuals’ privacy. Inside and outside the U.S., there are multiple visions for how to address these concerns. Accordingly, the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) is developing a forward-thinking approach that supports both business innovation and strong privacy protections. As part of this effort, NIST is developing a voluntary Privacy Framework to help organizations: better identify, assess, manage, and communicate privacy risks; foster the development of innovative approaches to protecting individuals’ privacy; and increase trust in products and services.2 The Privacy Framework is intended to be a tool that would assist with enterprise risk management.

Privacy Framework Development and Attributes

While good cybersecurity practices help manage privacy risk through the protection of personally identifiable information (PII),3 privacy risks also can arise from how organizations collect, store, use, and share PII to meet their mission or business objective, as well as how individuals interact with products and services. NIST seeks to understand whether organizations that design, operate, or use these products and services would be better able to address the full scope of privacy risk with more tools to support better implementation of privacy protections.

NIST will develop the Privacy Framework in a manner consistent with its mission to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness, and is seeking input from all interested stakeholders. NIST intends for the Framework to provide a prioritized, flexible, risk-based, outcome-based, and cost-effective approach that can be compatible with existing legal and regulatory regimes in order to be the most useful to organizations and enable widespread adoption. NIST expects that the Privacy Framework development process will involve several iterations to

1 While NIST requests information about how organizations define privacy risk in topic #3 below, for the purposes of this RFI, NIST references the privacy risk model set forth in NISTIR 80062. An Introduction to Privacy Engineering and Risk Management in Federal Systems at https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/nistir/8062/final.
2 In parallel with this effort, the DOC’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration is developing a set of privacy principles in support of a domestic policy approach that advances consumer privacy protections while protecting prosperity and innovation, in consultation with DOC’s International Trade Administration to ensure consistency with international policy objectives: https://www.ntia.doc.gov/federal-register-notice/2018/request-comments-developing-administration-s-approach-consumer-privacy.
3 For the purposes of this RFI, NIST is using the definition from the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–130. PII is defined as “information that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual’s identity, either alone or when combined with other information that is linked or linkable to a specific individual.”
allow for continuing engagement with interested stakeholders. This will include interactive workshops, along with other forms of outreach.

On October 16, 2018, NIST held its first workshop in Austin, Texas to launch the framework development process. NIST heard from panelists from industry, civil society and academia, as well as audience participants about the needs the Privacy Framework should address and some key desired characteristics. As a consequence, NIST believes that in order to be effective, the Privacy Framework should have the following minimum attributes:

1. Consensus-driven and developed and updated through an open, transparent process. All stakeholders should have the opportunity to contribute to the Privacy Framework’s development. NIST has a long track record of successfully and collaboratively working with stakeholders to develop guidelines and standards. NIST will model the approach for the Privacy Framework on the successful, open, transparent, and collaborative approach used to develop the Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (“Cybersecurity Framework”).

2. Common and accessible language. The Privacy Framework should be understandable by a broad audience, including senior executives and those who are not privacy professionals. The Privacy Framework can then facilitate communications among various stakeholders by promoting use of this common language.

3. Adaptable to many different organizations, technologies, lifecycle phases, sectors, and uses. The Privacy Framework should be scalable to organizations of all sizes, public or private, in any sector, and operating within or across domestic borders. It should be platform- and technology-agnostic and customizable.

4. Risk-based, outcome-based, voluntary, and non-prescriptive. The Privacy Framework should provide a catalog of privacy outcomes and approaches to be used voluntarily, rather than a set of one-size-fits-all requirements, in order to: Foster innovation in products and services; inform education and workforce development; and promote research on and adoption of effective privacy solutions. The Privacy Framework should assist organizations to better manage privacy risks within their diverse environments without prescribing the methods for managing privacy risk.

5. Readily usable as part of any enterprise’s broader risk management strategy and processes. The Privacy Framework should be consistent with, or reinforce, other risk management efforts within the enterprise, recognizing that privacy is one of several major areas of risk that an organization needs to manage.

6. Compatible with or may be paired with other privacy approaches. The Privacy Framework should take advantage of existing privacy standards, methodologies, and guidance. It should be compatible with and support organizations’ ability to operate under applicable domestic and international legal or regulatory regimes.

7. A living document. The Privacy Framework should be updated as technology and approaches to privacy protection change and as stakeholders learn from implementation.

Although the goal of the Privacy Framework is to help organizations better identify, assess, manage, and communicate privacy risks, NIST expects there may be aspects of privacy practices that are not sufficiently developed for inclusion in the Privacy Framework. When developing the Cybersecurity Framework, NIST produced a related roadmap that identified focus areas that still needed more research and understanding before they were mature enough for widespread adoption, but that could potentially inform future revisions of the Cybersecurity Framework. With respect to the Privacy Framework, NIST anticipates that a roadmap may be needed for similar reasons.

As noted below, NIST solicits comments on the desired attributes of a Privacy Framework, as well as high-priority gaps in organizations’ ability to manage privacy risk, as part of this RFI.

**Goals of This Request for Information**

Based upon discussions that took place during the October 16, 2018 workshop, this RFI seeks further information about the topics discussed by stakeholders, as elaborated in the sections below. The RFI invites stakeholders to submit ideas, based on their experience as well as their mission and business needs, to assist in prioritizing elements and development of the Privacy Framework. NIST invites industry, civil society groups, academic institutions, federal agencies, state, local, territorial, tribal, and foreign governments, standard-setting organizations, and other interested stakeholders to respond.

The goals of the Privacy Framework development process, generally, and this RFI, specifically, are:

(i) To better understand common privacy challenges in the design, operation, and use of products and services that might be addressed through a voluntary Privacy Framework,

(ii) to gain a greater awareness about the extent to which organizations are identifying and communicating privacy risk or have incorporated privacy risk management standards, guidelines, and best practices, into their policies and practices; and

(iii) to specify high-priority gaps for which privacy guidelines, best practices, and new or revised standards are needed and that could be addressed by the Privacy Framework or a related roadmap.

**Details About Responses to This Request for Information**

When addressing the topics below, commenters may address the practices of their organization or a group of organizations with which they are familiar. If desired, commenters may provide information about the type, size, and location of the organization(s). Provision of such information is optional and will not affect NIST’s full consideration of the comment.

Comments containing references, studies, research, and other empirical data that are not widely published (e.g., available on the internet) should include copies of or electronic links to the referenced materials. Beyond that, responses should not include additional information. Do not include in comments or otherwise submit information deemed to be proprietary, private, or in any way confidential, as all comments relevant to this RFI topic area that are received by the deadline will be made available publicly at http://www.nist.gov/privacyframework.

**Request for Information**

The following list of topics covers the major areas about which NIST seeks information. The listed areas are not intended to limit the topics that may be addressed by respondents so long as they address privacy and how a useful Privacy Framework might be developed. Responses may include any topic believed to have implications for the development of the Privacy Framework, regardless of whether the topic is included in this document.

**Risk Management**

NIST solicits information about how organizations assess risk; how privacy
considerations factor into that risk assessment; the current usage of existing privacy standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines, and principles; and other risk management practices related to privacy. In addition, NIST is interested in understanding whether particular frameworks, standards, guidelines, and/or best practices are mandated by legal or regulatory requirements and the challenges organizations perceive in meeting such requirements. This will assist in achieving NIST’s goal of developing a framework that includes and identifies common practices across contexts and environments and is structured to help organizations achieve positive privacy outcomes. Accordingly, NIST is requesting information related to the following topics:

Organizational Considerations

1. The greatest challenges in improving organizations’ privacy protections for individuals;
2. The greatest challenges in developing a cross-sector standards-based framework for privacy;
3. How organizations define and assess risk generally, and privacy risk specifically;
4. The extent to which privacy risk is incorporated into different organizations’ overarching enterprise risk management;
5. Current policies and procedures for managing privacy risk;
6. How senior management communicates and oversees policies and procedures for managing privacy risk;
7. Formal processes within organizations to address privacy risks that suddenly increase in severity;
8. The minimum set of attributes desired for the Privacy Framework, as described in the Privacy Framework Development and Attributes section of this RFI, and whether any attributes should be added, removed or clarified;
9. What an outcome-based approach to privacy would look like;
10. What standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines and best practices, and principles organizations are aware of or using to identify, assess, manage, and communicate privacy risk at the management, operational, and technical levels, and whether any of them currently meet the minimum attributes described above;
11. How current regulatory or regulatory reporting requirements (e.g., local, state, national, international) relate to the use of standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines and best practices, and principles;
12. Any mandates to use specific standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines and best practices, and principles or conflicts between requirements and desired practices;
13. The role(s) national/international standards and organizations that develop national/international standards play or should play in providing confidence mechanisms for privacy standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines, and principles;
14. The international implications of a Privacy Framework on global business or in policymaking in other countries; and
15. How the Privacy Framework could be developed to advance the utilization, hiring, development, and retention of a knowledgeable and skilled workforce necessary to perform privacy functions within organizations.

Structuring the Privacy Framework

NIST is interested in understanding how to structure the Privacy Framework to achieve the desired set of attributes and improve integration of privacy risk management processes with the organizational processes for developing products, services, and consumer expectations. NIST is seeking any input from the public regarding options for structuring the Privacy Framework, and is particularly interested in receiving comment on the following issues, if applicable:

16. Please describe how your organization currently manages privacy risk. For example, do you structure your program around the information life cycle (i.e., the different stages—from collection to disposal—through which PII is processed), around principles such as the Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPs), or by some other construct?
17. Whether any aspects of the Cybersecurity Framework could be a model for this Privacy Framework, and what is the relationship between the two frameworks.
18. Please describe your preferred organizational construct for the Privacy Framework. For example, would you like to see a Privacy Framework that is structured around:
   a. The information life cycle;
   b. Principles such as FIPPs;
   c. The NIST privacy engineering objectives of predictability, manageability, and disassociability or other objectives;
   d. Use cases or design patterns;
   e. A construct similar to the Cybersecurity Framework functions, categories, and subcategories; or
   f. Other organizing constructs?

Please elaborate on the benefits or challenges of your preferred approach with respect to integration with organizational processes for managing enterprise risk and developing products or services. If you provided information about topic 10 above, please identify any supporting examples of standards, frameworks, models, methodologies, tools, guidelines and best practices, and principles.

Specific Privacy Practices

In addition to the approaches above, NIST is interested in identifying core privacy practices that are broadly applicable across sectors and organizations. NIST is interested in information on the degree of adoption of the following various practices regarding products and services:

- De-identification;
- Enabling users to have a reliable understanding about how information is being collected, stored, used, and shared;
- Enabling user preferences;
- Setting default privacy configurations;
- Use of cryptographic technology to achieve privacy outcomes—for example, the disassociability privacy engineering objective;
- Data management, including:
  - Tracking permissions or other types of data tracking tools;
  - Metadata;
  - Machine readability;
  - Data correction and deletion; and
  - Useable design or requirements.

19. Whether the practices listed above are widely used by organizations;
20. Whether, in addition to the practices noted above, there are other practices that should be considered for inclusion in the Privacy Framework;
21. How the practices listed above or other proposed practices relate to existing international standards and best practices;
22. Which of these practices you see as being the most critical for protecting individuals’ privacy;
23. Whether some of these practices are inapplicable for particular sectors or environments;
24. Which of these practices pose the most significant implementation challenge, and whether the challenges vary by technology or other factors such as size or workforce capability of the organization;

25. Whether these practices are relevant for new technologies like the Internet of Things and artificial intelligence; and
26. How standards or guidelines are utilized by organizations in implementing these practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 272(b), (c), & (e); 15 U.S.C. 278g–3.

Kevin A. Kimball,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2018–24714 Filed 11–13–18; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Proposed Voluntary Product Standard 2–10, Performance Standard for Wood-Based Structural-Use Panels

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is soliciting public comment on a proposed revision to Voluntary Product Standard (PS) 2–10, Performance Standard for Wood-Based Structural-Use Panels. The standard, prepared by the Standing Committee for PS 2, establishes requirements for those who choose to adhere to the standard, for the structural criteria to assess the acceptability of wood-based structural-use panels for construction sheathing and single-floor applications. It also provides a basis for common understanding among the producers, distributors, and users of these products. Interested parties are invited to review the proposed standard and submit comments to NIST.

DATES: Written comments regarding the proposed revision to PS 2–10 should be submitted to the Standards Services Division, NIST, no later than December 14, 2018.

ADDRESSES: An electronic copy (an Adobe Acrobat File) of the proposed revision to the standard, PS 2–10, can be obtained at the following website: https://www.nist.gov/standardsgov/voluntary-product-standards-program. This site also includes an electronic copy of PS 2–10 (the existing standard) and a summary of the significant changes. Written comments on the proposed revision should be submitted to David F. Alderman, Standards Coordination Office, NIST, 100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2100, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–2100. Electronic comments may be submitted to david.alderman@nist.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David F. Alderman, Standards Coordination Office, National Institute of Standards and Technology, telephone (301) 975–4019; fax: (301) 975–4715, email: david.alderman@nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed revision of the standard has been developed and is being processed in accordance with Department of Commerce provisions in 15 CFR part 10, Procedures for the Development of Voluntary Product Standards, as amended (published June 20, 1986). The Standing Committee for PS 2 is responsible for maintaining, revising, and interpreting the standard, and is comprised of producers, distributors, users, and others with an interest in the standard. Committee members voted on the revision, which was approved unanimously. The Committee then submitted a report to NIST along with the voting results and the draft revised standard. NIST has determined that the revised standard should be issued for public comment.

Voluntary Product Standard PS 2–10 establishes structural criteria for assessing the acceptability of wood-based structural-use panels for construction sheathing and single-floor application and provides a basis for common understanding among the producers, distributors, and users of these products. After conducting a review of the current standard, PS 2–10, the Standing Committee for PS 2 determined that updates were needed to reflect current industry practices and developed the proposed revision to the standard through meetings to review the standard and propose needed changes. The proposed revision includes the following changes: Change of title, editorial corrections, new and revised definitions, updated references, and changes to Section 5 Requirements. A complete list of proposed changes can be found at https://www.nist.gov/standardsgov/voluntary-product-standards-program. All public comments will be reviewed and considered.

Attachments will be accepted in plain text, Microsoft Word, or Adobe PDF formats. Comments containing references, studies, research, and other empirical data that are not widely published should include copies or electronic links of the referenced materials.

All submissions, including attachments and other supporting materials, will become part of the public record and subject to public disclosure. NIST reserves the right to publish comments publicly, unedited and in their entirety. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or Social Security numbers, or names of other individuals, should not be included. Submissions will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information. Do not submit confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive or protected information. Comments that contain profanity, vulgarity, threats, or other inappropriate language or content will not be considered.

Written comments should be submitted in accordance with the DATES and ADDRESSES sections of this notice. The Standing Committee for PS 2 and NIST will consider all responsive comments received and may revise the standard accordingly.


Kevin A. Kimball,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2018–24713 Filed 11–13–18; 8:45 am]
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COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Notice of Intent To Renew Collection 3038–0043, Rules Relating To Review of National Futures Association Decisions in Disciplinary, Membership Denial, Registration, and Member Responsibility Actions

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the renewal of a collection of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA"), Federal agencies are required to publish notice in the Federal Register concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment. This notice solicits comments on rules relating to review of National Futures Association decisions in disciplinary, membership denial, registration, and member responsibility actions.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 14, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by “OMB Control No. 3038–0043” by any of the following methods: