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to collect estimated antidumping duties for all shipments of subject merchandise exported by Sidenor and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of this notice in the Federal Register at the current AD cash deposit rate for Gerdau (i.e., 0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 3510–05–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.

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. 2016–28980 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 free 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.

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.
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

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


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@cspc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

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 Commissioner Robert S. Adler agreed upon by private litigants may be challenged individually for lack of good cause. 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, 879 (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 incarcerating documents outside the