

exchange standard is effective and efficient?

3. State agencies already have focused efforts on integrating case management initiatives in order to better coordinate assistance for families with complex service needs across multiple program areas. What factors should FNS consider in a future rule to address SNAP data standardization so as not to adversely impact ongoing or planned initiatives?

4. In promulgating rules, what Federal or State laws should FNS be aware of that either hinder or promote data exchange standards?

5. What factors should FNS consider as part of the data exchange standardization effort to further strengthen client confidentiality? For example, should FNS mandate industry standard security protocols, such as requirements that Social Security Numbers (SSN) be encrypted and that States utilize data masking, or that States may not use SSN as a unique client identifier? If so, how can FNS promote further data interoperability while maintaining data security?

6. Are there any data standardization practices in your current data management process that could apply here, such as standardizing your data field names and definitions, including security classification, and implementing access policies to ensure input data cleansing and output data consistency?

7. Do States provide training to workers involved in the administration and enforcement of SNAP about data sharing?

8. Do States conduct security training with all staff involved in the administration and enforcement of the program that covers the client confidentiality requirements of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as well as the SNAP regulations? If so, please address additional questions below:

a. What is the frequency of the training?

b. Does the State maintain a record of each individual worker's security training history?

c. Does the training cover additional security topics?

9. What factors should FNS consider regarding the impact data exchange standards would have on States that integrate data sources external to the SNAP State agency?

10. What barriers, if any, should FNS consider in implementing federally required data exchanges for SNAP program administration?

11. What factors should FNS consider for States that utilize an enterprise data

warehouse for reporting and analyzing data in SNAP as well as across programs?

12. Efforts to promote data interoperability to improve oversight, data analysis, and decision-making are only as good as the quality of the data itself. What factors should FNS consider to strengthen SNAP data integrity in support of data exchange standards?

13. In addition to data exchange standards, should FNS consider additional steps related to this effort, such as providing standardized data sharing agreements for SNAP data?

14. What other concerns or barriers, if any, exist in successfully implementing data exchanges that were not addressed by any of the previous questions that FNS should consider?

Dated: May 10, 2016.

Audrey Rowe,

Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-12262 Filed 5-24-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

WTO Agricultural Quantity-Based Safeguard Trigger Levels

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Notice of product coverage and trigger levels for safeguard measures provided for in the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Agriculture.

SUMMARY: This notice lists the updated quantity-based trigger levels for products which may be subject to additional import duties under the safeguard provisions of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture. This notice also includes the relevant period applicable for the trigger levels on each of the listed products.

DATES: May 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Safeguard Staff, Import Policies and Export Reporting Division, Office of Trade Programs, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Stop 1020, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250-1020; by telephone (202) 720-0638; or by fax (202) 720-0876.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Article 5 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture provides that additional import duties may be imposed on imports of products subject to tariffication as a result of the Uruguay Round, if certain conditions

are met. The agreement permits additional duties to be charged if the price of an individual shipment of imported products falls below the average price for similar goods imported during the years 1986-88 by a specified percentage. It also permits additional duties to be imposed if the volume of imports of an article exceeds the average of the most recent 3 years for which data are available by 5, 10, or 25 percent, depending on the article. These additional duties may not be imposed on quantities for which minimum or current access commitments were made during the Uruguay Round negotiations, and only one type of safeguard, price or quantity, may be applied at any given time to an article.

Section 405 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act requires that the President cause to be published in the **Federal Register** information regarding the price and quantity safeguards, including the quantity trigger levels, which must be updated annually based upon import levels during the most recent 3 years. The President delegated this duty to the Secretary of Agriculture in Presidential Proclamation No. 6763, dated December 23, 1994, 60 FR 1005 (Jan. 4, 1995). The Secretary of Agriculture further delegated this duty, which lies with the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service (7 CFR 2.43(a)(2)). The Annex to this notice contains the updated quantity trigger levels.

Additional information on the products subject to safeguards and the additional duties which may apply can be found in subchapter IV of Chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (2016) and in the Secretary of Agriculture's Notice of Uruguay Round Agricultural Safeguard Trigger Levels, published in the **Federal Register** at 60 FR 427 (Jan. 4, 1995).

Notice: As provided in Section 405 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, consistent with Article 5 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture, the safeguard quantity trigger levels previously notified are superceded by the levels indicated in the Annex to this notice. The definitions of these products were provided in the Notice of Safeguard Action published in the **Federal Register**, at 60 FR 427 (Jan. 4, 1995).

Issued at Washington, DC, this 25th day of April 2016.

Suzanne Palmieri,

Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.

Annex

QUANTITY-BASED SAFEGUARD TRIGGER

Product	Trigger level	Period
Beef	317,530 mt	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Mutton	3,316 mt	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Cream	2,789 liters	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Evaporated or Condensed Milk	1,173,090 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Nonfat Dry Milk	525,441 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Dried Whole Milk	3,406,679 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Dried Cream	586 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Dried Whey/Buttermilk	18,198 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Butter	13,656,765 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Butter Oil and Butter Substitutes	6,076,713 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Dairy Mixtures	15,718,595 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Blue Cheese	4,865,957 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Cheddar Cheese	11,292,096 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
American-Type Cheese	663,153 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Edam/Gouda Cheese	8,161,533 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Italian-Type Cheese	19,591,643 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Swiss Cheese with Eye Formation	28,790,738 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Gruyere Process Cheese	3,745,854 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
NSPF Cheese	52,603,975 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Lowfat Cheese	153,319 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Peanuts	19,037 mt	April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016.
	13,106 mt	April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017.
Peanut Butter/Paste	3,592 mt	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Raw Cane Sugar	676,944 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	617,282 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Refined Sugar and Syrups	177,579 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	355,264 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Blended Syrups	87 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	106 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Articles Over 65% Sugar	385 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	415 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Articles Over 10% Sugar	20,158 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	18,930 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Sweetened Cocoa Powder	86 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	72 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Chocolate Crumb	12,167,560 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Lowfat Chocolate Crumb	500,069 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Infant Formula Containing Oligosaccharides	309,726 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Mixes and Doughs	230 mt	October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015.
	234 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
Mixed Condiments and Seasonings	961 mt	October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016.
	894 mt	October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.
Ice Cream	2,964,185 liters	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Animal Feed Containing Milk	27,792 kg	January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.
Short Staple Cotton	2,330,949 kg	September 20, 2015 to September 19, 2016.
	1,363,307 kg	September 20, 2016 to September 19, 2017.
Harsh or Rough Cotton	0 kilograms	August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2016.
	13 kg	August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017.
Medium Staple Cotton	48,783 kg	August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2016.
	0 kg	August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017.
Extra Long Staple Cotton	1,505,611 kg	August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2016.
	1,270,096 kg	August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017.
Cotton Waste	793,048 kg	September 20, 2015 to September 19, 2016.
	925,273 kg	September 20, 2016 to September 19, 2017.
Cotton, Processed, Not Spun	2,058 kg	September 20, 2015 to September 19, 2016.
	51 kg	September 20, 2016 to September 19, 2017.

[FR Doc. 2016-12321 Filed 5-24-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule

AGENCY: USDA Forest Service.

ACTION: Call for nominations.

SUMMARY: The National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System (NFS) Land Management Planning Rule (Committee) was re-established, in the public interest, on February 3, 2016, to continue providing advice and recommendations on the implementation of the NFS Land Management Planning Rule (Planning