

Dated: August 4, 2017.  
**David Mussatt**,  
*Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.*  
 [FR Doc. 2017-16837 Filed 8-9-17; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Census Bureau**

**2018 End-to-End Census Test—  
 Address Canvassing Operation**

**AGENCY:** Census Bureau, Commerce.  
**ACTION:** Notice, comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Census Bureau publishes this notice to announce a change in the expected burden for the 2018 End-to-End Census Test—Address Canvassing Operation. The Census Bureau invites public comment on the increase in burden, as described below.

*Agency:* U.S. Census Bureau.  
*Title:* 2018 End-to-End Census Test—Address Canvassing Operation.

*OMB Control Number:* 0607-0997.  
*Type of Request:* New Collection.  
*Number of Respondents:* 85,093.  
*Average Hours per Response:* 5 minutes.

*Burden Hours:* 7,091.  
*Needs and Uses:* The Address Canvassing operation is the first operation in the 2018 End-to-End Census Test, with field activity beginning in the summer of 2017. The purpose of the Address Canvassing operation is (1) to deliver a complete and accurate address list and spatial database for enumeration and

tabulation, and (2) to determine the type and address characteristics for each living quarter. The Address Canvassing operation consists of two major components: In-Office Address Canvassing and In-Field Address Canvassing. Only the latter component involves collection of information from residents at their living quarters.

The following objectives are crucial to a successful Address Canvassing operation:

- Test the listing and mapping capabilities required by In-Field Address Canvassing.
- Validate the creation of In-Field Address Canvassing workload by In-Office Address Canvassing.
- Conduct a listing quality control operation during In-Field Address Canvassing.

The results of this test will inform the Census Bureau’s final preparations for the Address Canvassing Operation in advance of the 2020 Census.

The number of housing units with respondent burden in the original OMB package was calculated based on the national estimate of 25 percent of addresses in the Self-Response areas needing In-Field Address Canvassing. This estimate was based on our original approach to In-Office Address Canvassing Operation, which included two phases: Interactive Review and Active Block Resolution. In the Interactive Review phase staff make an initial assessment of the stability of the blocks under review, determining whether a block is “stable,” or undergoing minor changes or no changes at all, or “unstable,” which

indicates that there are significant changes within the block. In the Active Block Resolution phase, which we are no longer pursuing for the 2020 Census, staff would have done a second, “deep dive” into the “unstable” blocks to attempt to resolve them by accurately identifying the changes taking place. The Census Bureau discontinued this second phase because we were experiencing significant issues with productivity and quality control in the Active Block Resolution phase. The result of this decision is that our estimated national workload for In-Field Address Canvassing has increased from 25 percent to 30 percent. Prior to the suspension of Active Block Resolution, some of the blocks in the three test sites were removed from In-Field Address Canvassing workload as result of this phase of the In-Office Address Canvassing operation. Therefore, in order to ensure that the operations implemented in the 2018 End-to-End Census Test are consistent with the operations we plan to execute in the 2020 Census, the Census Bureau determined it was appropriate to add the blocks originally resolved during Active Block Resolution back into the in-field workload for this test.

The original estimate of burden was calculated to be:

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 43,965 households.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 5 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 3,664 hours.

Test site	Estimated number of respondents	Estimated time per response (minutes)	Total burden hours
Pierce County, Washington .....	20,818	5	1,735
Providence County, Rhode Island .....	17,526	5	1,461
Bluefield-Beckley-Oak Hill, West Virginia Area .....	5,621	5	468
<b>Totals .....</b>	<b>43,965</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>3,664</b>

The new burden estimate is calculated to be:

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 85,093 households.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 5 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 7,091 hours.

Test site	Estimated number of respondents	Estimated time per response (minutes)	Total burden hours
Pierce County, Washington .....	43,806	5	3,651
Providence County, Rhode Island .....	25,409	5	2,117
Bluefield-Beckley-Oak Hill, West Virginia Area .....	15,878	5	1,323
<b>Totals .....</b>	<b>85,093</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>7,091</b>

Written comments and recommendations on this change in burden should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *OIRA Submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to (202) 395-5806.

**Sheleen Dumas,**

*Departmental PRA Lead, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2017-16875 Filed 8-9-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-909]

#### Certain Steel Nails From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results Pursuant to Court Decision

**AGENCY:** Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** On July 3, 2017, the Court of International Trade (CIT or Court) sustained the Department of Commerce's (the Department) final remand results pertaining to the sixth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel nails from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period of August 1, 2013, through July 31, 2014. The Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the final results of the administrative review. Therefore, the Department is amending the final results with respect to the dumping margin assigned to SDC International Aust. PTY. Ltd. (SDC).

**DATES:** Applicable July 13, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Annatheia Cook, AD/CVD Operations Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0250.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

As part of the sixth administrative review of certain steel nails from the PRC, on August 29, 2014, Mid-Continent Nail Corporation (Mid Continent), the petitioner, requested a review of "SDC INTERNATIONAL AUSTRALIA (PTY) LTD." <sup>1</sup> On

<sup>1</sup> See Mid Continent's "Request for Sixth Administrative Review," August 29, 2014, at Attachment 1.

September 2, 2014, Progressive Steel and Wire (Progressive Wire), a domestic interested party, requested a review of "SDC International Aust. Pty., Ltd." and "SDC International Australia Pty., Ltd." <sup>2</sup> On September 30, 2014, the Department initiated a review of, among other companies: "SDC International Aust. Pty., Ltd.," "SDC International Australia Pty., Ltd.," and "SDC International Australia (Pty) Ltd."

On March 8, 2016, the Department issued the *6th AR Final Results*,<sup>3</sup> where the Department continued to grant a separate rate only to "SDC International Aust. PTY. LTD."—the full business name requested by SDC in its separate rate certification and supported by the company's business license.<sup>4</sup> SDC challenged the *6th AR Final Results* before the CIT.<sup>5</sup>

The Department requested a voluntary remand to address whether the Department improperly included permutations of SDC's company name as part of the PRC-wide entity, subjecting these name permutations to the PRC-wide entity rate. On January 20, 2017, the Court granted the Department's request for a voluntary remand to reevaluate its determination regarding permutations of SDC's name.

On July 3, 2017, the CIT sustained the Department's final remand determination, affirming the Department's determination to continue to grant a separate rate to the name SDC provided on its business license—"SDC International Aust. PTY. LTD."—and no other names.<sup>6</sup> The CIT further affirmed the Department's determination to amend its *6th AR Final Results*, issue accompanying liquidation instructions indicating that any entries under "SDC International Australia Pty., Ltd." and "SDC International Australia (Pty) Ltd." for this review period may be assessed at the separate rate for "SDC International Aust. PTY. LTD.," and to no longer list these name permutations in the PRC-wide entity.

<sup>2</sup> See Progressive Steel & Wire LLC's "Request for Administrative Review," September 2, 2014, at Attachment 1.

<sup>3</sup> See *Certain Steel Nails from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 81 FR 14092 (March 16, 2016) (*6th AR Final Results*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

<sup>4</sup> See *6th AR Final Results*.

<sup>5</sup> CIT Court No. 16-00062.

<sup>6</sup> See *SDC International Aust. PTY. LTD. v. United States*, CIT Slip Op. 17-78, Ct. No. 16-00062 (July 3, 2017).

#### Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,<sup>7</sup> as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,<sup>8</sup> the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The Court's July 3, 2017, judgment in *SDC International Aust. PTY. Ltd. v. United States* constitutes a final decision of the Court that is not in harmony with the Department's *AR6 Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirement of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise at issue pending expiration of the period to appeal or, if appealed, a final and conclusive court decision.

#### Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department hereby amends the *AR6 Final Results* with respect to the companies identified below. Based on the Remand Results, as affirmed by the Court in *SDC International Aust. PTY. Ltd. v. United States*, the revised combination-rate weighted average-dumping margin for the companies listed below during the period August 1, 2013, through July 31, 2014 is as follows:

Exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
SDC International Aust. PTY. Ltd. (SDC) <sup>9</sup> .....	11.95

In the event that the CIT's ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, is upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on

<sup>7</sup> See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

<sup>8</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

<sup>9</sup> The Department determines that any entries under "SDC International Australia Pty., Ltd." and "SDC International Australia (Pty) Ltd." for this review period may be assessed at the separate rate for "SDC International Aust. PTY. LTD." The Department will issue accompanying liquidation instructions indicating that these permutations are assessed at the separate rate, *i.e.* 11.95%, and will no longer identify these name permutations as part of the PRC-wide entity for this review period. These changes to the *6th AR Final Results* are specific to, and a result of, the above-referenced remand redetermination.