

to the local FMSC, however, because we do have an obligation to ensure that a specific number of members have the prerequisite maritime security experience, we encourage the submission of resumes highlighting experience in the maritime and security industries.

Dated: September 22, 2017.

J. S. Dufresne,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Federal Maritime Security Coordinator, Buffalo.

[FR Doc. 2017-21486 Filed 10-4-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1185 (Review)]

Steel Nails From the United Arab Emirates

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on steel nails from the United Arab Emirates would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted this review on April 3, 2017 (82 FR 16229) and determined on July 7, 2017 that it would conduct an expedited review (82 FR 37112, August 8, 2017).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on September 29, 2017. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4729 (September 2017), entitled *Steel Nails from the United Arab Emirates: Investigation No. 731-TA-1185 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 29, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-21427 Filed 10-4-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1010]

Certain Semiconductor Devices, Semiconductor Packages, and Products Containing Same: Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding in Part a Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding; and Denial of a Motion To Modify the Administrative Protective Order

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the final initial determination (“final ID”) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) on June 30, 2017, finding in part a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has also determined to deny the motion filed on August 1, 2017, to amend the administrative protective order. The Commission requests certain briefing from the parties on the issues under review, as indicated in this notice. The Commission also requests briefing from the parties and interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2532. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation

on June 24, 2016, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Tessera Technologies, Inc.; Tessera, Inc.; and Invensas Corporation, all of San Jose, California (collectively, “Tessera”). 81 FR 41344 (Jun. 24, 2016). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,856,007 (“the ‘007 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 6,849,946 (“the ‘946 patent”); and U.S. Patent No. 6,133,136 (“the ‘136 patent”). The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. The Commission’s notice of investigation named 24 respondents. Those respondents are Broadcom Limited of Singapore and Broadcom Corporation of Irvine, California (collectively, “Broadcom”), and 22 manufacturers and importers of products containing Broadcom’s semiconductor devices: Avago Technologies Limited of Singapore, and Avago Technologies U.S. Inc. of San Jose, California (collectively, “Avago”); Arista Networks, Inc. of Santa Clara, California; ARRIS International plc, ARRIS Group, Inc., ARRIS Solutions, Inc., ARRIS Enterprises, and Pace Ltd., all of Suwanee, Georgia, as well as Pace Americas LLC and Pace USA LLC, both of Boca Raton, Florida, and ARRIS Technology, Inc. of Horsham, Pennsylvania (collectively, “ARRIS”); ASUSTek Computer, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan, and ASUS Computer International of Fremont, California (collectively, “ASUS”); Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC, and Comcast Business Communications, LLC, each of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (collectively, “Comcast”); HTC Corporation of Taoyuan, Taiwan and HTC America Inc. of Bellevue, Washington (collectively, “HTC”); NETGEAR, Inc. of San Jose, California; Technicolor S.A. of Issy-Les-Moulineaux, France, as well as Technicolor USA, Inc. and Technicolor Connected Home USA LLC, both of Indianapolis, Indiana (collectively, “Technicolor”). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in the investigation.

On June 30, 2017, the presiding administrative law judge issued the final ID. The final ID finds a violation of section 337 as to claims 16, 17, 20, and 22 of the ‘946 patent. ID at 262. The final ID finds that for claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 16, 24–26, and 34 of the ‘136 patent, the claims are infringed and not invalid, but that the existence of a domestic industry was not shown. *Id.* at 262–63. For the ‘007 patent, the final ID finds that infringement was shown only as to