

Border Rules (CBPRs) and the E.U.-U.S. Privacy Shield Arrangement.⁹

Emerging Technologies and Trends: NTIA also advocates for policies that enable entrepreneurs and innovators to take risks and to find global markets for new digital products and services. This advocacy often draws NTIA into discussions about access to broadband internet service, digital literacy, intellectual property, and technological standardization. Over the last decade, these discussions have intensified, as many countries have invested greater resources into developing national innovation strategies, and have increasingly brought those ideas into international forums, such as APEC and the OECD. Over the coming years, these discussions will increasingly focus on issues such as the economic and social impacts of artificial intelligence, the workforce changes brought on by automation and new internet-enabled business models, and the growth of blockchain applications, to name a few. NTIA welcomes comments on how OIA should participate in international discussions of these issues, as well as other issues related to emerging technologies and trends.

Request for Comments

Instructions for Commenters: NTIA invites comments on the full range of questions presented by this Notice, including issues that are not specifically raised. Commenters are encouraged to address any or all of the following questions. Comments that contain references to specific court cases, studies, and/or research should include copies of the referenced materials with the submitted comments. Commenters should include the name of the person or organization filing the comment, as well as a page number on each page of their submissions. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted on the NTIA website, <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/>, without change. All personal identifying information (for example, name or address) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

⁹ See Department of Commerce, *Fact Sheet: Overview of the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield Framework* (Feb. 29, 2106), <https://www.commerce.gov/news/fact-sheets/2016/02/fact-sheet-overview-eu-us-privacy-shield-framework>; see also Department of Commerce, Press Release, *Joint Press Statement from Secretary Ross and Commissioner Jourova on the Privacy Shield Review* (Sept. 20, 2017), <https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2017/09/joint-press-statement-secretary-ross-and-commissioner-jourova-privacy>.

I. The Free Flow of Information and Jurisdiction

A. What are the challenges to the free flow of information online?

B. Which foreign laws and policies restrict the free flow of information online? What is the impact on U.S. companies and users in general?

C. Have courts in other countries issued internet-related judgments that apply national laws to the global internet? What have been the practical effects on U.S. companies of such judgements? What have the effects been on users?

D. What are the challenges to freedom of expression online?

E. What should be the role of all stakeholders globally—governments, companies, technical experts, civil society and end users—in ensuring free expression online?

F. What role can NTIA play in helping to reduce restrictions on the free flow of information over the internet and ensuring free expression online?

G. In which international organizations or venues might NTIA most effectively advocate for the free flow of information and freedom of expression? What specific actions should NTIA and the U.S. Government take?

H. How might NTIA better assist with jurisdictional challenges on the internet?

II. Multistakeholder Approach to Internet Governance

A. Does the multistakeholder approach continue to support an environment for the internet to grow and thrive? If so, why? If not, why not?

B. Are there public policy areas in which the multistakeholder approach works best? If yes, what are those areas and why? Are there areas in which the multistakeholder approach does not work effectively? If there are, what are those areas and why?

C. Are the existing accountability structures within multistakeholder internet governance sufficient? If not, why not? What improvements can be made?

D. Should the IANA Stewardship Transition be unwound? If yes, why and how? If not, why not?

E. What should be NTIA's priorities within ICANN and the GAC?

F. Are there any other DNS related activities NTIA should pursue? If yes, please describe.

G. Are there barriers to engagement at the IGF? If so, how can we lower these barriers?

H. Are there improvements that can be made to the IGF's structure,

organization, planning processes, or intercessional work programs? If so, what are they?

I. What, if any, action can NTIA take to help raise awareness about the IGF and foster stakeholder engagement?

J. What role should multilateral organizations play in internet governance?

III. Privacy and Security

A. In what ways are cybersecurity threats harming international commerce? In what ways are the responses to those threats harming international commerce?

B. Which international venues are the most appropriate to address questions of digital privacy? What privacy issues should NTIA prioritize in those international venues?

IV. Emerging Technologies and Trends

A. What emerging technologies and trends should be the focus of international policy discussions? Please provide specific examples.

B. In which international venues should conversations about emerging technology and trends take place? Which international venues are the most effective? Which are the least effective?

C. What are the current best practices for promoting innovation and investment for emerging technologies? Are these best practices universal, or are they dependent upon a country's level of economic development? How should NTIA promote these best practices?

For any response, commenters may wish to consider describing specific goals and actions that NTIA, the Department, or the U.S. Government in general, might take (on its own or in conjunction with the private sector) to achieve those goals; the benefits and costs associated with the action; whether the proposal is agency-specific or interagency; the rationale and evidence to support it; and the roles of other stakeholders.

Dated: May 31, 2018.

David J. Redl,

Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information.

[FR Doc. 2018-12075 Filed 6-4-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC-2018-0006]

Draft Guidelines for Determining Age Appropriateness of Toys; Notice of Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Commission (Commission or CPSC) published a notice of availability (NOA) in the **Federal Register**, announcing the availability of a draft document titled, "Guidelines for Determining Age Appropriateness of Toys," on March 27, 2018. The Commission invited the public to submit comments on the draft guidelines; the comment period, as set in the NOA, ends on June 11, 2018. The Commission is extending the comment period until July 31, 2018.

DATES: Submit comments by July 31, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC-2018-0006, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through: <http://www.regulations.gov>. The Commission encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Written Submissions

Submit written submissions in the following way:

Mail/Hand delivery/Courier to: Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504-7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information electronically. Such information should be submitted in writing.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: <http://www.regulations.gov> and insert the Docket No. CPSC-2018-0006 into the "Search" box and follow the prompts.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

On March 27, 2018, the Commission published an NOA in the **Federal Register**, announcing the availability of a draft document titled, "Guidelines for Determining Age Appropriateness of

Toys" (83 FR 13121). The Commission invited the public to submit comments on the draft guidelines, and the comment period, as set in the NOA, ends on June 11, 2018. The Commission received a request to extend the comment period until the end of July 2018. The Commission is extending the comment period until July 31, 2018, to allow additional time for public comment on the draft guidelines.

Alberta E. Mills,

Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018-11994 Filed 6-4-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0031]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, DoD.

ACTION: Information collection notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995*, the Office of the Undersecretary for Personnel and Readiness announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by August 6, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Department of Defense, Office of the Chief Management Officer, Directorate for Oversight and Compliance, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24 Suite 08D09, Alexandria, VA 22350-1700.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) (Military Personnel Policy), ATTN: MAJ Kevin Bentz, 1500 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1500 or call (703) 695-5527.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Report of Medical History; DD Forms 2807-1 and 2807-2; OMB Control Number 0704-0413.

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary per Title 10 U.S.C. Chapter 31: Sections 504 and 505, and Chapter 33, Section 532, which requires applicants to meet accession medical standards prior to enlistment into the Armed Forces, including the Coast Guard. If applicants' medical history reveals a medical condition that does not meet the accession medical standards, they are medically disqualified for military entrance. This form also will be used by all service members not only in their initial medical examination but also for periodic medical examinations.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 128,833 hours.

Number of Respondents: 773,000.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 773,000.

Average Burden per Response: 10 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

These forms obtain medical information which affects entrance physical examinations, routine in-service physical examinations, separation physical examinations, and other medical examinations as required. The respondents are all applicants for enlistment, induction or commissioning, or service members. The respondents complete the medical history information recorded on the form. Medical professionals complete the remaining sections, and the information collected provides the Armed Services with the medical