through October 31, 2003, with respect to the weighted-average dumping margins assigned to Zhengzhou Harmoni Spice Co., Ltd., Jinan Yipin Corporation, Ltd., Linshu Dading Private Agricultural Products Co., Ltd., and Sunny Import & Export Co., Ltd. (collectively, "Respondents").

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* July 5, 2013. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eugene Degnan, Office 8, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0414.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

Subsequent to the publication of the *Final Results*<sup>2</sup> on June 13, 2005, and the *Amended Final Results*<sup>3</sup> on September 28, 2005, Chinese producers and exporters of fresh garlic filed a complaint with the CIT to challenge various aspects of the *Final Results* and *Amended Final Results* of the Department's ninth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the PRC.

On June 29, 2009, the Court sustained the Department's first remand redetermination as to three of 10 issues and remanded the remaining seven for further consideration.<sup>4</sup> On July 22, 2011, the Court sustained the Department's second remand redetermination with regard to four of the seven issues and remanded the remaining three issues, regarding valuation of factors of production for (1) labor, (2) cardboard packing cartons, and (3) plastic jars and lids, for further consideration.<sup>5</sup>

On June 24, 2013, the Court affirmed the Department's re-calculation of the surrogate labor wage rate by applying its current methodology of using certain industry-specific labor cost data from the selected surrogate country available during the underlying administrative review.<sup>6</sup> The Court also found that domestic producers failed to exhaust their administrative remedies to challenge surrogate value decisions concerning the cardboard packing cartons and plastic jars and lids because they did not submit comments on the Department's draft redetermination.<sup>7</sup> Lastly, the Court found that the Department's use of the "near perfect" price quotes, instead of "distorted import statistics," as the surrogate value for the cartons, jars and lids was supported by substantial evidence.8

# **Timken Notice**

In its decision in *Timken*, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held

that, pursuant to section 516A(c) 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 CIT's June 24, 2013, judgment in this case constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Department's final results of the administrative review. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of Timken. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.

44929

# **Amended Final Results**

Because there is now a final court decision with respect to this case, the Department is amending its *Final Results* and *Amended Final Results* with respect to the Respondents' weighted-average dumping margins for the period November 1, 2002 through October 31, 2003. The revised weightedaverage dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter	Weighted- average dumping margin (percent)
Zhengzhou Harmoni Spice Co., Ltd	0.00
Jinan Yipin Corporation, Ltd	0.00
Linshu Dading Private Agricultural Products Co., Ltd	0.00
Sunny Import & Export Co., Ltd	0.00

In the event that the CIT's ruling is not appealed, or if appealed, upheld by the CAFC, because the above margins are zero, the Department will instruct CBP to liquidate entries of subject merchandise exported by the Respondents without regard to dumping duties.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

<sup>2</sup> See Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of

Administrative Review, 70 FR 34082 (June 13, 2005)

China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty

<sup>3</sup> See Notice of Amended Final Results of

("Final Results").

Dated: July 19, 2013. Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013–17903 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

#### Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Garlic From the People's Republic of China, 70 FR 56639 (September 28, 2005) ("Amended Final Results"). 5 See Taian Ziyang Food Co., Ltd. v. United States, 783 F. Supp. 2d 1292 (CIT 2011).

#### ble to the Taian 2013). Taian Fook Huat <sup>7</sup> Id.

<sup>8</sup> Id.

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

# National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

# RIN 0648-XC778

# New England Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice; public meeting.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Taian Ziyang Food Co., Ltd. v. United States, 637 F. Supp. 2d 1093 (CIT 2009) (sustaining application of adverse facts available to the Taian Ziyang Food Company, Ltd.'s and Taian Fook Huat Tong Kee Foodstuffs Co., Ltd.'s factors of production).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Taian Ziyang Food Co., Ltd. v. United States, Court No. 05–00399, Slip. Op. 13–80 (CIT 2013)

**SUMMARY:** The New England Fishery Management Council's (Council) Groundfish Oversight Committee will meet to consider actions affecting New England fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ).

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 14, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn, One Newbury Street Route 1, Peabody, MA 01960; telephone: (978) 535–4600; fax: (978) 535–8238.

*Council address:* New England Fishery Management Council, 50 Water Street, Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas A. Nies, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council; telephone: (978) 465–0492.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The items of discussion in the committee's agenda are as follows:

The Groundfish Oversight Committee will meet to discuss issues related to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, including the review of the Plan Development Team (PDT) work related to the development of Framework 51; the discussion of potential measures to include in Framework 51; review of PDT work related to the development of Amendment 18; review recommendations of the Groundfish Advisory Panel and discuss potential groundfish priorities for 2014. They will also address other business as necessary.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before this group for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency.

#### **Special Accommodations**

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Thomas A. Nies (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

Dated: July 19, 2013. **Tracey L. Thompson,**  *Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.* [FR Doc. 2013–17849 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 3510–22–P** 

# BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

[Docket No CFPB-2013-0023]

# Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Bureau) is proposing to renew the approval for an existing information collection titled, *Fair Credit Reporting Act (Regulation V) 12 CFR 1022.* 

**DATES:** Written comments are encouraged and must be received on or before September 23, 2013 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by the title of the information collection, OMB Control Number (see below), and docket number (see above), by any of the following methods:

• *Electronic: http:// www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

• Mail/Hand Delivery/Courier: **Consumer Financial Protection Bureau** (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. In general, all comments received will be posted without change to regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or social security numbers, should not be included. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Documentation prepared in support of this information collection request is available at www.regulations.gov. Requests for additional information should be directed to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 435-9575,

or email: *PRA@cfpb.gov. Please do not submit comments to this mailbox.* SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title of Collection:* Fair Credit Reporting Act (Regulation V) 12 CFR 1022. *OMB Control Number:* 3170–0002. *Type of Review:* Extension without change of a previously approved collection.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits (insured depository institutions and credit unions with total assets of more than \$10 billion and their depository affiliates).

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 155<sup>1</sup>.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 4,737,120.

*Abstract:* The consumer disclosures included in Regulation V are designed to alert consumers that a financial institution furnished negative information about them to a consumer reporting agency, that they have a right to opt out of receiving marketing materials and credit or insurance offers, that their credit report was used in setting the material terms of credit that may be less favorable than the terms offered to consumers with better credit histories, that they maintain certain rights with respect to a theft of their identity that they reported to a consumer reporting agency, that they maintain rights with respect to knowing what is in their consumer reporting agency file, that they can request a free credit report, and that they can report a theft of their identity to the CFPB. Consumers then can use the information provided to consider how and when to check and use their credit reports.

*Request for Comments:* Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. In this regard, the Bureau especially appreciates comments providing insights into the time and effort ("burden") for covered entities to comply with the recordkeeping and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Bureau allocated half of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) burden amount after subtracting the burden which the FTC has attributed to itself for motor vehicle dealers. Section 1029 of the Dodd-Frank Act exempts certain motor vehicle dealers from the Bureau's enforcement authority. However, due to the difficulty of making a reliable estimate of those dealers, the FTC has attributed to itself the PRA burden for all motor vehicle dealers. This attribution does not change the actual enforcement authority of either the FTC or the CFPB.