

name, character, or use test in making a substantial transformation determination. See *Ran-Paige Co., Inc. v. United States*, 35 Fed. Cl. 117, 121 (1996); *Belcrest Linens*, 741 F.2d at 1371; *Uniroyal*, 3 C.I.T. at 226, 542 F. Supp. at 1031. The court has sometimes compared the degree of operations in pre versus post-importation processing to evaluate whether a substantial transformation occurred. For example, in *Nat'l Hand Tool*, the court contrasted the pre-importation processing of cold forming and hot-forging and noted that it required more complicated functions than post-importation processing, which included heat treatment and electroplating. 16 C.I.T. at 311; see also *Uniroyal*, 3 C.I.T. at 224-227, 542 F. Supp. at 1029-31 (comparing a post-importation "minor manufacturing or combining process" in which imported shoe uppers were attached to outsoles with "complex manufacturing processes" that occurred pre-importation when the imported uppers were produced). In such cases, CBP has focused on the importance of other components to make an origin determination.

For example, in HQ H018467, dated January 4, 2008, CBP was asked to consider two manufacturing scenarios for multi-function printers. In one scenario, manufacturing took place in two countries; in the other, it took place in three countries. In the two-country scenario, 18 units were manufactured in the Philippines from components produced in various countries. The units were sent to Japan where the system control board, engine control board, OPC drum unit, and the toner reservoir were manufactured and incorporated into the units. The control boards were programmed in Japan with Japanese firmware that controlled the user interface, imaging, memories, and the mechanics of the machines. The machines were then inspected and adjusted as necessary. CBP found that the manufacturing operations in Japan substantially transformed the Philippine units such that Japan was the country of origin of the multifunctional machines. In making the determination (and in addition to the finding that operations performed in Japan were meaningful and complex and resulted in an article of commerce with a new name, character and use), CBP took into consideration the fact that the system control board, the engine control board, and the firmware, which were very important to the functionality of the machines, were manufactured in Japan.

Similarly, in HQ W563491, dated February 8, 2007, CBP was asked to consider a two-country scenario where all of the subassemblies of the multifunction machine were made in China, with the exception of the controller unit subassembly, application specific integrated circuits and firmware, which were made in Japan. In that case, the final assembly, testing, and the final inspection were done in Japan. Although CBP stated that the product assembly in Japan was also complex and meaningful, CBP focused on the origin of key components in finding that the country of origin was Japan. See also HQ H020516, dated November 7, 2008 (CBP considered Sharp Andromeda II J models composed of eight main

subassemblies, two of which involved processing in Japan. All the engineering, development, design, and artwork were developed in Japan. The multifunction printer control unit was described as the brain of the model. While some of the components were installed on the control printer board in China, the flash read-only memory which included firmware developed in Japan, was manufactured in Japan. The other unit that involved production in Japan was the process unit, that housed a drum produced in Japan. The process unit was assembled in China. The other subassemblies were assembled in China but certain key components of the subassemblies originated in Japan. The final assembly was performed in Japan. Based on the totality of the circumstances discussed in this ruling, CBP agreed that the Jupiter II J-models were considered a product of Japan).

Similar to HQ H018467, HQ W563491, and HQ H020516, in this case, the main PCB assembly is the motherboard of the printers, which communicates with the PC, houses the memory in the printer, and forms the image printed on the page. It also includes key functional circuits, including mechanical control and printing data processing. Additionally, the overall structure and each functional circuit of the ASIC, the main component of PCB, will be designed in Japan and manufactured by third-party suppliers in Japan. The firmware itself provides the control program for the printers and enables the main PCB assembly to function as the electronic "brains" of the printers by controlling all printer functions. The main PCB assembly (consisting of approximately 1,028 components) and the firmware, produced in Japan, a TAA-designated country, account for a significant percentage of the total subassembly cost. Together, the firmware and the main PCB, which serve major functions and are high in value, constitute the essential character of the printers. We note that in the three rulings referenced above, the key components and the firmware were manufactured and developed in the same country in which the final assembly took place. This is not the case here. However, considering that the production of the printer occurs in three countries, we find the last substantial transformation to occur in Japan, given that the essential character of the printer is made in Japan. Accordingly, we find that Japan is the country of origin of the monochrome laser printers.

Replacement toner cartridges:

Finally, counsel argues that Japan is the country of origin for the Brother replacement toner cartridges. Several CBP rulings are cited in counsel's submission. HQ H251592, dated June 24, 2014, describes an AIO cartridge with three main components: 1) toner powder; 2) developer unit; and, 3) cleaning unit. In HQ H251592, CBP determined that the processing in Japan substantially transformed the non-Japanese components. We find that a similar rationale can be applied to Brother's replacement cartridges. Therefore, it is the opinion of this office that the country of origin of the replacement toner cartridges will be Japan.

HOLDING:

Based on the facts provided, the imported fully assembled printer subassemblies from Japan and Vietnam will not be substantially transformed into finished monochrome laser printers by the processes that take place in the United States. However, the finished monochrome laser printers will be considered a product of Japan for purposes of U.S. Government procurement. With respect to the Brother replacement toner cartridges, the country of origin will be Japan.

Notice of this final determination will be given in the Federal Register, as required by 19 C.F.R. § 177.29. Any party-at-interest other than the party which requested this final determination may request, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 177.31, that CBP reexamine the matter anew and issue a new final determination. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 177.30, any party-at-interest may, within 30 days of publication of the Federal Register Notice referenced above, seek judicial review of this final determination before the Court of International Trade.

Sincerely,

Monika R. Brenner
for
Alice A. Kipel, Executive Director
Regulations and Rulings
Office of Trade

[FR Doc. 2018-05964 Filed 3-22-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-14-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-7007-N-03]

60-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Pre-Purchase Homeownership Counseling Demonstration and Impact Evaluation

AGENCY: Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is seeking approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the information collection described below. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, HUD is requesting comment from all interested parties on the proposed collection of information. The purpose of this notice is to allow for 60 days of public comment.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* May 22, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Anna P. Guido, Reports Management Officer, QDAM, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street

SW, Room 4176, Washington, DC 20410-5000; telephone (202) 402-5534 (this is not a toll-free number) or email at Anna.P.Guido@hud.gov for a copy of the proposed forms or other available information. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anna P. Guido, Reports Management Officer, QDAM, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20410-5000; email Anna.P.Guido@hud.gov or telephone (202) 402-5535 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Guido.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This Notice informs the public that HUD is seeking approval from OMB for the proposed collection of information described in Section A.

A. Overview of Information Collection

Title of Information Collection: Impact Evaluation of the Pre-Purchase Housing Counseling Demonstration.
OMB Approval Number: 2528-0293.
Type of Request: Revision.
Form Number: None.
Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use: The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is conducting a national study on the effectiveness of

pre-purchase homeownership counseling services. This request covers four data collection activities: (1) Administering a final follow-up survey to study participants; (2) extending OMB approval #2528-0293 so that the study can continue to collect updated tracking information from study participants; and (3) extending OMB approval #2528-0293 so that the study can continue to collect consent from the co-borrowers of study participants; and (4) extending OMB approval #2528-0293 so that the study can continue to collect loan origination and servicing data from lenders. The final follow-up survey will be administered to study participants approximately 48 months after they completed the baseline survey. The final survey will provide a comparison of study participants' characteristics from the baseline survey and allow the study to better understand, document, and explain the impacts of first-time homebuyer education and counseling. As part of OMB approval #2528-0293, the study collects updated study participant contact information to locate study participants for the final follow-up survey. Maintaining contact with study participants over time is critical to minimizing attrition and ensuring high response rates to the follow-up surveys. Additionally, the collection of consent from study participants' co-borrowers is necessary to allow the study to collect data related to the characteristics and performance of study participants' mortgage loans. Lastly, as part of OMB approval #2528-0293, the study collects study participants' loan origination and

service tracking data from the study's three participating lenders.

Respondents (i.e. affected public): Up to 5,854 study participants; approximately 1,000 co-borrowers; and, staff at 3 lenders.

The average time per study participant (up to 5,854 study participants) to complete the final follow-up survey is 30 minutes. The study mails study participant tracking letters twice per year. The average time for study participants' review of the letters and return of the tracking form is 5 minutes. The collection of co-borrower consent involves including the co-borrower consent form in the study's regular tracking letters, along with a request for the co-borrower to review, sign, and return the written consent form. For co-borrowers who do not return the written form, the study will collect consent verbally at the time of the interim survey. The study estimates that approximately 1,000 study participants will have co-borrowers. The co-borrowers' review of the co-borrower consent information and completion of the consent process is estimated to require approximately 5 minutes per co-borrower. The average time for lenders to prepare study participants' loan origination and performance data for the study team is 60 minutes. The study team will ask for this data semi-annually from each lender during the next 3 years from each lender. The total burden for the study is 3,992 hours: 3,903 hours for study participants, 83 hours for co-borrowers, and 6 hours for lenders.

Information collection	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Responses per annum	Burden hours per response (mins)	Annual burden hours	Hourly cost per response	Annual cost
Final Follow-up Survey	5,854	1	5,854	30	2,927	* \$27.70	\$81,078
Tracking Letter	5,854	2	11,708	5	976	* 27.70	27,045
Co-borrower Consent Form	1,000	1	1,000	5	83	* 27.70	2,310
Loan origination and performance data:							
Lenders	3	2	6	60	6	* 35	210
Total	12,711	3,992	110,643

* The average income that our study participants received in the last 12 months is \$57,811. This estimate of average income is based on responses to the Short-Term Follow-Up Survey and was weighted to represent the full study sample using sample weights that adjust for follow-up survey nonresponse. Thus, the hourly rate for our study participants is estimated at \$27.70 (using the U.S. Office of Personnel's national standard of 2,087 hours per year for a full-time employee).

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice solicits comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of

the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those

who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses. HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

Dated: March 12, 2018.

Todd M. Richardson,

*Acting General Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Policy Development and Research.*

[FR Doc. 2018-05946 Filed 3-22-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-67-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-HQ-ES-2018-N019;
FXHC1122090000-167-FF09E33000; OMB
Control Number 1018-0148]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service,
Interior.

ACTION: Notice of information collection;
request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the
Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we,
the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are
proposing to revise an existing
information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to
submit comments on or before April 23,
2018.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments on
this information collection request (ICR)
to the Office of Management and
Budget's Desk Officer for the
Department of the Interior by email at
OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov; or via
facsimile to (202) 395-5806. Please
provide a copy of your comments to the
Service Information Collection
Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service, MS: BPHC, 5275
Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-
3803 (mail); or by email to *Info_Coll@
fws.gov*. Please reference OMB Control
Number 1018-0148 in the subject line of
your comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To
request additional information about
this ICR, contact Madonna L. Baucum,
Service Information Collection
Clearance Officer, by email at *Info_
Coll@fws.gov*, or by telephone at (703)
358-2503. You may also view the ICR
at [http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/
PRAMain](http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In
accordance with the Paperwork
Reduction Act of 1995, we provide the
general public and other Federal
agencies with an opportunity to
comment on new, proposed, revised,
and continuing collections of
information. This helps us assess the
impact of our information collection

requirements and minimize the public's
reporting burden. It also helps the
public understand our information
collection requirements and provide the
requested data in the desired format.

A **Federal Register** notice with a 60-
day public comment period soliciting
comments on this collection of
information was published on October
10, 2017 (82 FR 47021). The following
comment was received:

Comment #1: Received from Michael
Speerschneider, Senior Director,
Permitting Policy and Environmental
Affairs, and Gene Grace, Senior
Counsel, American Wind Energy
Association, on December 11, 2017, via
email.

The American Wind Energy
Association (AWEA) comments were
limited to the accuracy of the estimate
of the burden for the collection of
information detailed therein. They
provided the Service with an estimate of
the paperwork and respondent burden
required for the wind industry to collect
the data associated with the voluntary
Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines
("Guidelines") on a per project basis.
Based on a survey of their member
companies involved in the development
of wind energy facilities, they believe
the updated estimates are a more
accurate reflection of the work
necessary to adhere to the Guidelines,
and respectfully requested that the
Service utilize this estimate, combined
with other assumed costs (*e.g.*,
government agency costs) in this and
any other analysis of the Guidelines
going forward. Rather than have
individual companies submit their
respective data with respect to the
estimate burden hours related to the
Guidelines, AWEA submitted
aggregated data and, therefore, chose not
to include identifying information for
any of their members that supplied the
data.

FWS Response to Comment #1: The
Service thanks AWEA for the useful
comments that they provided on this
information collection, and specifically
on the estimate of the burden hours and
expenditures necessary to adhere to the
voluntary Guidelines. We used this
information to update the estimated
burden, noting that there are significant
differences between the Service's
burden estimate developed several years
ago, and AWEA's current estimate. We
assume that these differences are a
reflection of the wide range and
variability in the size and degree of
complexity of commercial-scale wind
energy projects, and that changes in cost
reflect that variability. We attempted to
obtain further clarification and feedback

from AWEA on that presumption but
received no response.

We are again soliciting comments on
the proposed ICR that is described
below. We are especially interested in
public comment addressing the
following issues: (1) Is the collection
necessary to the proper functions of the
Service; (2) will this information be
processed and used in a timely manner;
(3) is the estimate of burden accurate;
(4) how might the Service enhance the
quality, utility, and clarity of the
information to be collected; and (5) how
might the Service minimize the burden
of this collection on the respondents,
including through the use of
information technology.

Comments that you submit in
response to this notice are a matter of
public record. Before including your
address, phone number, email address,
or other personal identifying
information in your comment, you
should be aware that your entire
comment—including your personal
identifying information—may be made
publicly available at any time. While
you can ask us in your comment to
withhold your personal identifying
information from public review, we
cannot guarantee that we will be able to
do so.

Abstract: As wind energy production
increased, both developers and wildlife
agencies recognized the need for a
system to evaluate and address the
potential negative impacts of wind
energy projects on species of concern.
As a result, the Service worked with the
wind energy industry, conservation
nongovernmental organizations, Federal
and State agencies, Tribes, and
academia to develop the voluntary
Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines
(Guidelines; [http://www.fws.gov/
windenergy](http://www.fws.gov/windenergy)) to provide a structured,
scientific process for addressing wildlife
conservation concerns at all stages of
land-based wind energy development.
Released in 2012, the Guidelines
promote effective communication
among wind energy developers and
Federal, State, Tribal, and local
conservation agencies. When used in
concert with appropriate regulatory
tools, the Guidelines are the best
practical approach for conserving
species of concern.

The Guidelines discuss various risks
to species of concern from wind energy
projects, including collisions with wind
turbines and associated infrastructure;
loss and degradation of habitat from
turbines and infrastructure;
fragmentation of large habitat blocks
into smaller segments that may not
support sensitive species; displacement
and behavioral changes; and indirect