The Census Bureau is responsible for collecting, compiling, and publishing export trade statistics for the United States under the provisions of Title 13, United States Code (U.S.C.), Chapter 9, Section 301. The Automated Export System (AES), now part of the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE), is the primary instrument used for collecting export trade data. Through the AES, the Census Bureau collects Electronic Export Information (EEI), the electronic equivalent of the export data formerly collected on the Shipper’s Export Declaration (SED), reported pursuant to the Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR), Title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), part 30. The EEI consists of data elements as set forth in 15 CFR 30.6 for an export shipment, and includes information such as the U.S. Principal Party in Interest’s (USPPI’s) name, address, and identification number, and detailed information concerning the exported product. The party responsible for the accuracy and timeliness of EEI data elements varies depending upon the type of export transaction; standard or routed. Through this notice, the Census Bureau is seeking public comments to perform a review of the requirements governing routed export transactions, a subset of export transactions, as detailed in the FTR, 15 CFR, part 30.

Request for Comments

The Census Bureau is soliciting comments on the clarity, usability, and any other matters related to the regulatory requirements for routed transactions. This will include the definition of a routed export transaction found in 15 CFR 30.1 as well as the general responsibilities of parties in routed export transactions as detailed in 15 CFR 30.3. Suggested questions are below; however, any pertinent feedback not captured by these questions is also welcome:

1. If you do not think that the definition of a routed export transaction in 15 CFR 30.1 is clearly stated, then what definition of routed export transaction would you suggest?
2. Should the Census Bureau modify the list of data elements at 15 CFR 30.3(e)(2) that the U.S. authorized agent is required to provide when filing the electronic export information? If so, what changes would you suggest?
3. Should the Census Bureau modify the list of data elements at 15 CFR 30.3(e)(1) that the U.S. Principal Party in Interest is required to provide to the U.S. Authorized agent? If so, what changes would you suggest?
4. The carrier’s responsibilities under the FTR are the same in both standard and routed transactions. Does the FTR clearly communicate these responsibilities? If not, what clarification would you suggest?
5. The data elements that the USPPI and U.S. authorized agent are required to provide are currently located in Section 30.3(e) of the FTR. However, additional data elements are needed to complete the AES filing. Below is a list of data elements that are required to be reported but for which a responsible party is not listed. Please provide comments on which party, the USPPI or the U.S. authorized agent, should report these data elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous material indicator</th>
<th>FTZ identifier</th>
<th>shipment reference number</th>
<th>VIN/product ID</th>
<th>related party indicator</th>
<th>export information code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vehicle title number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vehicle title state code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filing option indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are the responsibilities of parties in a routed export transaction clearly stated? If not, what improvements would you suggest?
7. How could we improve the process to authorize filing in a routed export transaction?
8. How could the FTR be revised to align with the Bureau of Industry and Security’s Export Administration Regulations on routed export transactions?
9. What changes would you suggest in Section 30.3 of the FTR that might improve the parties’ understanding of the requirements of a routed export transaction?
10. What changes would you suggest in Section 30.3 of the FTR that might improve the parties’ understanding of their roles in a routed or standard export transaction?


Ron S. Jarmin,
Associate Director for Economic Programs,
Performing the Non-Exclusive Functions and Duties of the Director, Bureau of the Census.

BILING CODE 3510–07–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Chapter II
[Docket No. CPSC–2017–0037]

Petition Requesting Rulemaking on Magnet Sets

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or Commission) has received a petition requesting that the Commission initiate rulemaking under the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA) to adopt a safety standard for high-powered magnet sets. The Commission invites written comments concerning the petition.

DATES: Submit comments by December 5, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2017–0037, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through www.regulations.gov. The Commission encourages you to submit electronic
The petitioner notes that one potential injury that can result from ingesting high-powered magnets is damage to gastrointestinal tissue. The petitioner requests that CPSC promulgate a mandatory safety standard that includes the following:

- **Performance standards.** Require individual magnets and each magnet in a magnet set that fits entirely within the cylinder described in 16 CFR 1501.4 (small parts cylinder) to have a flux index of 50 kG²mm² or less if the product is designed, marketed, or manufactured for children under the age of 14 years. Establish standards for magnet set packaging, such as requiring packaging to be difficult for children to open and assist users in determining whether all magnets are returned to the package after use. According to the petitioner, these requirements would limit the magnetic strength of magnets so that they would not attach across internal tissue if ingested and would assist users in limiting children’s access to the magnets.

- **Warning requirements.** Require magnet sets to bear warnings that conform to specific form requirements, warn of the ingestion hazard, and indicate the product is not intended for children. Require warnings on product packaging, including in a location that requires a user to see the warning when opening the package.

- **Instructional requirements.** Require magnet sets to include instructions that indicate how to avoid using the magnet set in a way that can lead to ingestion, aspirating, or inserting the magnets into the body and how to return magnets to the packaging.

- **Age restrictions.** Require warnings and instructions for magnet sets to include an age recommendation of 14 years or older.

The Commission seeks comments concerning this petition. The petition is available at: http://www.regulations.gov, under Docket No. CPSC–2017–0037, Supporting and Related Materials. Alternatively, interested parties may obtain a copy of the petition by writing or calling the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–6833.

Alberta E. Mills, Acting Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[PR Doc. 2017–21534 Filed 10–5–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve elements of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision from the State of Missouri for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). Section 110 of the CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of each new or revised NAAQS promulgated by EPA. These SIPs are commonly referred to as “infrastructure” SIPs. The infrastructure requirements are designed to ensure that the structural components of each state’s air quality management program are adequate to meet the state’s responsibilities under the CAA. In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this Federal Register, we are approving the state’s SIP revisions as a direct final rule without a prior proposed rule. If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 6, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2015–0356, to https://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential