

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

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

(4) Minimize the burden of the information collection on those who are to respond (such as through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses).

**Estimate of burden:** Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average .55 hours per response.

**Respondents:** NPPO of Morocco, blueberry producers in Morocco, and U.S. importers.

**Estimated annual number of respondents:** 8.

**Estimated annual number of responses per respondent:** 3.

**Estimated annual number of responses:** 20.

**Estimated total annual burden on respondents:** 11 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Mrs. Celeste Sickles, APHIS' Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 851-2908.

### E-Government Act Compliance

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is committed to compliance with the E-Government Act to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies, to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes. For information pertinent to E-Government Act compliance related to this proposed rule, please contact Mrs. Celeste Sickles, APHIS' Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 851-2908.

### Lists of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 319

Coffee, Cotton, Fruits, Imports, Logs, Nursery stock, Plant diseases and pests, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rice, Vegetables.

Accordingly, we are proposing to amend 7 CFR part 319 as follows:

### PART 319—FOREIGN QUARANTINE NOTICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 319 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701-7772, and 7781-7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

■ 2. Section 319.56-63 is added to read as follows:

#### § 319.56-63 Fresh blueberries from Morocco.

Fresh fruit of highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum* L.) and its hybrid varieties southern highbush blueberry [*V. corymbosum* x *angustifolium* (*V. x atlanticum*) and *V. corymbosum* x *virgatum*] may be imported into the continental United States from Morocco only under the conditions described in this section. These conditions are designed to prevent the introduction of the following quarantine pests: *Ceratitis capitata*, the Mediterranean fruit fly, and the fungus *Monilinia fructigena* Honey ex Whetzel.

(a) The blueberries may be imported in commercial consignments only.

(b) The blueberries must be grown at places of production that are registered with the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Morocco.

(c) During the growing season, blueberries must be inspected in the field for signs of *M. fructigena* infestation 30 days prior to harvest. If the fungal disease is detected, the NPPO of Morocco must notify APHIS. APHIS will prohibit the importation of blueberries from Morocco into the continental United States from the place of production for the remainder of the growing season. The exportation of blueberries from the rejected place of production may resume in the next growing season if an investigation is conducted and APHIS and the NPPO of Morocco agree that appropriate remedial actions have been taken.

(d) Each consignment of blueberries must be treated in accordance with 7 CFR part 305 for *C. capitata*.

(e) Each consignment of blueberries must be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of Morocco with an additional declaration stating that the conditions of this section have been met, and that the consignment has been inspected prior to export from Morocco and found free of *M. fructigena*.

Done in Washington, DC, this 20th day of December 2013.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2013-31144 Filed 12-30-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

#### 7 CFR Parts 319 and 340

[Docket No. APHIS-2008-0011]

RIN 0579-AD75

### Restructuring of Regulations on the Importation of Plants for Planting

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** We are reopening the comment period for our proposed rule that would restructure the regulations governing the importation of plants for planting. We are requesting comments on our proposed framework for integrated pest risk management measures for plants for planting. We are especially interested in: The differences commenters perceive between International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures No. 36 and the North American Plant Protection Organization's Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures No. 24, and reasons to prefer one over the other as a basis for such measures; and how to address the risk posed when plant brokers purchase and move plants for planting after they leave their place of production and before they are exported to the United States. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments on these topics.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published April 25, 2013 (78 FR 24634) is reopened. We will consider all comments that we receive on or before January 30, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov/#!/documentDetail;D=APHIS-2008-0011-0001>.

- **Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:** Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2008-0011, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A-03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at <http://www.regulations.gov/#!/docketDetail;D=APHIS-2008-0011> or in our reading room, which is located in Room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal

reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799-7039 before coming.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Heather Coady, Regulatory Policy Specialist, Plants for Planting Policy, PPQ, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 133, Riverdale, MD 20737; (301) 851-2076.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

On April 25, 2013, we published in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 24634–24663, Docket No. APHIS–2008–0011) a proposal that would restructure the regulations governing the importation of plants for planting in 7 CFR part 319.

Comments on the proposed rule were required to be received on or before June 24, 2013. We reopened and extended the deadline for comments until September 10, 2013, in a document published in the **Federal Register** on July 12, 2013 (78 FR 41866–41867, Docket No. APHIS–2008–0011).

Among other changes, we proposed to establish a framework for the development of integrated pest risk management measures in the regulations. We did not propose to require any specific pest risk management measures; rather, we intended the proposed regulatory text to serve as a framework for their eventual development. We based the provisions for the integrated pest risk management measures on the North American Plant Protection Organization's Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) No. 24, which addresses trade in plants for planting. As we stated in the proposed rule, our framework for integrated pest risk management measures is also consistent with the International Plant Protection Convention's International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) No. 36, which addresses the same topic.

One element of RSPM No. 24 that we included in the proposed framework was a requirement that persons trading in plants for planting intended for export without growing the plants (whom we referred to in the proposal as plant brokers) be approved by the national plant protection organization of the exporting country. In addition, we proposed to require plant brokers to ensure the traceability of export consignments to an approved place of production or production site, and to maintain the phytosanitary status of the plants in a manner equivalent to an approved place of production from purchase, storage, and transportation to the export destination. (The "phytosanitary status" refers to their freedom from exposure to the

quarantine pests addressed by the integrated pest risk management measures.)

We received several comments on our decision to base the proposed framework for integrated pest risk management measures on RSPM No. 24, rather than ISPM No. 36. Most of the commenters preferred that we base our measures on ISPM No. 36. Some commenters on the proposed rule stated that the two standards differed significantly and that the framework we proposed was not consistent with ISPM No. 36. We also received several comments on our proposed requirement for approval of plant brokers, with some commenters indicating that such a requirement would be unworkable and that there could be other means for ensuring that plants for planting that are intended for export retain their phytosanitary status after leaving the place of production. We are considering whether to revise the proposed framework to base it on ISPM No. 36 and what other means might be available to ensure that the phytosanitary status of plants for planting is maintained after they leave an approved place of production.

We are reopening the comment period on Docket No. APHIS–2008–0011 for an additional 30 days. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments. We are particularly interested in detailed comments on the issues discussed above; specific comments will help us to evaluate potential changes to the proposed rule. We will also consider all comments received between September 10, 2013, and the date of this notice.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701–7772, and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 20th day of December 2013.

**Kevin Shea,**

*Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 2013–31146 Filed 12–30–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–34–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### 10 CFR Parts 429 and 430

[Docket No. EERE–2012–BT–TP–0046]

RIN 1904–AC52

### Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Set-Top Boxes

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) withdraws a proposed rule published January 23, 2013 to establish a test procedure to measure the energy consumption of set-top boxes (STBs). DOE is taking this action in light of a consensus agreement entered by a broadly representative group that DOE believes has the potential to achieve significant energy savings in STBs.

**DATES:** The proposed rule is withdrawn December 31, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mr. Jeremy Dommu, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building Technologies Program, EE–2J, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585–0121. Telephone: (202) 586–9870. Email: [Jeremy.Dommu@ee.doe.gov](mailto:Jeremy.Dommu@ee.doe.gov).

Ms. Celia Sher, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of the General Counsel, GC–71, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585–0121. Telephone: (202) 287–6122. Email: [Celia.Sher@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Celia.Sher@hq.doe.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### I. Authority

Title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291, *et seq.*; "EPCA") sets forth a variety of provisions designed to improve energy efficiency. (All references to EPCA refer to the statute as amended through the American Energy Manufacturing Technical Corrections Act (AEMTCA), Pub. L. 112–210 (Dec. 18, 2012)). Part A of Title III of EPCA (42 U.S.C. 6291–6309) established the "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products Other Than Automobiles," which covers consumer products and certain commercial products (hereafter referred to as "covered products").<sup>1</sup> In addition to specifying a list of covered residential and commercial products, EPCA contains provisions that enable the Secretary of Energy to classify additional types of consumer products as covered products. (42 U.S.C. 6292(a)(20)) DOE may prescribe test procedures for any product it classifies as a "covered product." (42 U.S.C. 6293(b))

#### II. Background

On June 15, 2011, DOE published a notice of proposed determination that tentatively determined that STBs and network equipment qualify as a covered product. 76 FR at 34914. Subsequently, DOE initiated the rulemaking process to

<sup>1</sup> For editorial reasons, upon codification in the U.S. code, Part B was re-designated Part A.