

Administration, respecting Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico, NAFTA Secretariat File Number USA-MEX-2007-1904-01. The binational panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the International Trade Administration's determination, with one dissenting opinion. Copies of the panel decision are available from the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marsha Ann Y. Iyomasa, Acting United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-5438.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the *Federal Register* on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686). The panel review in this matter has been conducted in accordance with these Rules.

**Panel Decision:** The panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the International Trade Administration's determination respecting Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico with one dissenting opinion. The panel remanded on the following issues:

1. On the issue of the permissibility of zeroing, the Panel remands this matter back to Commerce to re-calculate Mexinox's dumping margins without zeroing;

2. On the issue of whether Commerce's adjustments to the U.S. indirect selling expense ratio are not in accordance with law, the Panel remands this matter back to Commerce to re-calculate the indirect selling expense ratio in a manner not inconsistent with the panel's opinion; and

3. Commerce is further directed to issue its Final Re-Determination on Remand within forty-five days from the date of this Panel Decision.

The Department's decision in the final results of the 2004/2005 antidumping review was, in all other respects upheld.

Dated: April 14, 2010.

Marsha Ann Y. Iyomasa,  
*Acting U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*  
[FR Doc. 2010-9015 Filed 4-19-10; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### National Sea Grant Advisory Board

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of solicitation for nominations for potential National Sea Grant Advisory Board members and notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice responds to Section 209 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-461, 33 U.S.C. 1128), which requires the Secretary of Commerce to solicit nominations at least once a year for membership on the National Sea Grant Advisory Board, an advisory committee that provides advice on the implementation of the National Sea Grant College Program.

**DATES:** Solicitation of nominations is open ended: resumes may be sent to the address specified at any time.

**ADDRESSES:** Nominations should be sent to Dr. James D. Murray; Designated Federal Official, National Sea Grant Advisory Board; Deputy Director, National Sea Grant College Program; 1315 East-West Highway, Room 11841; Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Established by Section 209 of the Act and as amended the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-394), the duties of the Board are as follows:

(1) In general—The Board shall advise the Secretary and the Director concerning—

(A) Strategies for utilizing the sea grant college program to address the Nation's highest priorities regarding the understanding, assessment, development, management, utilization, and conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources;

(B) The designation of sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes; and  
(C) Such other matters as the Secretary refers to the Board for review and advice.

(2) Biennial Report—The Board shall report to the Congress every two years

on the state of the national sea grant college program. The Board shall indicate in each such report the progress made toward meeting the priorities identified in the strategic plan in effect under section 204(c). The Secretary shall make available to the Board such information, personnel, and administrative services and assistance as it may reasonably require to carry out its duties under this title.

The Board shall consist of 15 voting members who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The Director and a director of a sea grant program who is elected by the various directors of sea grant programs shall serve as nonvoting members of the Board. Not less than 8 of the voting members of the Board shall be individuals who, by reason of knowledge, experience, or training, are especially qualified in one or more of the disciplines and fields included in marine science. The other voting members shall be individuals who, by reason of knowledge, experience, or training, are especially qualified in, or representative of, education, marine affairs and resource management, coastal management, extension services, State government, industry, economics, planning, or any other activity which is appropriate for, and important for, any effort to enhance the understanding, assessment, development, management, utilization, or conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources. No individual is eligible to be a voting member of the Board if the individual is (A) the director of a sea grant college or sea grant institute; (B) an applicant for, or beneficiary (as determined by the Secretary) of, any grant or contract under section 205 [33 USCS § 1124]; or (C) a full-time officer or employee of the United States.

The Director of the National Sea Grant College Program and one Director of a Sea Grant Program also serve as non-voting members. Board members are appointed for a 4-year term.

Dated: April 14, 2010.

Mark E. Brown,  
*Chief Financial Officer/Chief Administrator  
Officer, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric  
Research.*

[FR Doc. 2010-9100 Filed 4-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-KA-P

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

### Agency Information Collection Activities Under OMB Review

**AGENCY:** Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected costs and burden; it includes the actual data collection instruments [if any].

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before May 20, 2010.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR A COPY CONTACT:** Andrea Musalem at CFTC, (202) 418-5167; FAX: (202) 418-5547; e-mail: [amusalem@cftc.gov](mailto:amusalem@cftc.gov) and refer to OMB Control No. 3038-0023.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Title:** Proposed Questionnaire to Regulation 30.10 Relief Recipients (OMB Control No. 3038-0023). This is a request for approval of a new information collection.

**Abstract****I. Background**

CFTC Regulation 30.10 allows persons located and doing business outside the U.S., who are subject to a comparable regulatory framework in the country in which they are located, to seek an exemption from the application of certain of the Part 30 regulations. Regulation 30.10 expressly states that, upon petition, the Commission may exempt any person from any requirement of the Part 30 regulations. If the Commission grants an exemption, persons located and doing business outside the U.S. may solicit or accept orders directly from U.S. customers for foreign futures or options transactions without registering under the Act as FCMs.

A petition for exemption pursuant to Regulation 30.10 is typically filed on behalf of persons located and doing business outside the U.S. that seek access to U.S. customers by (1) a governmental agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the foreign regulatory program, or (2) a self-regulatory organization (SRO) of which such persons are members. A petitioner who seeks an exemption pursuant to Regulation 30.10, based on substituted compliance with a non-U.S. regulatory framework that is comparable to the Act and rules thereunder, must set forth with particularity the comparable regulations applicable in the jurisdiction in which that person is located. In essence, a petitioner under Regulation 30.10 must present, with particularity, the factual basis for a

finding of comparability and the reasons why the policies and purposes of the Commission's regulatory program are met, notwithstanding any differences of degree or kind in the petitioner's regulatory program.

Appendix A to Part 30 (Appendix A) articulates standards to be used by staff in assessing whether a foreign regulatory system is comparable.<sup>1</sup> These standards involve inquiry into the following areas: (1) Registration, authorization or other form of licensing, fitness review or qualification of persons through which customer orders are solicited and accepted; (2) minimum financial requirements for those persons that accept customer funds; (3) protection of customer funds from misapplication; (4) recordkeeping and reporting requirements; (5) minimum sales practice standards, including disclosure of the risks of futures and options transactions and, in particular, the risk of transactions undertaken outside the jurisdiction of domestic law; (6) compliance; and (7) information-sharing.

**II. The Proposed Questionnaire**

Currently, there are 13 foreign entities<sup>2</sup> (two regulators and 11 futures exchanges) that have a Regulation 30.10 exemption some of which date back to the late eighties, early nineties. Consequently, the Commission's Division of Clearing and Intermediary Oversight (DCIO) would like to embark upon a program whereby each year, DCIO sends out a questionnaire to exemption recipients inquiring as to material and other relevant changes that impacted our could impact the fundamentals for which exemptive relief was granted in the first place.

The proposed 2010 Questionnaire will ask the following questions: The following questions relate to material changes that have occurred since the original filing of the 30.10 petition. Please answer the following questions in detail.

1. Have there been any material changes with regards to the identity or organization of the original Petitioner (*i.e.* change in control, change in name, change in structure, *etc.*)?
2. Has there been a change in the role of the government, the regulator, or the self-regulatory organization(s) which has or could potentially impact their supervision of and their enforcement

<sup>1</sup> "Interpretative Statement With Respect to the Commission's Exemptive Authority Under § 30.10 of its Rules," 17 CFR part 30, Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> The 13 foreign entities are represented by the following jurisdictions: The United Kingdom, Australia, Brazil, Germany, Canada, France, Spain, New Zealand, Singapore, Taiwan, and Japan.

powers over the exchange and its members?

3. Has there been any material change in the legal framework which impacted or could impact any of the following:

a. Registration, authorization or other form of licensing, fitness review or qualification of persons through which customer orders are solicited and accepted;

b. Minimum financial requirements for those persons that accept customer funds;

c. Protection of customer funds from misapplication;

d. Recordkeeping and reporting requirements;

e. Minimum sales practice standards, including disclosure of risks of futures and options transactions and, in particular, the risk of transactions undertaken outside the jurisdiction of domestic law; and

f. Compliance (*i.e.* any change in oversight structure which impacted or could impact the governmental authority or the self-regulatory organization's ability to audit Part 30 firms for compliance with, or take action against persons that violate the requirements of the Part 30 program).

4. What changes, if any, have occurred in insolvency laws as they affect futures customers? If there have been changes to insolvency laws, have the changes occurred within the past two to three years? To what extent do you view any recently proposed changes to insolvency laws as resulting from the 2008-09 financial crisis?

5. Security futures products have both an equity component and a futures component. Consequently, in what accounts are security futures products held (*i.e.* the equity account, the futures account, or a combined account)? Are security futures products subject to separate disclosure and margin requirements than those required for plain vanilla futures products?

6. Please provide an updated list of all firms with relief under the Regulation 30.10 exemption.

7. Since the granting of the original exemption, please affirm whether 30.10 firms have been subject to arbitration and/or disciplinary proceedings arising from transactions with U.S. customers. To the best extent possible, please provide the number of times and a brief description of such proceedings.

8. Please provide the name and contact information for individuals to whom follow up questions might be directed.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB

control number. The OMB control numbers for the CFTC's regulations were published on December 30, 1981. See 46 FR 63035 (Dec. 30, 1981). The Federal Register notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on February 10, 2010 (75 FR 6637).

**Burden statement:** The respondent burden for this collection is estimated to average one hour per response. These estimates include the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

**Respondents/Affected Entities:** 13.

**Estimated number of responses:** 13.

**Estimated total annual burden on respondents:** 169 hours.

**Frequency of collection:** Annually.

Send comments regarding the burden estimated or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the addresses listed below. Please refer to OMB Control No. 3038-0023 in any correspondence.

Andrea Musalem, Division of Clearing and Intermediary Oversight, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581; and Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for CFTC, 725 17th Street, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: April 14, 2010.

David Stawick,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-9014 Filed 4-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Information Collection; Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service (hereinafter the "Corporation"), has submitted a public information collection request (ICR)

entitled the Community Stakeholder Assessment of Senior Corps RSVP Grantees to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13, (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Copies of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Corporation for National and Community Service, Katharine Delo Gregg at (202) 606-6965. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY-TDD) may call (202) 606-3472 between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted, identified by the title of the information collection activity, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service, by any of the following two methods within 30 days from the date of publication in this Federal Register:

- (1) *By fax to:* (202) 395-6974, Attention: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service; and
- (2) *Electronically by e-mail to:* smar@omb.eop.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Corporation, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Propose ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Propose ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

### Comments

A 60-day public comment Notice was published in the Federal Register on January 12, 2010. This comment period ended March 15, 2010. A total of 12 commenters submitted 33 comments.

**Comment 1.** The Corporation is urged to take a step back and consider other

ways in which "true stakeholder support" can be obtained.

**Response—**Corporation disagrees and believes that the proposed collection is at least one valid method assessing stakeholder support.

**Comment 2.** The federal registry explains the purpose of the survey is to help provide TTA to existing projects. The purpose statement on the survey does not talk about TTA.

**Response—**Instrument instructions will be edited per comment.

**Comment 3.** Two commenters suggested that the language needs to be simplified.

**Response—**Instrument instructions and questions edited per comment.

**Comment 4.** The tool asks assessments that I believe may be well beyond the reach of our stakeholders to properly assess.

**Response—**The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify why the intended recipients should be able to adequately respond.

**Comment 5.** The burden of administrative demand far exceeds any perceived benefit from my perspective.

**Response** The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the benefit of the survey depends on its use by the grantee.

**Comment 6.** Speaking more generally, this assessment should reflect how successfully respondents feel their respective RSVP's are doing to fulfill their missions and provide volunteers and services that have a meaningful and significant impact on the needs of the communities they operate in.

**Response—**Instrument instructions and questions edited per comment.

**Comment 7.** Questions should better address the processes and guidelines applied to RSVP projects.

**Response—**Instrument instructions and questions edited per comment.

**Comment 8.** Three commenters suggested that there should be fewer questions about how projects are perceived by the community and a few more about the operations of the project.

**Response—**The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the purpose of the instrument is to measure community impact of RSVP grantees.

**Comment 9.** Three commenters suggested that there are some similarities of the current questions.

**Response—**Instrument instructions and questions edited per comment.

**Comment 10.** I would also like to have the issue of a project that does not have a formal advisory council addressed.

**Response—**Instrument instructions have been edited per comment.