

the period April 1, 2000, through March 31, 2001.<sup>1</sup> In that determination, the Department calculated a dumping margin of 10.34 percent for Polyplex Corporation Limited (Polyplex); however, it excluded Polyplex from the AD order on PET film from India because its AD cash deposit rate was zero percent. The Department calculated the zero percent AD cash deposit rate by reducing the dumping margin of 10.34 percent by the 18.66 percent countervailing duty (CVD) rate on export subsidies that was established in the companion CVD investigation. See, *Issues and Decision Memorandum* accompanying the *Final Determination* at Comment 2. The petitioners filed a motion for judgment upon the agency record contesting the *Final Determination*, claiming that the Department should not have excluded Polyplex from the AD order based on a zero cash deposit rate when Polyplex's dumping margin is greater than *de minimis*. The Court of International Trade (CIT) held that the Department's exclusion of Polyplex from the order was in error, noting that the Department cannot exclude an exporter from an order because its cash deposit rate is zero. See, *Dupont Teijin Films USA, LP, et al. v. United States and Polyplex Corp. Ltd.*, 273 F. Supp. 2d 1347, 1352 (CIT July 9, 2003). In remanding the case to the Department, the CIT stated that the Department must calculate Polyplex's dumping margin after considering the applicability of 19 U.S.C. § 1677a<sup>2</sup> and must find Polyplex's merchandise to be subject to the AD order on PET film from India if the Department continues to calculate a dumping margin for the company of 10.34 percent.

On August 11, 2003, the Department issued its Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand in which it explained that countervailing duties are imposed upon the issuance of a CVD order, and that, at the time the Department issued its *Final Determination*, the order in the companion CVD investigation had not yet been issued. Thus, the Department argued, Polyplex's sales were not

<sup>1</sup> This determination was subsequently amended to reflect the correction of a ministerial error. See, *Notice of Amended Final Antidumping Duty Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India*, 67 Fed. Reg. 44175 (July 1, 2002).

<sup>2</sup> This section of the statute requires U.S. price to be increased by the amount of any countervailing duty imposed to offset export subsidies. In the *Final Determination*, the Department accounted for the countervailing duty on export subsidies by adjusting the AD cash deposit rate, rather than U.S. price.

subject to a CVD order, and the decision not to increase U.S. price by the amount of the countervailing duty on export subsidies that was established in the companion CVD investigation was consistent with 19 U.S.C. § 1677a. Because Polyplex's dumping margin was 10.34 percent, the Department determined, consistent with the finding of the CIT decision, that Polyplex is subject to the AD order on PET film from India. In *Dupont Teijin Films USA, LP, et al. v. United States and Polyplex Corp. Ltd.*, 297 F. Supp. 2d 1367 (*Dupont Teijin II*), the CIT sustained the Department's determination in part, but remanded the case in part, instructing the Department to address certain concerns regarding the application of its new interpretation of "imposed."

On March 3, 2004, the Department issued its second Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand (Second Remand Determination) in which it addressed the CIT's concerns. On June 18, 2004, the CIT sustained the Department's Second Remand Determination in its entirety. See, *Dupont Teijin Films USA, LP, et al. v. United States and Polyplex Corp. Ltd.*, No. 02-00463, 2004 WL 1368838 (CIT June 18, 2004) (*Dupont Teijin III*). Polyplex timely appealed this decision to the CAFC.

On May 12, 2005, the CAFC affirmed the decision of the CIT in *Dupont Teijin III*, thereby sustaining the Department's Second Remand Determination and its determination that Polyplex is subject to the AD duty order on PET film from India.

As the litigation in this case has concluded, the Department is amending the *Final Determination*. Because the Department calculated a weighted-average dumping margin of 10.34 percent for Polyplex, Polyplex is subject to the AD order on PET film from India. However, as discussed above, for cash deposit purposes, the Department is subtracting from Polyplex's cash deposit rate the CVD rate on export subsidies that was established in the companion affirmative CVD determination (*i.e.*, 18.66 percent). After this adjustment, the cash deposit rate for Polyplex is zero.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 735(d) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: August 26, 2005.

**Joseph A. Spetrini**,  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-4799 Filed 8-31-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (ETTAC)

**AGENCY:** International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Cancellation Notice of September 16, 2005 Open Meeting.

*Date:* September 16, 2005.

*Time:* 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

*Place:* Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution NW., Washington DC 20230, Room 4830.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (ETTAC) has elected to cancel its previously scheduled September 16, 2005 plenary meeting. The meeting will be rescheduled for a later time to be determined in 2005.

The ETTAC is mandated by Public Law 103-392. It was created to advise the U.S. government on environmental trade policies and programs, and to help it to focus its resources on increasing the exports of the U.S. environmental industry. ETTAC operates as an advisory committee to the Secretary of Commerce and the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee (TPCC).

ETTAC was originally chartered in May of 1994. It was most recently rechartered until May 30, 2006.

For further information phone Joseph Ayoub, Office of Energy and Environmental Technologies Industries (OEEI), International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce at (202) 482-5225 or [Joseph.Ayoub@mail.doc.gov](mailto:Joseph.Ayoub@mail.doc.gov).

Dated: August 26, 2005.

**Carlos F. Montoulieu**,  
Director, Office of Energy and Environmental Industries.

[FR Doc. E5-4798 Filed 8-31-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### Science Advisory Board

**AGENCY:** Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

**ACTION:** Notice of charter renewal.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce's Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration

has renewed the charter for the Science Advisory Board (SAB) for a 2-year period, through August 9, 2007. The SAB is a federal advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463).

**DATES:** Renewed through August 9, 2007.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The charter has evolved since the SAB's inception in 1997 so as to accurately describe the SAB's purpose, membership, and administrative provisions. To more fully align the charter with the current state of the SAB and NOAA, the renewal charter has been modified as follows: (1) The first Objective has been changed to: "The SAB will advise the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere on strategies for research, education, and application of science to operations and information services, so as to better understand and predict changes in the Earth's environment and conserve and manage coastal and marine resources to meet the Nation's economic, social, and environmental needs." This change aligns the charter with NOAA's mission statement. (2) The SAB's Objectives and Duties now authorize the SAB to conduct NOAA Cooperative Institute reviews, in addition to those of NOAA laboratories and programs. (3) The Administrative Provisions have been modified to clarify that the SAB reports only to the Under Secretary, and so strengthens its senior advisory role within NOAA. (4) The Administrative Provisions have also been modified to clarify that, when deemed appropriate, the SAB can choose to appoint NOAA employees to task forces and working groups.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Michael Uhart, Executive Director, Science Advisory Board, NOAA, Rm. 11152, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. (Phone: 301-713-9121, Fax: 301-713-3515, E-mail: [Michael.uhart@noaa.gov](mailto:Michael.uhart@noaa.gov)); or visit the NOAA SAB Web site at <http://www.sab.noaa.gov>.

Dated: August 26, 2005.

**Louisa Koch,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.*

[FR Doc. 05-17443 Filed 8-31-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-KD-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Patent and Trademark Office

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

*Title:* Representative and Address Provisions.

*Form Number(s):* PTO/SB/80/81/82/83/84/122/123/124A/124B/125A/125B.

*Agency Approval Number:* 0651-0035.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Burden:* 23,668 hours annually.

*Number of Respondents:* 370,766 responses per year.

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 3 to 12 minutes (0.05 to 0.2 hours) to gather the necessary information, prepare the form, and submit a completed request involving a power of attorney, correspondence address, or Customer Number. The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 1 hour to prepare and submit a petition related to power of attorney and 1 hour and 30 minutes (1.5 hours) to submit a Customer Number Upload Spreadsheet, including the time to prepare the spreadsheet file on diskette or CD and to produce a signed cover letter.

*Needs and Uses:* Under 35 U.S.C. 2 and 37 CFR 1.31-1.36 and 1.363, this information collection is used by the public to grant or revoke power of attorney in a patent application, to withdraw as attorney or agent of record, to authorize a practitioner to act in a representative capacity, to designate or change the correspondence address or fee address for one or more applications or patents, to request a Customer Number, and to designate or change the correspondence address, fee address, or list of practitioners associated with a Customer Number. The Customer Number practice permits authorized individuals to change the correspondence address, fee address, or representatives of record for a number of patents or applications with one change request instead of filing separate requests for each patent or application. The USPTO uses the information in this collection to determine who is

authorized to take action in an application or patent on behalf of the applicant or assignee and where to send correspondence regarding an application or patent. This information collection currently contains eight paper forms, and customers may also submit information using the Customer Number Upload Spreadsheet format. The USPTO is adding the Authorization to Act in a Representative Capacity (PTO/SB/84), two petitions, and electronic power of attorney submissions to this collection.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households, businesses or other for-profits, not-for-profit institutions, farms, the Federal Government, and state, local or tribal governments.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by any of the following methods:

- *E-mail:* [Susan.Brown@uspto.gov](mailto:Susan.Brown@uspto.gov).

Include "0651-0035 copy request" in the subject line of the message.

- *Fax:* 571-273-0112, marked to the attention of Susan Brown.

- *Mail:* Susan K. Brown, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Data Architecture and Services, Data Administration Division, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before October 3, 2005 to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: August 26, 2005.

**Susan K. Brown,**

*Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Data Architecture and Services, Data Administration Division.*

[FR Doc. 05-17408 Filed 8-31-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-16-P**

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service (hereinafter the "Corporation"), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and