

- (a) "Horizontal peripheral third surface" (claims 1, 13);
 (b) "vertical outer peripheral surface" (claims 1, 13); and
 (c) "horizontal third surface" (claim 1)?

4. How should the following claim limitations be construed:

- (a) "The second surface of the die pad is exposed in the plane of the first exterior surface of the package body" ('277 patent, claim 18); and
 (b) "the second surface of each lead is exposed in a horizontal plane of a first exterior surface of the package" ('356 patent, claims 1, 13)?

In particular, please address how plating affects whether "the second surface of the die pad" in claim 18 of the '277 patent and "the second surface of each lead" in claims 1 and 13 of the '356 patent are "exposed."

5. Do the preambles of claims 1 and 3 of the '728 patent constitute claim limitations? In particular, please address how the intrinsic evidence supports your position in light of the teachings of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Written Submissions: Submissions should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation. The written submissions must be filed no later than close of business on February 14, 2005. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on February 22, 2005. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file with the Office of the Secretary the original document and 14 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR § 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.42–210.45 and 210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and

Procedure (19 CFR §§ 210.42–210.45 and 210.51).

By order of the Commission.
 Issued: February 1, 2005.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 05–2261 Filed 2–4–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Emergency Review; Comment Request

February 1, 2005.

The Department of Labor has submitted the following information collection request (ICR), utilizing emergency review procedures, 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). OMB approval has been requested by March 9, 2005. A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor's Departmental Clearance Officer, Ira L. Mills at (202) 693–4122 (this is not a toll-free number); via e-mail at: mills-ira@dol.gov; or (202) 693–7755 (TTY). The State Planning Guidance may also be found at the Web site—<http://www.doleta.gov/usworkforce>.

Comments and questions about the ICR listed below should be forwarded to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employment and Training Administration, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

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 agency, 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;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- 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.)

Agency: Employment and Training Administration.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Title: Planning Guidance and Instructions for Submission of the Strategic Five Year State Plan for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) and the Wagner Peyser Act.

OMB Number: 1205–0398.

Frequency: Every five years.

Type of Response: Reporting.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Government.

Total Respondents: 59.

Number of Responses: 59.

Total Burden: 1,475.

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Cost: \$ 0.

Total Annual Costs (Operating/Maintaining Systems or Purchasing Services): \$ 0.

Description: All current WIA State Plans will expire June 30, 2005. It is unlikely that Congress will pass a reauthorized Workforce Investment Act (WIA) before that time. Therefore, the enclosed Proposed WIA Planning Guidance is designed to advise States about how to continue their WIA Title I and Wagner Peyser Act programs under Public Law 105–220.

Ira L. Mills,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 05–2441 Filed 2–4–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–55,518]

BASF Corporation, Freeport, TX; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On January 12, 2005, the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration applicable to the subject firm. The Notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The initial investigation found that workers are separately identifiable by product line (polycaprolactum, oxo, diols, and acrylic monomers), that polycaprolactum, oxo and diol production increased during the relevant period, and that the subject company neither increased imports of acrylic monomers during the relevant period nor shifted acrylic monomer production abroad.

The petitioner asserted in the request for reconsideration that the worker