investigation and additional information placed by Commission staff on the record during this remand proceeding.

#### Participation in the Proceeding

Only those persons who were interested parties in the original administrative proceeding and are parties to the ongoing litigation (i.e., persons listed on the Commission Secretary's service list and parties to *Bratsk Aluminum Smelter* v. *United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 03–00200) may participate as interested parties in this remand proceeding.

## Nature of the Remand Proceeding

On February 16, 2007, the Commission will make available to parties who are participating in the remand proceeding information that has been gathered by the Commission as part of this remand proceeding. These parties may file comments on or before February 27, 2007 on the legal issues raised in Bratsk with respect to nonsubject imports and on the information on the record that is relevant to how the Commission addresses these issues in its remand determination. No additional new factual information may be included in such comments. Such comments shall not exceed 25 doublespaced pages.

All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain business proprietary information (BPI) must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002). Even where electronic filing of a document is permitted, certain documents must also be filed in paper form, as specified in II (C) of the Commission's Handbook on Electronic Filing Procedures, 67 FR 68168, 68173 (November 8, 2002). Each document filed by a party participating in the remand investigation must be served on all other parties who may participate in the remand investigation (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service. Parties are also advised to consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subpart A (19 CFR part 207), for provisions of general

applicability concerning written submissions to the Commission.

#### Limited Disclosure of Business Proprietary Information (BPI) Under an Administrative Protective Order (APO) and BPI Service List

Information obtained during the remand investigation will be released to the referenced parties, as appropriate, under the administrative protective order (APO) in effect in the original investigation. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO in this remand investigation.

Authority: This action is taken under the authority of the Tariff Act of 1930, title VII.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 4, 2007.

## Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. E7–187 Filed 1–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–678, 679, 681, and 682 (Second Review)]

# Stainless Steel Bar From Brazil, India, Japan, And Spain

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar from Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>2</sup>

#### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on March 1, 2006 (71 FR 10552) and determined on June 5, 2006 that it would conduct full reviews (71 FR 34391, June 14, 2006). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on June 20, 2006 (71 FR 36359). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on October 12, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on January 5, 2007. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3895 (January, 2007), entitled Stainless Steel Bar from Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–678, 679, 681, 682 (Second Review).

By order of the Commission. Issued: January 5, 2007.

#### Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. E7–191 Filed 1–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

BILLING CODE 7020-02-1

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### Office of the Secretary

#### Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

January 5, 2007.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection requests (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35). A copy of each ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained from RegInfo.gov at *http://www.reginfo.gov/ public/do/PRAMain* or by contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) / e-mail: *king.darrin@dol.gov.* 

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone: 202–395–7316 / Fax: 202–395–6974 (these are not a toll-free numbers), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

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,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Chairman Daniel R. Pearson and Commissioner Deanna Tanner Okun dissenting with respect to Brazil and Spain.

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 submission of responses.

*Agency:* Employee Benefits Security Administration.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of currently approved collection.

*Title:* Annual Report for Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (Form

M–1).

 $OMB\ Number: 1210-0116.$ 

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Type of Response:* Reporting.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Business or other for-profit and Not-forprofit institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 515.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 515.

Average Response Time:

Approximately 9 minutes (average across all filers).

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 78. Estimated Total Annualized capital/ startup costs: \$0.

Estimated Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): \$45,520.

Description: The Department's regulation at 29 CFR 2520.101-2 requires annual reporting by "multiple employer welfare arrangements," as defined in section 3(40) of Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), and certain other entities claiming an exception from the ERISA definition of "multiple employer welfare arrangements," for the purpose of determining the extent to which such entities comply with Part 7 of ERISA. The Department provides a form (Form M–1) for the required reporting and also provides an electronic filing system through which entities may complete the required Form M–1 and file it without cost.

Pursuant to section 101(g) of ERISA, the Form M–1 information is used by governmental oversight entities to determine the extent of compliance with the requirements of Part 7 of ERISA by multiple employer welfare arrangements and entities claiming exception under section 3(40) of ERISA and to take appropriate compliance assistance and enforcement actions. *Agency:* Employee Benefits Security Administration.

*Type of Review:* Extension without

change of currently approved collection. *Title:* ERISA Investment Manager

Electronic Registration.

OMB Number: 1210–0125.

Frequency: Annually.

Type of Response: Reporting.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Business or other for-profit and Not-forprofit institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 500.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 500.

Average Response Time: 2 hours for new filers and 1 hour for existing annual filers.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 550.

*Estimated Total Annualized capital/ startup costs:* \$0.

Estimated Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): \$17,500.

Description: The Department's regulation at 29 CFR 2510.3–38 provides that, in order to meet the definition of investment manager in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act 3(38), state-registered investment advisers must register electronically through a centralized electronic filing system established by the Securities and Extension Commission and state investment authorities ("Investment Advisor Registration Depository"/ IARD) rather than providing a paper copy of their state registration to the Secretary of Labor.

Although the primary users of the information collected through the Department's regulation are plan fiduciaries, who can review the IARD registration statements for information about investment advisers that are either currently service providers to the plan or potential service providers to the plan, EBSA also uses the information for enforcement and compliance purposes. EBSA investigators are expected to review IARD data whenever they conduct an investigation that involves investment advisers or investment managers.

## Darrin A. King,

Acting Departmental Clearance Officer. [FR Doc. E7–164 Filed 1–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

# Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,659]

### Colgate Palmolive Company; Kansas City, KS; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on December 22, 2006, in response to a worker petition filed by the Missouri Workforce Development Specialist on behalf of workers at Colgate Palmolive Company, Kansas City, Kansas.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 28th day of December, 2006.

#### **Richard Church**,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance. [FR Doc. E7–146 Filed 1–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-60,045]

#### International Business Machines Corporation; IBM/ITOS Rocklin; Rocklin, CA; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at **International Business Machines** Corporation, IBM/ITOS Rocklin, Rocklin, California. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA–W–60,045; International Business Machine Corporation, IBM/ITOS Rocklin, Rocklin, California (December 27, 2006)

Signed at Washington, DC, this 28th day of December 2006.

#### **Richard Church**,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–139 Filed 1–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–30–P