SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. General

The Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100–503), amended the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) by describing the conditions under which computer matching involving the Federal Government could be performed and adding certain protections for persons applying for, and receiving, Federal benefits. Section 7201 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101–508) further amended the Privacy Act regarding protections for such persons. The Privacy Act, as amended, regulates the use of computer matching by Federal agencies when records in a system of records are matched with other Federal, State, or local government records. It requires Federal agencies involved in computer matching programs to:

1. Negotiate written agreements with the other agency or agencies participating in the matching programs;
2. Obtain the approval of the Data Integrity Boards (DIB) of the participating Federal agencies;
3. Publish notice of the computer matching program in the Federal Register;
4. Furnish detailed reports about matching programs to Congress and OMB;
5. Notify applicants and beneficiaries that their records are subject to matching; and
6. Verify match findings before reducing, suspending, terminating, or denying a person’s benefits or payments.

B. SSA Computer Matches Subject to the Privacy Act

We have taken action to ensure that all of our computer matching programs comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act, as amended.

Jonathan R. Cantor,
Executive Director, Office of Privacy and Disclosure, Office of the General Counsel.
Notice of Computer Matching Program, SSA With the Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

A. PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

SSA and IRS.

B. PURPOSE OF THE MATCHING PROGRAM:

The purpose of this matching program is to establish the terms under which IRS will disclose to SSA certain return information for use in verifying eligibility for, and/or the correct amount of, benefits provided under Title XVI of the Social Security Act (Act) to qualified aged, blind, and disabled persons, and Federally administered supplementary payments of the type described in section 1616(a) of such Act (including payments pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 212(a) of Pub. L. 93–66, 87 Stat. 152).

C. AUTHORITY FOR CONDUCTING THE MATCHING PROGRAM:

Public Law 98–369, Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, requires agencies administering certain Federally-assisted benefit programs to use certain information to ensure proper distribution of benefit payments. Section 6103(l)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) (26 U.S.C. 6103(l)(7)) authorizes IRS to disclose return information with respect to unearned income to Federal, State, and local agencies administering certain Federally-assisted benefit programs under the Act and the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

Section 1631(e)(1)(B) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(e)(1)(B)) requires verification of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) eligibility and benefit amounts with independent or collateral sources. This section of the Act also provides that the “Commissioner of Social Security shall, as may be necessary, request and utilize information available pursuant to section 6103(l)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986” for purposes of Federally administered supplementary payments of the type described in section 1616(a) of the Act (including payments pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 212(a) of Pub. L. 93–66).

D. CATEGORIES OF RECORDS AND PERSONS COVERED BY THE MATCHING PROGRAM:

We will provide IRS with identifying information with respect to applicants for and recipients of title XVI benefits available under programs specified in this Agreement from the Supplemental Security Income Record and Special Veterans Benefit (SSR), SSA/OASSIS 60–0103, as published at 71 FR 1795 (January 11, 2006). IRS will extract return information with respect to unearned income from the Information Return Master File (IRMF), Treat/IRS 22.061, as published at 73 FR 42159 (July 25, 2006), through the Disclosure of Information to Federal, State and Local Agencies (DIFSLA) program.

E. INCLUSIVE DATES OF THE MATCHING PROGRAM:

The matching program will become effective no sooner than 40 days after notice of the matching program is sent to Congress and OMB, or 30 days after

publication of this notice in the Federal Register, whichever date is later. The matching program will continue for 18 months from the effective date and may be extended for an additional 12 months thereafter, if certain conditions are met.

[FR Doc. 2010–25526 Filed 10–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
[Public Notice 7201]

Pursuant to the authority vested in me as Secretary of State, including under section 7076(d)(2) of the Act to certify that the Government of Afghanistan is cooperating fully with United States efforts against the Taliban and Al Qaeda to reduce poppy cultivation and illicit drug trafficking and report that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

This waiver shall be reported to the Congress promptly and published in the Federal Register.

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,
Secretary of State.
[FR Doc. 2010–25609 Filed 10–8–10; 8:45 am]
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OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
[Docket No. USTR–2010–0025]
WT Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding United States—Final Antidumping Measures on Stainless Steel from Mexico

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (“USTR”) is providing notice that pursuant to a request by Mexico under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (“WTO Agreement”), the Dispute Settlement Body of the World Trade Organization (“WTO”) has referred a matter concerning the dispute United States—Final Antidumping Measures on Stainless Steel from Mexico to a panel. The request may be found at http://www.wto.org in document WT/DS344/20. USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute.

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before November 12, 2010, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted electronically to www.regulations.gov, docket number USTR–2010–0025. If you are unable to provide submissions by http://www.regulations.gov, please contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–9483 to arrange for an alternative method of transmission. If (as explained below), the comment contains confidential information, then the comment should be submitted by fax only to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Maria L. Pagán, Associate General Counsel, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508, (202) 395–7305.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: USTR is providing notice that the Dispute Settlement Body (“DSB”) has, at the request of Mexico, referred a matter to a dispute settlement panel pursuant to the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (“DSU”). The panel will hold any meetings with the parties to the dispute in Geneva, Switzerland.

Major Issues Raised by Mexico

In its request for the establishment of a panel, Mexico alleges that the United States has not fully implemented the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in the dispute United States—Final Antidumping Measures on Stainless Steel from Mexico. The recommendations and rulings stem from the DSB’s adoption of the panel and Appellate Body reports in that dispute, which can be found at http://www.wto.org in documents WT/DS344/R and WT/DS344/AB/R, respectively.

Mexico states that the DSB made recommendations and rulings that the use of simple zeroing in administrative reviews is “as such” inconsistent with Article VI.2 of the GATT 1994 and Article 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement. Mexico alleges that the United States has taken no steps to eliminate simple zeroing in five administrative reviews, thereby failing to implement the DSB’s recommendations and rulings in this regard by the end of the reasonable period of time (“RPT”) or thereafter. Mexico alleges that the United States continues to act inconsistently with Articles 17.14, 21.1, and 21.3 of the DSU, Articles 2.1, 2.4, and 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement, and Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994.

In addition, Mexico states that the DSB made recommendations and rulings that the United States acted inconsistently with Article VI.2 of the GATT 1994 and Article 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement by applying simple zeroing in five administrative reviews at issue in the dispute (identified as cases 1 through 5 in the Annex to Mexico’s request). Mexico alleges that the margins of dumping calculated in these five administrative reviews continue to have legal effects after the end of the RPT and have been relied upon by the U.S. Department of Commerce (“USDOC”) in several subsequent closely connected measures, including in the 2005 and 2010 “sunset” reviews and in revocation decisions made in the context of subsequent antidumping administrative reviews, including the 7th and 9th administrative reviews. Mexico alleges that the United States has failed to adopt any measures by the end of the RPT or thereafter to implement the DSB’s recommendations and rulings regarding the use of simple zeroing in administrative reviews 1 through 5, and therefore is acting inconsistently with Articles 17.14, 21.1, and 21.3 of the DSU, Articles 2.1, 2.4, and 9.3 of the Antidumping Agreement, and Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994.

Furthermore, Mexico alleges that the United States has failed to take action to bring certain “closely connected measures” into compliance with U.S. WTO obligations and, that by continuing to use simple zeroing in subsequent “closely connected measures,” has imposed, assessed, and/or collected antidumping duties in excess of the proper margin of dumping. Mexico alleges that the United States is therefore imposing duties on the importation of Mexican goods in excess of the duties permitted under the U.S. Schedule of Concessions and otherwise nullifies or impairs benefits accruing to Mexico under the covered agreements. Mexico alleges that as a result the United States is acting inconsistently with Articles 17.14, 21.1, and 21.3 of the DSU, Articles 2.1, 2.4, 9.3, 11.2, and 11.3 of the Antidumping Agreement, and Article VI:2 of the GATT 1994. The alleged “closely connected measures” are:

(i) The six subsequent administrative reviews of the same antidumping duty