appear on the Employment Eligibility Verification (Form I–9). Therefore, employers may not request proof of Syrian citizenship when completing the Employment Eligibility Verification (Form I–9). If presented with EADs that are unexpired on their face, employers should accept such EADs as valid “List A” documents so long as the EADs reasonably appear to be genuine and to relate to the employee. Refer to the “Note to All Employees” section for important information about your rights if your employer rejects lawful documentation, requires additional documentation, or otherwise discriminates against you because of your citizenship or immigration status, or national origin.

Note to All Employers

Employers are reminded that the laws requiring employment eligibility verification and prohibiting unfair immigration-related employment practices remain in full force. This notice does not supersede or in any way limit applicable employment verification rules and policy guidance, including those rules setting forth reverification requirements. For questions, employers may call the USCIS Customer Assistance Office at 1–800–357–2099. The USCIS Customer Assistance Office accepts calls in English and Spanish only. Employers may also call the Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Special Counsel for Immigration-Related Unfair Employment Practices (OSC), Employer Hotline at 1–800–255–8155.

Note to Employees

Employees or applicants may call the DOJ OSC Worker Information Hotline at 1–800–255–7688 for information regarding employment discrimination based upon citizenship or immigration status and national origin, unfair documentary practices related to the Employment Eligibility Verification (Form I–9), and discriminatory practices related to E-Verify. Employers must accept any document or combination of documents acceptable for the Employment Eligibility Verification (Form I–9) completion if the documentation reasonably appears to be genuine and to relate to the employee. Employers may not require extra or additional documentation beyond what is required for the Employment Eligibility Verification (Form I–9) completion. Further, employees who receive an initial mismatch via E-Verify must be given an opportunity to challenge the mismatch, and employers are prohibited from taking adverse action against such employees based on the initial mismatch unless and until E-Verify returns a final non-confirmation. The Hotline accepts calls in multiple languages. Additional information is available on the OSC Web site at http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/osc/.

Note Regarding Federal, State and Local Government Agencies (Such as Departments of Motor Vehicles)

State and local government agencies are permitted to create their own guidelines when granting certain benefits. Each state may have different laws, requirements, and determinations about what documents you need to provide to prove eligibility for certain benefits. If you are applying for a state or local government benefit, you may need to provide the state or local government agency with documents that show you are a TPS beneficiary and/or show you are authorized to work based on TPS. Examples are:

1. Your EAD that has a valid expiration date; and/or
2. A copy of your Application for Temporary Protected Status Approval Notice (Form I–797), if you receive one from USCIS.

Check with the state or local agency regarding which document(s) the agency will accept. You may also provide the agency with a copy of this notice.

Some benefit-granting agencies use the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) Program to verify the current immigration status of applicants for public benefits. If such an agency has denied your application based solely or in part on a SAVE response following completion of all required SAVE verification steps, the agency must offer you the opportunity to appeal the decision in accordance with the agency’s procedures. If the agency has completed all SAVE verification and you do not believe the response is correct, you may make an InfoPass appointment for an in-person interview at a local USCIS office. Detailed information on how to make corrections, make an appointment, or submit a written request can be found at the SAVE Web site at www.uscis.gov/save, then by choosing “How to Correct Your Records” from the menu on the right.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection [CBP Dec. No. 12–06]

Automated Commercial Environment Required for the Transmission of Advance Ocean and Rail Cargo Information

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Various U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations require the transmission of advance cargo information to CBP through a CBP-approved electronic data interchange (EDI) system. CBP recently completed the testing of the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) for the transmission of advance ocean and rail cargo information. This notice announces that, after a six month transition period, ACE will be the only CBP-approved EDI for submitting required advance information for ocean and rail cargo.

DATES: On September 29, 2012, ACE will be the only CBP-approved EDI for transmitting to CBP required advance information for ocean and rail cargo.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Maskell, Office of International Trade, Susan.Maskell@dhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 343(a) of the Trade Act of 2002, as amended by the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 2071 note) (referred to in this notice as the Trade Act), directed U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to promulgate regulations providing for the mandatory transmission of electronic cargo information by way of a CBP-approved electronic data interchange (EDI) system before the cargo is brought into or departs the United States by any mode of commercial transportation (ocean, air, rail or truck). The required cargo information is that which is reasonably necessary to enable high-risk shipments to be identified for purposes of ensuring cargo safety and security and preventing smuggling pursuant to the laws enforced and administered by CBP. To effectuate the provisions of the Trade Act, CBP published a final rule in the Federal Register in 2003, requiring the advance electronic transmission of information pertaining to cargo prior to its being brought into, or sent from, the United States by sea, air, rail or truck. See Required Advance Electronic
Presentation of Cargo Information, 68 FR 68140, December 5, 2003.¹

Section 203 of the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2002, Public Law 109–347, 120 Stat. 1884 (SAFE Port Act) directed the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commissioner of CBP, to promulgate regulations to require the electronic transmission to the Department of Homeland Security of additional data elements for improved high-risk targeting, including appropriate security elements of entry data, as determined by the Secretary. This additional data was to be provided as advanced information with respect to cargo destined for importation into the United States prior to loading of such cargo on vessels at foreign seaports. In 2008, pursuant to the Trade Act and the SAFE Port Act, CBP published an interim final rule in the Federal Register requiring importers and carriers to submit additional information pertaining to maritime cargo before the cargo is brought into the United States by means of a CBP-approved electronic interchange system. See Importer Security Filing and Additional Carrier Requirements, 73 FR 71730, November 25, 2008. The interim final rule is known to the trade as the “Importer Security Filing” (ISF) or “10 + 2” rule.

Advance Ocean and Rail Cargo Data

The CBP regulations pertaining to the submission of the data required in advance of arrival for ocean and rail cargo are set forth in title 19 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 4, 123, and 149.² Sections 4.7(b)(2), 4.7(b)(3)(i), 123.91(a), and 149.2 pertain to the method of transmission of the advance ocean and rail data relevant to this notice. They generally require the transmission of the advance data through the EDI system approved by CBP.

Section 4.7(b)(2), pertaining to vessels, provides that the electronic cargo declaration information must be transmitted through the CBP Automated Manifest System (AMS) or any electronic data interchange system approved by CBP to replace the AMS system for this purpose. Section 4.7(b)(3)(i), also pertaining to vessels, provides that a non-vessel operating common carrier (NVOCC) must electronically transmit the corresponding required cargo declaration information directly to CBP through the vessel AMS system (or other system approved by CBP for this purpose), or in the alternative, fully disclose and present the required cargo declaration information for the related cargo to the vessel carrier which is required to present this information to CBP via the vessel AMS system (or other CBP approved system).

Section 123.91(a) requires rail carriers to use a CBP-approved electronic data interchange system to submit the required advance information. Section 149.2, pertaining to maritime cargo, requires the Importer Security Filing data elements to be submitted through a CBP-approved electronic interchange system.

M1 Test for Ocean and Rail Data Transmission

CBP recently conducted a National Customs Automation Program (NCAP) test, known as M1, concerning the transmission of required advance ocean and rail data through ACE. The test was announced in two Federal Register notices (M1 notices). See 75 FR 64737, October 20, 2010 and 76 FR 42721, July 19, 2011.

CBP sought participants that were transmitting the required advance ocean and rail data to CBP in different formats to facilitate their transition to ACE in a controlled environment.³ M1 test participants were chosen based on the specific type of software format they used to transmit the required advance data. The goal of the M1 test was to ensure that each transmission format was fully compatible with ACE. By working with this select group of participants, CBP was able to verify that each transmission format functioned properly with ACE and to develop effective processes and guidelines. These processes and guidelines will enable the rest of the affected trade community to quickly and efficiently transition to ACE. The M1 participants began submitting live data through ACE on November 30, 2011.

CBP stated in the M1 notices that upon the successful completion of the M1 test, CBP would publish another notice to announce that after a transition period, ACE would be the only CBP-approved EDI for transmitting required advance data for ocean and rail cargo.

M1 Test Results

The M1 test has been successfully completed. To date, 24 trade participants have completed the certification testing described in the M1 test notice and are transmitting their advance ocean and rail cargo information in ACE. Another 11 trade participants are currently involved in certification testing. The port of Baltimore, Maryland began utilizing ACE for processing ocean cargo on November 30, 2011. The ports of Buffalo, New York and Brownsville, Texas began using ACE for processing ocean and rail cargo on December 5, 2011. To date, 91 ports are using ACE for ocean and/or rail processing.

CBP verified that all electronic data interchanges are compatible with ACE and has prepared ACE Implementation Guidelines, which are posted at www.cbp.gov. The ACE Implementation Guidelines include the appropriate standards needed for each referenced type of software to work with ACE. These standards will enable transmitters to conform their own software to ACE or to acquire new software that is compatible with ACE. In addition to the ACE Implementation Guidelines, CBP has posted informational notices, user guides, and Web-based training at www.cbp.gov.

ACE as the Only CBP-Approved EDI for Required Advance Ocean and Rail Cargo Information

For purposes of sections 4.7(b)(2), 4.7(b)(3)(i), 123.91(a), and 149.2 of title 19 CFR, beginning on September 29, 2012, ACE will be the only CBP-approved EDI for transmitting the required advance information for ocean and rail cargo. Until this date, a transition period is in effect during which ACE or AMS may be used to transmit the required advance information for ocean and rail cargo. During this transition period, ACE will continue to work with the affected trade community to ensure a complete and efficient transition to ACE. CBP encourages all transmitters to undergo the ACE certification process described in the M1 notices during the transition period to ensure total ACE

¹The Trade Act, enacted on August 6, 2002, was amended by the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, enacted on November 25, 2002. On October 31, 2002, CBP published a final rule to require the advance and accurate presentation of certain manifest information before cargo is laden aboard a vessel at a foreign port. This rule was promulgated under the authority of 19 U.S.C. 1431. CBP encouraged the presentation of this information electronically. See 67 FR 66318. This final rule is known to the trade as the “24 hour rule.”

²For specific information about the requirements to provide advance cargo information to CBP, please see the following sections of title 19 CFR: 4.7 Inward foreign manifest; production on demand, contents and form, advance filing of cargo declaration; 4.7a Inward manifest, information required, alternative forms; 4.7c Vessel stow plan; 4.7d Container status messages; 123.91 Electronic information for rail cargo required in advance of arrival; and Part 149 Importer Security Filing.

³For more information on the types of compatible software utilized to transmit the required advance data, please see the Implementation of the Test section of the October 20, 2010 M1 notice (75 FR 64737 at 64738).
functionality.\textsuperscript{4} Total ACE functionality means that the transmitter will retain all of the existing functionality currently available as well as the new functionalities only available through ACE.\textsuperscript{5} Transmitters should contact the Client Representative Branch at 571–468–5500 to make arrangements to begin the ACE certification process. Although AMS will continue to operate during the transition period and may still be used in the normal course of business for other purposes, it will no longer be available for purposes related to transmitting to CBP required advance ocean and rail cargo information beginning on September 29, 2012.

Dated: March 26, 2012.

Thomas Winkowski,
Acting Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012–7558 Filed 3–28–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Geological Survey

Announcement of National Geospatial Advisory Committee Meeting


ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) will meet on April 17–18, 2012 at the American Institute of Architects Building, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20006. The meeting will be held in the Gallery Room. The NGAC, which is composed of representatives from governmental, private sector, non-profit, and academic organizations, was established to advise the Federal Geographic Data Committee on management of Federal geospatial programs, the development of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure, and the implementation of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–16. Topics to be addressed at the meeting include:

—FGDC Guidance to the NGAC
—FGDC Update
—Innovative Strategies
—National Enhanced Elevation Assessment
—LandSat
—Subcommittee Reports

The meeting will include an opportunity for public comment on April 17. Comments may also be submitted to the NGAC in writing. Members of the public who wish to attend the meeting must register in advance. Please register by contacting Arista Maher at the U.S. Geological Survey (703–648–6283, amaher@usgs.gov). Registrations are due by April 13, 2012. While the meeting will be open to the public, seating may be limited due to room capacity.

DATES: The meeting will be held from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on April 17 and from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. on April 18.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Meetings of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee are open to the public. Additional information about the NGAC and the meeting is available at www.fgdc.gov/ngac.


Ivan DeLoatch,
Executive Director, Federal Geographic Data Committee.

[FR Doc. 2012–7479 Filed 3–28–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4311–AM–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[DN 2888]

Certain Semiconductor Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled Certain Semiconductor Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same, DN 2888; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant’s filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).


General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at http://edis.usitc.gov. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Microchip Technology Incorporated on March 23, 2012. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain semiconductor integrated circuit devices and products containing same. The complaint names as respondents Intersil Corporation of CA; Zilker Labs, Inc. of TX; and Techwell, Inc. of CA.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) Identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) Identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant,