DATES: Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before May 6, 2013. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the FCC contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Submit your PRA comments to Nicholas A. Fraser, Office of Management and Budget, via fax at 202–395–5167 or via Internet at Nicholas.A.Fraser@omb.eop.gov and to Judith B. Herman, Federal Communications Commission, via the Internet at Judith-b.herman@fcc.gov. To submit your PRA comments by email send them to: PRA@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judith B. Herman, Office of Managing Director. (202) 418–0214.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0265. Title: Section 80.868, Card of Instructions. Form Number: N/A. Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, not-for-profit institutions and state, local or tribal government. Number of Respondents: 4,506 respondents; 4,506 responses. Estimated Time per Response: 0.1 minutes.

Frequency of Response: Recordkeeping requirement.

Obligation To Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. sections 154(I), 161, 303(g), 303(r), and 332(c)(7). Total Annual Burden: 451 hours. Total Annual Cost: N/A. Privacy Impact Assessment: N/A. Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality. Needs and Uses: The Commission is submitting this expiring information collection to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval of an extension request (no change in the recordkeeping requirement). There is no change in the Commission’s previous burden estimates.

Section 90.505 requires applicants proposing developmental operations to submit supplemental information showing why the authorization is necessary and what its use will be. This requirement will be used by Commission staff in evaluating the applicant’s need for such frequencies and the interference potential to other stations operating on the proposed frequencies.


Federal Maritime Commission.

Washington, DC 20573, within ten days of the date this notice appears in the
Federal Register. A Copy of the agreement is available through the Commission’s Web site (www.fmc.gov) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202)-523–5793 or tradeanalysis@fmc.gov.

Agreement No.: 012195. Title: CSCL/UASC Slot Exchange Agreement.

PARTIES: China Shipping Container Lines Co., Ltd. and China Shipping Container Lines (Hong Kong) Co., Ltd. (acting as a single party) and United Arab Shipping Company (S.A.G.).

Filing Party: Wayne Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O’Connor; 1627 I Street, NW. Suite 1100; Washington, DC 20006.

Synopsis: The agreement authorizes the parties to charter space to each other in the trade between U.S. East Coast ports and Mediterranean ports, and between ports in Asia and Europe.

Dated: March 1, 2013.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Rachel E. Dickon, Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–05259 Filed 3–5–13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 13–03]

Seagull Maritime Agencies Private Ltd. v. Gren Automotive, Inc., Centrus Automotive Distributors Inc., and Liu Shao, Individually; Notice of Filing of Complaint and Assignment

Notice is given that a complaint has been filed with the Federal Maritime Commission (Commission) by Seagull Maritime Agencies Private Limited (“SMA”), hereinafter “Complainant,” against Gren Automotive, Inc. (“Gren”), Centrus Automotive Distributors Inc. (“Centrus”) and Mr. Liu Shao hereinafter “Respondents.” Complainant states that it is an FMC licensed non-vessel operating common-carrier (“NVOCC”) located in New Jersey. Complainant alleges that Respondent Gren is a New Jersey corporation and Respondent Centrus is or was a Florida corporation.

Complainant alleges that Respondents, by failing to pay Complainant $63,010.68 owed for “transportation, customs duties, and other services,” violated 46 U.S.C. 41102(a) which provides that “[a] person may not knowingly and willfully, directly or indirectly, by means of false billing, false