

are adequately presented in the parties' existing filings.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue a cease and desist order that could result in the respondent being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation. The Commission is particularly interested in briefing on the following issues:

1. HTC's statement on the public interest contends that the Qualcomm Magellan and Odyssey transceiver chips have become a *de facto* standard in the mobile devices industry. What evidence exists to support or refute HTC's contention? If HTC is correct, please discuss any evidence regarding whether the exclusion of HTC devices containing the Qualcomm Magellan and Odyssey chips raise any concerns similar to those raised by some commentators regarding patent hold-up in the FRAND-encumbered standards-essential patent context?

2. Several entities submitted statements on the public interest asserting that the Commission should consider in its public interest analysis the fact that HTC's accused products are

complex devices comprising numerous components, whereas Nokia's infringement allegations are directed to a single component of the accused devices. How (if at all) should the Commission consider such a factor in determining whether to issue such a remedy or in fashioning an appropriate remedy in this investigation?

3. How (if at all) should Nokia's covenant not to sue Qualcomm over the asserted patents affect the Commission's consideration of the public interest in determining whether to issue a remedy against HTC based on the functionality of Qualcomm components or in fashioning an appropriate remedy in this investigation?

4. Several entities submitted statements on the public interest asserting that there should be a transition period for any remedy issued against HTC. Please explain and provide evidence regarding whether such a transition period is warranted in this investigation. Additionally, please explain and provide evidence regarding the appropriate duration for any such transition period.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. The entirety of the parties' written submissions must not exceed 75 pages, and must be filed no later than close of business on December 23, 2013. Reply submissions must not exceed 50 pages, and must be filed no later than the close of business on January 6, 2014. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the investigation number ("Inv. No. 337-TA-847") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed simultaneously with the any confidential filing. All non-confidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

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 210.42-46 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42-46).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 9, 2013.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013-29738 Filed 12-12-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Commencement of Claims Program

AGENCY: Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: This notice announces the commencement by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission ("Commission") of a program for adjudication of certain categories of

claims of United States nationals against the Government of Libya, as defined below, which were settled under the "Claims Settlement Agreement Between the United States of America and the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" ("Claims Settlement Agreement") effective August 14, 2008.

DATES: These claims can now be filed with the Commission and the deadline for filing will be June 13, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian M. Simkin, Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, 600 E Street NW., Room 6002, Washington, DC 20579, Tel. (202) 616-6975, FAX (202) 616-6993.

Notice of Commencement of Claims Adjudication Program

Pursuant to the authority conferred upon the Secretary of State and the Commission under subsection 4(a)(1)(C) of Title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (Pub. L. 455, 81st Cong., approved March 10, 1950, as amended by Pub. L. 105-277, approved October 21, 1998 (22 U.S.C.

1623(a)(1)(C))), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission hereby gives notice of the commencement of a program for adjudication of certain categories of claims of United States nationals against the Government of Libya. These claims, which have been referred to the Commission by the Department of State by letter dated November 27, 2013, are defined as follows:

Category A: This category shall consist of claims of U.S. nationals for physical injury who had claims in the Pending Litigation, but whose claims for physical injury were previously denied by the Commission for failure to plead for injury other than emotional injury alone in the Pending Litigation, provided that (1) the claim meets the standard for physical injury adopted by the Commission; (2) the claimant was a named party in the Pending Litigation; (3) the Pending Litigation against Libya has been dismissed before the claim is submitted to the Commission; and (4) the claimant has not received any compensation under any other distribution under the Claims Settlement Agreement and does not qualify for any other category of compensation in this referral except Category D.

Category B: This category shall consist of claims of U.S. nationals for mental pain and anguish who are living close relatives of a decedent provided that (1) the claim was set forth as a claim for emotional distress, solatium, or similar emotional injury by the claimant in the Pending Litigation; (2) the claim meets the standard adopted by the Commission for mental pain and anguish; (3) the claimant is not eligible for compensation as part of the associated wrongful death claim; and (4) the claimant has not received any compensation under any other

distribution under the Claims Settlement Agreement, and does not qualify for any other category of compensation in this referral.

Category C: This category shall consist of claims of U.S. nationals who were held hostage or unlawfully detained in violation of international law during one of the terrorist incidents listed in Attachment 2 ("Covered Incidents"), provided that (1) the claimant was not a plaintiff in the Pending Litigation; (2) the claim meets the standard for such claims adopted by the Commission; and (3) the claimant has not received any compensation under any other distribution under the Claims Settlement Agreement, and does not qualify for any other category of compensation in this referral.

Category D: This category shall consist of claims of U.S. nationals for compensation for physical injury in addition to amounts already recovered under the Commission process initiated by the Department of State's January 15, 2009 referral or by this referral, provided that (1) the claimant has received an award for physical injury pursuant to the Department of State's January 15, 2009 referral or this referral; (2) the Commission determines that the severity of the injury is a special circumstance warranting additional compensation, or that additional compensation is warranted because the injury resulted in the victim's death; and (3) the claimant did not make a claim or receive any compensation under Category D of the Department of State's January 15, 2009 referral.

Category E: This category shall consist of claims of U.S. nationals for mental pain and anguish who are living close relatives of a decedent whose death formed the basis of a death claim compensated under the Claims Settlement Agreement, provided that (1) the claimant was not a plaintiff in the Pending Litigation; (2) the claimant is not eligible for compensation from the associated wrongful death claim, and the claimant did not receive any compensation from the wrongful death claim; (3) the claim meets the standard adopted by the Commission for mental pain and anguish; and (4) the claimant has not received any compensation under any other distribution under the Claims Settlement Agreement, and does not qualify for any other category of compensation in this referral.

Category F: This category shall consist of commercial claims of U.S. nationals provided that (1) the claim was set forth by a claimant named in *Abbott et al. v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 1:94-cv-02444-SS; and (2) the Commission determines that the claim would be compensable under the applicable legal principles.

The "Pending Litigation" referenced above is composed of the following cases:

Baker v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 03-cv-749;

Pflug v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 08-cv-505.

Certain Underwriters at Lloyds London v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-731.

Clay v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-707.

Collett v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 01-cv-2103.

Cummock v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2134.

Estate of John Buonocore III v. Great Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-727;

Simpson v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 08-cv-529.

Fisher v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 04-cv-2055.

Franqui v. Syrian Arab Republic, et al. (D.D.C.) 06-cv-734.

Hagerman v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2147.

Harris v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-732.

Hartford Fire Insurance Company v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 98-cv-3096.

Kilburn v. Islamic Republic of Iran, et al. (D.D.C.) 01-cv-1301.

Knowland v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 08-cv-1309.

La Reunion Aerienne v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 05-cv-1932.

McDonald v. Socialist People's Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-729.

MacQuarrie v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 04-cv-176.

Patel v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 06-cv-626.

Pugh v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2026.

Simpson v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C.) 00-cv-1722.

Beecham, et al. v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, et al. (D.D.C.) 01-cv-2243.

The "Covered Incidents" referenced above for purposes of Category C are composed of the following:

May 30, 1972 attack at Lod Airport in Israel, as alleged in *Franqui v. Syrian Arab Republic, et al.* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-734.

December 17, 1983 vehicle bomb explosion near Harrods Department Store in Knightsbridge, London, England, as alleged in *McDonald v. Socialist People's Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-729.

November 30, 1984 (approximate) kidnapping and subsequent death of Peter C. Kilburn, as alleged in *Kilburn v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 01-cv-1301.

March 25, 1985 (approximate) kidnapping and subsequent death of Alec L. Collett, as alleged in *Collett v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 01-cv-2103.

November 23, 1985 hijacking of Egypt Air flight 648, as alleged in *Certain Underwriters at Lloyds London v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-731 and *Baker v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 03-cv-749/Pflug v. *Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 08-cv-505.

December 27, 1985 attack at the Leonardo da Vinci Airport in Rome, Italy, as alleged in *Estate of John Buonocore III v. Great Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-727/*Simpson v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 08-cv-529.

December 27, 1985 attack at the Schwechat Airport in Vienna, Austria, as alleged in *Knowland v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 08-cv-1309.

April 5, 1986 bombing of the La Belle Discotheque in Berlin, Germany, as alleged in *Clay v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-707 and *Harris v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-732.

September 5, 1986 hijacking of Pan Am flight 73, as alleged in *Patel v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 06-cv-626.

Detention beginning February 10, 1987 of the passengers and crew of the private yacht "Carin 11," as alleged in *Simpson v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 00-cv-1722.

December 21, 1988 bombing of Pan Am flight 103, as alleged in *Cummock v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2134, *Fisher v. Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 04-cv-2055, *Hagerman v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2147, *Hartford Fire Insurance Company v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 98-cv-3096, and *MacQuarrie v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 04-cv-176.

September 19, 1989 bombing of UTA flight 772, as alleged in *La Reunion Aeriennne v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 05-cv-1932 and *Pugh v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* (D.D.C.) 02-cv-2026.

In conformity with the terms of the referral, the Commission will determine the claims in accordance with the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 1621 *et seq.*, which comprises Title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission will then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury those claims that it finds to be valid, for payment out of the claims fund established under the Claims Settlement Agreement.

The Commission will administer this claims adjudication program in accordance with its regulations, which are published in Chapter V of Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR part 500 *et seq.*). In particular, attention is directed to subsection 500.3(a) of these regulations which, based on 22 U.S.C. 1623(f), limits the amount of attorney's fees that may be charged for legal representation before the Commission. These regulations are also available over the Internet at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html>.

Approval has been obtained from the Office of Management and Budget for the collection of this information. Approval No. 1105-0100, expiration date 11/30/2016.

Brian M. Simkin,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2013-29710 Filed 12-12-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Loans to Plan Participants and Beneficiaries Who Are Parties in Interest With Respect to the Plan Regulation

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, "Loans to Plan Participants and Beneficiaries Who Are Parties In Interest With Respect to the Plan Regulation," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for continued use, without change, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

DATES: Submit comments on or before January 13, 2014.

ADDRESSES: A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained free of charge from the RegInfo.gov Web site at http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref_nbr=201311-1210-001 (this link will only become active on the day following publication of this notice) or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or sending an email to DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Submit comments about this request by mail or courier to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL-EBSA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503; by Fax: 202-395-6881 (this is not a toll-free number); or by email: OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov. Commenters are encouraged, but not required, to send a courtesy copy of any comments by mail or courier to the U.S. Department of Labor-OASAM, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attn: Departmental Information Compliance Management Program, Room N1301, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; or by email: DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or by email at DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The ICR seeks to maintain PRA authority to conduct information collections contained in the regulation related to plan participants and beneficiaries who are parties in interest with respect to the plan, 29 CFR 2550.408b-1. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) prohibits a plan fiduciary from causing the plan to engage in a transaction, if the fiduciary knows or should know the transaction constitutes a direct or indirect loan or extension of credit between the plan and a party in interest. ERISA section 408(b)(1) exempts from this prohibition a loan from a plan to a party in interest who is also a plan participant or beneficiary, provided satisfaction of certain requirements. DOL regulations implementing the statutory provision provide additional guidance. Specifically, regulations 29 CFR 2550.408b-1(d) prescribes eight specific provisions that must be included in the plan documents, including: (1) An explicit authorization for the plan fiduciary responsible for investing plan assets to establish such a loan program, (2) the identity of the person or position authorized to administer the program, (3) a procedure for applying for loans, (4) the basis on which loans will be approved or denied, (5) limitations, if any, on the types and amounts of loans offered, (6) the procedure for determining a reasonable interest rate, (7) types of collateral that may secure a participant loan, and (8) the events constituting default and the steps that will be taken to preserve plan assets in the event of such default.

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. The DOL obtains OMB approval for this information collection under Control Number 1210-0076.

OMB authorization for an ICR cannot be for more than three (3) years without renewal, and the current approval for this collection is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2013. The DOL seeks to extend PRA authorization for this information collection for three (3) more years, without any change to existing requirements. The DOL notes that