receive an email confirmation of this information.

You may submit written comments to: REE Advisory Board Office, Jamie L. Whitten Building, Room 332A, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250, or via email at ahwrpanel@usda.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michele Esch, Executive Director, REE Advisory Board Office, US Department of Agriculture; telephone: (202) 720–3684; fax: (202) 720–6199; or email: ahwrpanel@usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Wednesday, March 18, 2015, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time a virtual meeting will be conducted for any interested stakeholders and/or interested parties, to hear the summary of findings and recommendations on the review of the animal handling, care, and welfare at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center. The Review Panel plans to hear stakeholder input received from this meeting as well as other written comments. The report will be available at www.ree.usda.gov on March 9, 2015.

This meeting is open to the public and any interested individuals wishing to attend.

Opportunity for verbal public comment will be offered on the day of the meeting. Written comments by attendees or other interested stakeholders will be welcomed for the public record before and up to the day of the meeting (by close of business Wednesday, March 18, 2015). All statements will become a part of the official record of the REE Mission Area and will be kept on file for public review in the REE Advisory Board Office.

Done at Washington, DC this 10th day of March 2015.

Catherine E. Wołek, Under Secretary, REE, Chief Scientist, USDA.

[FR Doc. 2015–05730 Filed 3–12–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–03–P
interoporability among databases and systems used to identify owners of rights and terms of use, and a possible portal for linking to such databases and to licensing platforms (similar in its goals to what has been established in the United Kingdom).

**DATES:** The public meeting will be held on April 1, 2015, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time. Registration will begin at 8:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The public meeting will be held at the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the Singapore and Venice Rooms of the Global Intellectual Property Academy on the second floor of the Madison Building, which is located at 600 Dulary Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. All major entrances to the building are accessible to people with disabilities.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information regarding the meeting, contact Hollis Robinson or Ann Chaitovitz, Office of Policy and International Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Madison Building, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314; telephone (571) 272–9300; email EfficientOnlineMarketplace@USPTO.gov. Please direct all media inquiries to the Office of the Chief Communications Officer, USPTO, at (571) 272–8400.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

A. **Ongoing Government Initiatives**

The Department of Commerce’s Internet Policy Task Force (Task Force) released Copyright Policy, Creativity, and Innovation in the Digital Economy on July 31, 2013 (Green Paper). The Green Paper was the product of extensive public consultation led by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). It provided a comprehensive review of the current policy landscape related to copyright and the Internet, and identified important issues that called for attention and possible solutions.

In October 2013, the USPTO and NTIA published a request for public comments relating to three areas of work flowing out of the Green Paper, including whether and how the Government can facilitate the further development of a robust online licensing environment. The request for comments noted that building the online marketplace is fundamentally a function of the private sector, and described how that process has been progressing. It also concluded that there remains a need for more comprehensive and reliable ownership data, interoperable standards enabling communication among databases, and more streamlined licensing mechanisms. As described in the Green Paper, while much progress has been made in the licensing of creative content for online uses, the pace of development has varied from sector to sector, and we are still far from a world in which individuals, business entities and other organizations wishing to license rights to use works online can always easily locate the owners of rights in specific works or large repertoires of works and obtain licenses to engage in the desired activities. This is especially true with respect to high-volume, low-value transactions and uses.

The Task Force therefore posited that there could be an appropriate and useful role for Government in facilitating the process, whether by removing obstacles or taking steps to encourage faster and more collaborative action. It posed a number of questions regarding access to and standardization of rights ownership information, facilitating the effectiveness of the online marketplace, and the role of the Government in such matters. The request for comments also raised the possibility of pursuing the concept of a digital copyright hub similar to that being constructed in the United Kingdom.3


The Copyright Office is also engaged in a number of activities to improve its own public databases of rights information as well as connecting them to those maintained by the private sector. In March 2013, the Copyright Office solicited public comments regarding possible improvements to its registration and recordation functions. It focused on making the registration process more user-friendly, making access to public registration records more robust and versatile, ensuring that the information in those records is accurate and up-to-date, using proper data and metadata standards and integrating with third party databases.4 The Technical Upgrades Special Project Team delivered a report to the Register on February 18, 2015, suggesting technical upgrades necessary to enable, among other things, improved searchability, collection of appropriate data including identifiers, integration with third party databases, and the development of a data repository.5

The Copyright Office has also solicited public comments and held public meetings regarding strategies for the electronic recordation of documents relating to transfers of copyright ownership, including the use of standard identifiers and other metadata standards.6 In a December 2014 report, Robert Brauneis, the Kaminstein Scholar in Residence, made a number of recommendations, including accommodating standard identifiers in registration and recordation documents to enable interoperability with other databases and developing an application programming interface (API) allowing third parties to develop software to retrieve data from Copyright Office records.7 In February 2015, the

---

Copyright Office issued a Report on Copyright and the Music Marketplace, which examined the current systems for licensing of musical works and sound recordings in the United States and made a number of recommendations for updating and improving those systems.8

Among these recommendations was one that would involve the use of standard identifiers for music: The creation of a “general” music rights organization (GMRO), a non-profit entity designated and regulated by the government, to supplement the activities of music rights organizations (MROs) with regard to licensing musical works. The proposed GMRO would maintain a publicly accessible database of musical works represented by each MRO and by the publishers who directly license interactive performances/downloads, as well as of sound recording data. The proposed GMRO would use standard identifiers, and would actively gather missing data, correct flawed or conflicting data, handle competing ownership claims and develop additional data to match sound recordings with musical works. It would serve as the default licensing and collection agent for musical works (or shares of works) that licensees were unable to associate with an MRO or a direct licensing publisher. The Copyright Office also raised the possibility that its copyright registration database could be modified to incorporate standard identifiers, and stated the belief that the best strategy to address data issues would be to strongly incentivize the universal adoption and dissemination of several data standards.

The Task Force is interested in examining these recommendations as a potential solution to at least some of the licensing problems that have been identified in the music sector. We will also consider alternative proposals, as well as looking at the use of standard identifiers in other creative sectors and identifier schema to enable interoperability among them.9 Finally, we will look at the desirability and feasibility of U.S. stakeholders establishing or participating in a copyright hub that would include all types of works and facilitate multimedia licensing.

Possible roles for the Government, apart from the Copyright Office’s initiatives described above, include promoting greater use of standard identifiers in all sectors as well as interoperability among standards and databases; encouraging the creation of a standardized framework for APIs that could facilitate automatic access to information; working with other countries to prioritize the use of identifiers or standards; participating in the development of international licensing projects; facilitating the creation of or participation in a “copyright hub;” and convening stakeholders to take forward any related initiatives.

The April 1 public meeting will delve into specific aspects of these issues, building on the earlier questions, the public submissions, and the December 2013 discussion. Ultimately, the information obtained through this public process will be used to inform the Administration’s views and recommendations.

B. Questions for This Public Meeting

We plan to discuss whether the enhanced use and interoperability of standard identifiers across different sectors and geographical borders can help the continued development of online markets, whether the United States should develop or participate in an online licensing platform such as the U.K.’s Copyright Hub, and what the role of the Government should be in furthering any of these efforts.

1. Standard Identifiers

The questions we hope to examine at the meeting include:

- Would greater use of standard identifiers help streamline licensing and facilitate the continued growth of an online marketplace?
- What conditions would likely lead to such greater use in each creative sector? How can the use of identifiers best be encouraged?
- To what extent does every type of work have one or more identifiers, and how and when are they used today?
- Are there ways in which identifiers should be used in order to maximize their usefulness? For example, should they contain or be linked to the relevant licensing information (e.g., ownership information, licensing terms)?
- Would it be advisable to combine separate public or private databases, for either the same or different types of works, into a comprehensive database or repository, or to link them through a hub? If so, how should this be accomplished and by whom?
- Is there a need to make the identifier schema interoperable?
- How can interoperability be ensured across sectors, and across geographical borders?
- Can a standards-based approach facilitate API development to enable seamless data exchange between databases containing unique identifier data? In the field of music, would the creation of a GMRO as proposed by the Copyright Office be sufficient to resolve the issues identified in the Green Paper with respect to access to comprehensive, standardized and interoperable rights ownership information? If not, why not?
- What other options would be possible and desirable, either with or without the need for legislation? Would they require government regulation or oversight?

2. Copyright Hub

In the Green Paper, the Task Force discussed the U.K.'s Copyright Hub, a portal established and operated by industry to make licensing easier, especially for low-value, high-volume requests, by linking to a network of private and public copyright exchanges, rights registries and other copyright-related databases, with the government playing a facilitating and advisory role.10

As it has evolved, the Copyright Hub is run by a non-profit company funded by the creative industries, with its technical development designed by the Connected Digital Economy Catapult, funded by the U.K. Government.11 The public meeting will include representatives from the Copyright Hub, who will describe its status and operations. The discussion will explore whether a similar project would be desirable in the United States, or whether the U.K. Copyright Hub should or could be extended to further incorporate U.S. works and licensing information, and if so, whether and how the Government should be involved.

Public Meeting

On April 1, 2015, the Task Force will hold a public meeting to hear stakeholder views on these topics. We look forward to hearing from all interested stakeholders, including

---


11 More information about the Copyright Hub is available at http://www.copyrighthub.co.uk/about.
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Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (“the Department”) has received information sufficient to warrant initiation of a changed circumstances review (“CCR”) of the antidumping duty order on multilayered wood flooring from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”). Based upon a request filed by Sino-Maple (JiangSu) Co., Ltd. (“Sino-Maple”), an exporter of multilayered wood flooring to the United States, the Department is initiating a CCR to determine whether Sino-Maple is the successor-in-interest to Jiafeng Wood (Suzhou) Co., Ltd. (“Jiafeng”) for purposes of the antidumping duty order on multilayered wood flooring from PRC and, as such, is entitled to Jiafeng’s cash deposit rate with respect to entries of subject merchandise.

DATES: Effective Date: March 13, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Martinelli or Charles Riggle, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2923 or (202) 482–0650, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 23, 2014, Sino-Maple requested that the Department initiate an expedited CCR to confirm that Sino-Maple is the successor-in-interest to Jiafeng for purposes of determining antidumping duty liabilities. On January 16, 2015, Sino-Maple responded to the supplemental questionnaire issued by the Department on January 9, 2015. On February 4, 2015, the Department extended the time period for determining whether to initiate a CCR by 30 days, until March 8, 2015. On February 10, 2015, Sino-Maple responded to the Department’s second supplemental questionnaire, which was issued on February 4, 2015. We received no comments opposing Sino-Maple’s request.

Scope of the Order

Multilayered wood flooring is composed of an assembly of two or more layers or plies of wood veneer(s) with a combination with a core. The several layers, along with the core, are glued or otherwise bonded together to form a final assembled product. Multilayered wood flooring is often referred to by other terms, e.g., “engineered wood flooring” or “plywood flooring.” Regardless of the particular terminology, all products that meet the description set forth herein are intended for inclusion within the definition of subject merchandise.

All multilayered wood flooring is included within the definition of subject merchandise, without regard to: dimension (overall thickness, thickness of face ply, thickness of back ply, thickness of core, and thickness of inner plies; width; and length); wood species used for the face, back and inner veneers; core composition; and face grade. Multilayered wood flooring included within the definition of subject merchandise may be unfinished (i.e., without a finally finished surface to protect the face veneer from wear and tear) or “prefinished” (i.e., a coating applied to the face veneer, including, but not exclusively, oil or oil-modified or water-based polyurethanes, ultraviolet light cured polyurethanes, wax, epoxy-ester finishes, moisture-cured urethanes and acid-curing formaldehyde finishes). The veneers may be also soaked in an acrylic-impregnated finish. All multilayered wood flooring is included within the definition of subject merchandise regardless of whether the face (or back) of the product is smooth, wire brushed, distressed by any method or multiple methods, or hand-scraped. In addition, all multilayered wood flooring included within the definition of subject merchandise regardless of whether or not it is manufactured with any interlocking or


2 See Letter from Sino-Maple to the Department, regarding “Multilayered Wood Flooring from the PRC: Response of Sino-Maple (Jiangsu) Co., Ltd. and Jiafeng Wood (Suzhou) Co., Ltd to Supplemental Changed Circumstances Review Questionnaire” (January 16, 2015).
