

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–506 and 508 and 731–TA–1238–1243 (Review)]

Non-Oriented Electrical Steel from China, Germany, Japan, Korea, Sweden, and Taiwan; Notice of Commission Determinations To Conduct Full Five-Year Reviews

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether revocation of countervailing duty orders on non-oriented electrical steel (“NOES”) from China and Taiwan and the antidumping duty orders on NOES from China, Germany, Japan, Korea, Sweden, and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date.

DATES: February 4, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abu B. Kanu (202–205–2597), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 4, 2020, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (84

FR 58743, November 1, 2019) was adequate. The Commission also found that the respondent interested party group response to its notice of institution concerning the antidumping duty order on imports from Germany was adequate and, therefore, determined to proceed with a full review of that order. The Commission determined that the respondent interested party group responses to its notice of institution concerning the countervailing duty orders on imports from China and Taiwan, and the antidumping duty orders on imports from China, Japan, Korea, Sweden, and Taiwan were inadequate. However, the Commission determined to conduct full reviews of those orders in order to promote administrative efficiency considering its determination to conduct a full review of the antidumping duty order on imports from Germany. A record of the Commissioners’ votes, the Commission’s statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner’s statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission’s website.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission’s rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 7, 2020.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020–02854 Filed 2–12–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–NEW]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection; eComments Requested; New Collection: Criminal Cases in State Courts (CCSC), Previously Posted as Analysis of Publicly Available Court Data (APACD)

AGENCY: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection was previously published, allowing for a 60 day comment period. Seven comments from

the public were received during this period and are thoroughly addressed in the supporting statement for this collection. Three comments requested that information on interpreters be added. The requesters sought data elements reflecting for whom the interpreter was ordered (defendant, witness, victim), whether the interpreter was present for all hearings, and the qualifications of the interpreter. BJS added data elements asking courts to provide whether an interpreter was ordered for the case and for which party(ies) to the case the interpreter was ordered. BJS does not expect these changes to impact the estimated respondent burden.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional 30 day until March 16, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Suzanne M. Strong, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street NW, Washington, DC 20531 (email: Suzanne.M.Strong@usdoj.gov; telephone: 202–616–3666). Written comments and/or suggestions can also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms