the basis for this collection of information. Requirements that fishing gear be marked are essential to facilitate enforcement. The ability to link fishing gear to the vessel owner is crucial to enforcement of regulations issued under the authority of the MSA. The marking of fishing gear is also valuable in actions concerning damage, loss, and civil proceedings. The requirements imposed in the Southeast Region are for coral aquacultured live rock; golden crab traps; mackerel gillnet floats; spiny lobster traps; black sea bass pots; and buoy gear.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Annually.
Respondent’s Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: OIRA Submission@omb.eop.gov.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482–0336, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at jjessup@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to OIRA Submission@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: January 9, 2012.

Gwernar Banks,
Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–43 Filed 1–11–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–33–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube From Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: Effective Date: January 12, 2012.

SUMMARY: On September 7, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from Mexico.1 This administrative review covers two manufacturers/exporters and has a period of review (POR) from August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010. Based on our analysis of the comments received on the preliminary results, we have made changes to the margin calculations for one company (Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S.A. de C.V.) and, as a result, the final results of review differ from the preliminary results for this company. The final dumping margins for all reviewed companies are listed below in the section entitled “Final Results of Review.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Brian Davis (Regiopysa), Dena Crossland (Maquilacero), or Edythe Artman, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department

1 See Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 76 FR 55352 (September 7, 2011) (Preliminary Results).
of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–7024, (202) 482–3362, or (202) 482–3931, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 7, 2011, the Department published the Preliminary Results. This second administrative review of the order covers sales of subject merchandise, as described in the “Scope of the Order” section below, made during the POR from August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010. Although we named four companies in the notice of initiation for this review, we only reviewed the sales of two companies—Maquilacero S.A. de C.V. (Maquilacero) and Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S.A. de C.V. (Regiopytsa)—as we rescinded the review for two other companies. See Preliminary Results, 76 FR at 55353.

We invited parties to comment on the Preliminary Results and received case briefs from the respondent companies. None of the parties requested a hearing on the issues raised in comments.

Period of Review

The POR is August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise that is the subject of this order is certain welded carbon-quality light-walled steel pipe and tube, of rectangular (including square) cross section, having a wall thickness of less than 4 mm. The term carbon-quality steel includes both carbon steel and alloy steel which contains only small amounts of alloying elements. Specifically, the term carbon-quality includes products in which none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity by weight respectively indicated: 1.80 percent of manganese, or 2.25 percent of silicon, or 1.00 percent of copper, or 0.50 percent of aluminum, or 1.25 percent of chromium, or 0.30 percent of cobalt, or 0.40 percent of lead, or 1.25 percent of nickel, or 0.30 percent of tungsten, or 0.10 percent of molybdenum, or 0.10 percent of niobium, or 0.15 percent vanadium, or 0.15 percent of zirconium. The description of carbon-quality is intended to identify carbon-quality products within the scope. The welded carbon-quality rectangular pipe and tube subject to this order is currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings 7306.61.50.00 and 7306.61.70.60. While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this antidumping duty administrative review are addressed in the “Issues and Decision Memorandum” for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico” from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated January 4, 2012 (Issues and Decision Memorandum), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of all issues, which parties have raised and to which we have responded, is in the Issues and Decision Memorandum and is also attached to this notice as an appendix. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). Access to IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit (CRU), room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at http://www.trade.gov/ia/. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made one revision, a correction to the U.S. packing expense used to calculate Regiopytsa’s margin. This change has been detailed in Regiopytsa’s company-specific analysis memorandum, dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via IA ACCESS, as noted above. Specifically, we have revised the programming language in the U.S. Margin Program to convert Regiopytsa’s U.S. packing expenses from Mexican pesos to U.S. dollars for purposes of calculating the foreign unit price in dollars. See Comment 2 of the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Final Results of the Review

We determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from Mexico for the period August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer or Exporter</th>
<th>Percentage margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maquilacero S.A. de C.V. ...............</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S.A. de C.V.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), the Department normally calculates an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise covered by the order. Because both Maquilacero and Regiopytsa reported the entered value for all U.S. sales, we have calculated importer-specific, ad valorem duty assessment rates based on the ratio of each importer’s total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the sales for that importer. In the event an assessment rate is above de minimis (de minimis being less than 0.5 percent in a review), we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise for that importer during the period from August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010.

The Department clarified its “automatic assessment” regulation on May 6, 2003. See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (Assessment Notice). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in these final results of review for which these companies did not know that the merchandise it sold to an intermediary was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate non-reviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see Assessment Notice.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we intend to instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is de minimis. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions directly to CBP 41 days after the publication of these final results of review.

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following cash-deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Madrid Protocol

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the continuation information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before March 12, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:
• Email: InformationCollection@uspto.gov. Include “0651–0051 comment” in the subject line of the message.
• Mail: Susan K. Fawcett, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Requests for additional information should be directed to Sharon Marsh, Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy, Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, VA 22313–1451, by telephone at (571) 272–8900, or by email to Sharon.Marsh@uspto.gov. Additional information about this collection is also available at http://www.reginfo.gov under “Information Collection Review.”

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
I. Abstract

This collection of information is required by the Trademark Act of 1946, 15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq., which provides for the Federal registration of trademarks, service marks, collective trademarks and service marks, collective membership marks, and certification marks. Individuals and businesses that use or intend to use such marks in commerce may file an application to register the marks with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

The Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks (“Madrid Protocol”) is an international treaty that allows a trademark owner to seek registration in any of the participating countries by filing a single international application. The International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in Geneva, Switzerland, administers the international registration system. The Madrid Protocol Implementation Act of 2002 amended the Trademark Act to provide that: (1) The owner of a U.S. application or registration may seek protection of its mark in any of the participating countries by submitting a single international application to the IB through the USPTO, and (2) the holder of an international registration may request an extension of protection of the international registration to the United States. The Madrid Protocol became effective in the United States on November 2, 2003, and is implemented under 15 U.S.C. § 1141 et seq. and 37 CFR part 2 and part 7.

An international application submitted through the USPTO must be based on an active U.S. application or registration and must be filed by the owner of the application or registration. The USPTO reviews the international application to certify that it corresponds to the data contained in the existing U.S. application or registration before forwarding the international application to the IB. The IB then reviews the international application to determine whether the Madrid filing requirements have been met and the required fees have been paid. If the international application is unacceptable, the IB will send a notice of irregularity to the USPTO and the applicant. The applicant must respond to the irregularities to avoid abandonment, unless a response from the USPTO is required. After any irregularities are corrected and the application is accepted, the IB registers the mark, publishes the registration in the WIPO Gazette of International Marks, and sends a certificate to the holder.

When the mark is registered, the IB notifies each country designated in the application of the request for extension of protection. Each designated country then examines the request under its own laws. Once an international registration has been issued, the holder may also file subsequent designations to request an extension of protection to additional countries.

Under Section 71 of the Trademark Act, a registered extension of protection