

voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Getronics Wang Co., LLC v. Elaine Chao, U.S. Secretary of Labor*, No. 03-00529.

The Department's initial determination regarding Getronics Wang Co. LLC (hereafter "Getronics") was issued on April 23, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on May 7, 2003 (68 FR 24503). The negative determination was based on the finding that the workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. Workers performed data processing and related services for an unaffiliated company.

By letter dated June 2, 2003, the petitioner requested administrative reconsideration. The Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration was signed on June 13, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 2003 (68 FR 40300). The determination was based on the findings that the workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act and that the workers were not service providers in direct support of a Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) certified firm.

The remand investigation revealed that Getronics has a contract to provide on site services with a TAA certified company, LTV Steel Company, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio (TA-W-40,786; certified March 21, 2002).

### Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on the current remand, I conclude that the subject worker group provided services, the worker group is co-located with a trade-certified firm, and there is a contract between the subject firm and the trade-certified firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Trade Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Getronics Wang Co., LLC, Valley View, Ohio, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after March 3, 2002, through two years from the issuance of this revised determination, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC this 2nd day of April, 2004.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E4-857 Filed 4-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment And Training Administration

[TA-W-53,648]

#### International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of February 6, 2004, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma was signed on December 2, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on January 16, 2004 (69 FR 2622).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

- (1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;
- (2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or
- (3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma, engaged in accounting services. The petition was denied because the workers' firm does not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. Indeed, IBM does not produce an article at the Tulsa facility.

The petitioner refers to the British Petroleum Accounting Center operated by IBM which was certified eligible for TAA in 1999. The petitioner further states that layoffs at the subject firm can be attributed to the decision of British Petroleum to shift its oil production abroad, consequently, the petitioning workers should be eligible for trade adjustment assistance.

A company official was contacted in regard to these allegations. The official stated that there is no affiliation between the subject facility and British Petroleum. It was also revealed that International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma provides accounting services to British Petroleum at many locations in the United States

and abroad out of its own facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The fact that service workers have customers or clients that may be eligible for trade adjustment assistance does not automatically make the service workers eligible for TAA. Before service workers can be considered eligible for TAA, they must be in direct support of an affiliated facility currently certified for TAA or employed on a contractual basis at a location currently certified for TAA. This is not the case for the workers at International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The petitioner further alleges that "the center in Tulsa, OK has previously been covered under the TRA program," thus petitioning workers of the subject firm should also be eligible for TAA.

The same workers have been providing the same accounting services at the same Tulsa location for a number of years. However, the identity of their employer has changed twice over the pertinent period. Thus, the Department's records indicate workers, including accountants then working at the Tulsa facility, at AMOCO Exploration and Production, and AMOCO Shared Services, operating in the state of Oklahoma, were certified eligible to apply for adjustment assistance on February 19, 1999 (TA-W-36,309N). That certification was amended on March 14, 1999, to reflect new ownership and a name change to BP/AMOCO, AMOCO Exploration and Production, AMOCO Shared Services, A/K/A AMOCO Production Company, Inc., operating in the state of Oklahoma. Workers certified in that instance were determined to be "engaged in activities related to exploration and production of crude oil and natural gas." That certification expired February 19, 2001. Thus, there is no current certification of eligibility for workers at the Tulsa facility. The previous certification has no bearing on the determination of eligibility at this time.

Department records show no previous certifications for the Tulsa facility on the part of the current owner of the Tulsa facility, International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The petitioner finally states that International Business Machines Corporation, Tulsa, Oklahoma has moved a significant number of jobs to India.

Accounting services do not constitute production according to the eligibility requirements for trade adjustment assistance. Thus, the alleged shift of jobs to India is irrelevant to this investigation.

Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA. The worker separations must be caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article and who are currently under certification for TAA. Unlike the workers at the Tulsa, Oklahoma location employed under the AMOCO corporate umbrella, workers at International Business Machines, Tulsa, Oklahoma do not perform services for a parent or controlling firm or subdivision currently under certification for TAA.

### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 31st day of March, 2004.

**Richard Church,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E4-862 Filed 4-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,050]

#### Merrill Corporation, St. Paul, MN; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration on Remand

The United States Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the Secretary of Labor's motion for a voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Merrill Corporation v. Elaine Chao, U.S. Secretary of Labor*, Court No. 03-00662.

The Department's initial negative determination for the workers of Merrill Corporation (hereafter "Merrill") was issued on July 22, 2003. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on July 10, 2003 (68 FR 43373). The determination was based on the finding that workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. The Department determined that the subject worker group was not engaged in the production of an article, but rather engaged in activities related to document management services.

On September 9, 2003, the petitioner applied to the U.S. Court of International Trade for administrative

reconsideration, asserting that the subject firm produces an article (documents) and that the workers are engaged in this production.

The petitioner asserted that "[t]ypesetting is an industry that uses raw material (text data) to produce a finished product of economic value"; that workers received text files containing raw data which were sent electronically or in printed form (which had to be converted to an electronic format) and "typeset the information into an electronic format"; and that the file was sent to be printed and/or filed electronically with the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC).

On remand, the Department conducted an investigation to determine whether the company produces an article. In the investigation, the Department reviewed previously-submitted information and requested additional information from the petitioner and the company regarding the functions of the subject worker group and the operations of the company.

The remand investigation revealed that the subject company does not produce an "article" within the meaning of the Trade Act of 1974. The nature of the company is service-oriented.

Merrill describes itself as a "communication and document services company providing printing, photocopying and document management services to the financial, legal, and corporate markets. Merrill's services integrate traditional composition, imaging and printing services with online document management and distribution technology for the preparation and distribution of \* \* \* materials." (Administrative Record, page 12)

A company official reiterated that "Merrill helps clients to prepare required disclosure documents required by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)." (Supplemental Administrative Record, page 10)

Merrill helps its clients prepare and electronically file disclosure documents required by the SEC, such as prospectuses, annual reports and proxy statements. While the documents are valuable as financial records and references, they have no intrinsic value beyond the value of the materials upon which they are recorded (the paper, CD-Rom, floppy disk, etc.) and merely state the economic conditions or status of a company.

The petitioner's submission states that clients submit text files either electronically or in printed form to Merrill's customer service, and that Merrill would either send the electronic

files to the typesetters or convert the printed files into electronic files before sending them to the typesetters. If typesetters receive an unconverted file, they would use proprietary computer applications to convert the file to a form compatible to the program used to manipulate the information into the appropriate format to meet clients' needs and the SEC's filing specifications.

The company's submission is similar to the petitioner's, but supports the position that no article is produced.

According to the company, clients send their documents to Customer Service Group offices which are located throughout the United States and the United Kingdom. The documents are either in electronic or paper form. The Customer Service Group offices then send the documents to the Typesetting Center in St. Paul, Minnesota. The documents may be sent electronically or in print form (and later converted into an electronic format). At the Typesetting Center, typesetters use proprietary software to type, edit and format documents to satisfy client needs and meet the SEC's specifications. Proofreaders audit the documents for accuracy before the documents are filed electronically with the SEC. If a client requests a printed copy of the document, a Customer Services Group office will arrange for the printing.

Throughout the Trade Act, an article is often referenced as something that has a value that makes it marketable, fungible and interchangeable for commercial purposes. The SEC filings are public records and the documents are not sold or marketed individually or as a component to an article.

Because the documents have no commercial value and the company is a service provider, the workers do not produce an article.

### Conclusion

After reconsideration on remand, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Merrill Corporation, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Signed in Washington, DC this 2nd day of April, 2004.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E4-866 Filed 4-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-13-P