

removed, while preserving the ability of Internet intermediaries to continue to provide their vital services.

- What is the impact of third party liability laws on businesses' abilities to operate in global markets? How do businesses approach these differing liability regimes?

- To what extent do various governments' third party liability laws allow for immunity with exceptions for Internet intermediaries? How useful are such laws?

- Are there specific principles or factors that governments should take into account when dealing with content restrictions and the intermediaries who might be in a good position to monitor postings and remove illegal or objectionable content?

- How might governments promote innovation in the provision of new intermediary services (e.g., by granting immunities), while at the same time encouraging responsible conduct by those same intermediaries?

5. Trade Agreements

Trade and investment rules exist in WTO commitments, FTAs, and other international treaties or agreements. The WTO addresses the free flow of information in multiple ways. For example, Members currently abide by a moratorium on customs duties on electronic transmissions. In addition, WTO member governments allow cross-border trade in services through commitments made in the General Agreement on Trade in Services, FTAs, and other international treaties or agreements, which support trade in digital products or ease restrictions on market access for certain information communication technology products and services.

- How might bilateral or multilateral trade or other agreements promote the free flow of information over the Internet?

- How might these agreements promote transparency and the provision of due process in the creation and application of government restrictions to the free flow of information online?

- With respect to cloud or other Web-based services, are there specific trade disciplines that can enhance market access for all providers and increase legal certainty for potential users?

- What other affirmative trade obligations related to the free flow of information over the Internet should be considered?

6. International Cooperation

There are several intergovernmental bodies, including the International Telecommunication Union (ITU),

OECD, Council of Europe, and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, that attempt to guide the growth of the Internet and online commerce through policy negotiations and dialogues. Multi-jurisdictional governmental organizations such as these have the benefit of being inclusive (in that by definition they represent the interests of member governments) and the potential to be authoritative. By their nature however, these organizations move at a deliberate pace, which means that fast-moving Internet issues can be difficult for them to address.

Over the past decade the private sector, civil society, and academia increasingly have engaged in regional and international activities focused on the development of cross-border Internet policy. The IGF, for example, is a multi-stakeholder forum that places private sector, civil society and academic stakeholders on an equal footing with their government counterparts for an open and spirited dialogue on Internet policy. Another case in point is the Global Network Initiative, which is a voluntary multi-stakeholder initiative, composed of several human rights organizations and three major Internet companies who together aim to address restrictions on the free flow of information on the Internet.²¹ Advocates of multi-stakeholder initiatives point out that a less formal structure can be more nimble and thus in a better position to address the fast-changing nature of Internet offerings. Multi-stakeholder initiatives can be formed around discrete issues and can be populated by interested parties on an ad hoc basis. While such organizations cannot establish law or regulation, they can accelerate the articulation of acceptable norms seen as good practices for large segments of the population.

- Are there some multi-jurisdictional, governmental forums or multi-stakeholder, private-sector organizations that are better suited than others to develop proposals or principles to guide governments as they develop policies concerning the free flow of information on the Internet?

- What attributes should multi-stakeholder organizations or initiatives possess in order to maximize their efficacy? What makes them well-suited to develop principles and best practices to guide the private sector? Are there examples of industry best practices or codes of conduct which provide useful guidance on how businesses should

deal with restrictions on the free flow of information?

- What are the pros and cons of turning to multi-stakeholder initiatives to accelerate norm development instead of international governmental bodies?

- Has private-sector support for multi-stakeholder initiatives matured to the point where governments can rely on those initiatives for the long-term?

Commenters should feel free to raise and address other governance questions as they see fit.

Dated: September 23, 2010.

Gary Locke,

Secretary of Commerce.

Lawrence E. Strickling,

Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information.

Francisco J. Sánchez,

Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

Patrick Gallagher,

Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2010-24385 Filed 9-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Title: Initial Patent Applications.

Form Number(s): PTO/SB/01 and 01A, PTO/SB/02A and 02B, 02CN, 02DE, 02ES, 02FR, 02IT, 02JP, 02KR, 02NL, 02RU, 02SE, and 02LR, PTO/SB/03 and 03A, PTO/SB/04 through 07, PTO/SB/13/PCT, PTO/SB/14 and EFS-Web, PTO/SB/16 and EFS-Web, PTO/SB/17 through 19, PTO/SB/29 and 29A, and PTO/SB/101 through 110.

Agency Approval Number: 0651-0032.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 11,553,888 hours annually.

Number of Respondents: 513,221 responses per year, with an estimated 466,385 responses filed electronically.

Avg. Hours Per Response: The USPTO estimates that it takes the public between 24 minutes (0.40 hours) and 33 hours and 12 minutes (33.2 hours) to complete the applications, petitions,

²¹ *Global Network Initiative*, available at <http://www.globalnetworkinitiative.org/> (2010).

and additional papers in this collection, depending on the request. This includes the time to gather the necessary information, prepare the application, petition, or other papers, and submit the completed request to the USPTO. The USPTO calculates that, on balance, it takes the same amount of time to gather the necessary information, prepare the utility, design, or provisional application, and submit it to the USPTO, whether the applicant submits it in paper form or electronically.

Needs and Uses: This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 131 and 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.84. Each patent applicant must provide sufficient information to allow the USPTO to properly examine the application, petition, or paper to determine whether the application, petition, or paper meets the criteria set forth in the patent statutes and regulations. The various fee and application transmittal forms, the declarations, the cover sheets, the petitions, and the papers filed under 37 CFR 1.41, 1.48, and 1.53(c)(2) permit applicants to supply all of the information necessary to process the application and enables the USPTO to ensure that all of the information has been provided in order to process the application.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for profits and non-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: Nicholas A. Fraser, e-mail:

Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov.

Once submitted, the request will be publicly available in electronic format through the Information Collection Review page at <http://www.reginfo.gov>.

Paper copies can be obtained by:

• **E-mail:**

InformationCollection@uspto.gov. Include "0651-0032 copy request" in the subject line of the message.

• **Fax:** 571-273-0112, marked to the attention of Susan K. Fawcett.

• **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.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before October 29, 2010 to Nicholas A. Fraser, OMB Desk Officer, via e-mail to *Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov* or by fax to 202-395-5167, marked to the attention of Nicholas A. Fraser.

Dated: September 23, 2010.

Susan K. Fawcett,
Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-24354 Filed 9-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-552-802]

Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Correction to Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value Pursuant to Court Decision

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 29, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Renkey, AD/CVD Operations,

Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-2312.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

On September 2, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published the amended final determinations pursuant to court decision in the investigations of certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Brazil, India, the People's Republic of China, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, India, the People's Republic of China, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Amended Final Determinations of Sales at Less than Fair Value Pursuant to Court Decision*, 75 FR 53947 (September 2, 2010) ("Amended Final Determinations"). The Amended Final Determinations stated that the Department determined dusted shrimp to be within the scope of the investigations. Subsequent to the announcement and release of the Amended Final Determinations, the Department identified an inadvertent error. Specifically, in the table listing the antidumping duty rates for the companies in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, several companies were inadvertently omitted. Also, incorrect antidumping duty margins were listed for three of the Vietnamese companies. To resolve these discrepancies, the table below lists all of the Vietnamese companies along with the correct margin.

VIETNAM¹

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Camau Frozen Seafood Processing Import Export Corporation ²	5.24
Kim Anh Company Limited ³	25.76
Minh Phu Seafood Corporation ⁴	4.38
Minh Hai Joint Stock Seafoods Processing Company ⁵	4.30
Amanda Foods (Vietnam) Ltd. ⁶	4.57
Aquatic Products Trading Company ⁷	4.57
Bac Lieu Fisheries Company Limited ⁸	4.57
Coastal Fisheries Development Corporation ⁹	4.57
Cai Doi Vam Seafood Import-Export Company ¹⁰	4.57
Cam Ranh Seafoods Processing Enterprise Company ¹¹	4.57
Can Tho Agriculture and Animal Products Import Export Company ¹²	4.57
Cantho Animal Fisheries Product Processing Export Enterprise ¹³	4.57
C.P. Vietnam Livestock Co. Ltd.	4.57
Cuu Long Seaproducts Company ¹⁴	4.57
Danang Seaproducts Import Export Corporation ¹⁵	4.57
Hanoi Seaproducts Import Export Corporation ¹⁶	4.57
Investment Commerce Fisheries Corporation ¹⁷	4.57
Kien Giang Sea-Product Import-Export Company ¹⁸	4.57
Minh Hai Export Frozen Seafood Processing Joint-Stock Company ¹⁹	4.57