

(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 mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Georgia-Pacific Corporation, operating as James River Paper Co., Inc., Old Town, Maine engaged in the production of toilet tissue, towels, napkin paper and converted case products, was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met. The subject firm did not increase its reliance on imports of toilet tissue, towels, napkin paper and converted case products during the relevant period, nor did it shift production to a foreign source. Further, division-wide sales increased during the relevant period.

The company official alleges that, in order to remain competitive, the company was forced to upgrade the raw materials used to make its paper products, and that these raw materials are now obtained from foreign sources. The official further clarifies that, because the Old Town facility was unable to efficiently process this foreign fiber source, the company shifted production to another domestic facility with better capabilities for processing this imported raw material.

The foreign sourcing of raw materials is not a factor in determining the import impact of the finished product. In assessing import impact in connection with petitioning worker eligibility for TAA, the Department considers data regarding imports like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm.

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 at Washington, DC, this 17th day of July, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19221 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-U

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,084]

Lord Corporation, Aerospace Products Division, Erie, PA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on June 18, 2003, in response to a worker petition which was filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Lord Corporation, Aerospace Products Division, Erie, Pennsylvania (TA-W-52,084).

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 17th day of July, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19226 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,625]

Motorola, Inc.; iDen Radio Support Center; Elgin, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of June 21, 2003, 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 Motorola, Inc., iDen Radio Support Center, Elgin, Illinois was signed on May 20, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33195).

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 mis-interpretation of facts or

of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Motorola, Inc., iDen Radio Support Center, Elgin, Illinois engaged in activities related to the repair of iDEN cellular radios. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Act.

The petitioner questions why the repair work performed at the subject facility does not constitute production.

The Department of Labor, has consistently considered repair work a "service". Further, the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS), is a standard used by the Department to categorize products and services. Both the 1997 and 2002 editions of the NAICS designate the repair of telephones and two-way radios as classified within a code that signifies services (specifically NAICS 811213).

Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA, namely 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.

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 at Washington, DC, this 18th day of July, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19223 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-U

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,229]

Motorola, Inc., Global Telecom Solutions Sector (GTSS), Cellular Infrastructure Group, Fort Worth, Texas; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on July 3, 2003, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Motorola, Inc., Global Telecom

Solutions Sector (GTSS), Cellular Infrastructure Group, Fort Worth, Texas.

This petitioning group of workers is covered by an active certification issued on September 30, 2002 and which remains in effect (TA-W-41,716). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 11th day of July 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19227 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,253]

Scope Molding, LLC, Almena, Wisconsin; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on July 9, 2003 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Scope Molding, Inc., Almena, Wisconsin.

The petitioning group of workers is covered by an earlier petition filed on July 1, 2003 (TA-W-52,216) that is the subject of an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Further investigation in this case would duplicate efforts and serve no purpose; therefore the investigation under this petition has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 18th day of July, 2003

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19228 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,957]

Temme Mold & Engineering, Evansville, IN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on June 6, 2003, in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Temme Mold & Engineering, Evansville, Indiana.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation would serve no purpose and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 11th day of July, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-19224 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment Training Administration

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed revision of the collection of the Occupational Code Request (OCR) that is being renamed Occupational Code Assignment (OCA) information. A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the addressee section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section below on or before 60 days after date of publication in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Pam Frugoli, Office of Policy Development, Evaluation and Research, Employment Training Administration, Room N-5637, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, 202/693-3643 (This is not a toll-free number), Fax 202/693-2766, and e-mail o-net@dol.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Occupational Analysis program developed the Occupational Code Request (OCR) form as a public service to the users of the revised Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) in an effort to help them in obtaining occupational codes and titles for jobs that they were unable to locate in the DOT. With the development and release of the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) system, some modifications were needed to make the OCR form correlate more closely to the information in the O*NET system. The OCR form, with these modifications, has been renamed the Occupational Code Assignment (OCA) form.

The O*NET system classifies nearly all jobs in the United States economy. However, new specialties are constantly evolving and emerging. The use of OCA is voluntary and is provided (1) as a uniform format to the public and private sector to submit information in order to receive an occupational code, (2) to provide input to a database of alternate (lay) titles to facilitate searches for occupational information in O*NET OnLine. (<http://online.onetcenter.org>), O*NET Code Connector (<http://www.onetcodeconnector.org>) as well as America's Career InfoNet (<http://www.acinet.org>), and (3) to assist the O*NET system in identifying potential occupations that may need to be included in future O*NET data collection efforts.

The OCA process is designed to help the occupational information user relate an occupational specialty or a job title to an occupational code and title within the framework of the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) based O*NET system. The O*NET-SOC system consists of a database that organizes the work done by individuals into approximately 1,000 occupational categories. In addition, O*NET occupations have associated data on the importance and level of a range of occupational characteristics and requirements, including Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, Tasks, and Work Activities. Since the O*NET-SOC code and title also facilitates linkage to national, state, and local occupational employment and wage estimates.

II. Review Focus

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including