

To facilitate public participation, we are inviting public comment on the issues the committee will consider prior to the formulation of recommendations as listed in the Agenda section below.

There will be a public comment period after each subcommittee update during the meeting on March 5, 2025. During the meeting, comments may be submitted via the trade events mailbox at [tradeevents@cbp.dhs.gov](mailto:tradeevents@cbp.dhs.gov) or through the Microsoft Teams chat feature. Please note the public comment period for speakers may end before the time indicated on the schedule that is posted on the CBP web page: <https://www.cbp.gov/trade/stakeholder-engagement/coac>.

### Agenda

The COAC will hear from the current subcommittees on the topics listed below:

1. The Intelligent Enforcement Subcommittee will provide updates on the work completed and topics discussed in its working groups. The Antidumping/Countervailing Duty (AD/CVD) Working Group will provide updates regarding its work and discussions on importer compliance with AD/CVD and other trade remedy measures and requirements. The Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Process Modernization Working Group will provide updates concerning progress associated with its proposed recommendations specific to IPR enforcement and facilitation. The Forced Labor Working Group (FLWG) will submit proposed recommendations and provide updates on continued discussions regarding trade outreach and clarification of requirements. The FLWG will continue to provide CBP with input, as CBP rolls out a case management portal and a new version of the “Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (UFLPA) U.S. Customs and Border Protection Operational Guidance for Importers”. The Bond Working Group remained on hiatus status since the last public meeting.

2. The Next Generation Facilitation Subcommittee will provide updates on all its existing working groups. The Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) 2.0 Working Group was focused on a discussion on the ACE 2.0 high level roadmap and clarification on some of the proposed capabilities such as blanket entries and correction processes. The Broker Modernization Working Group (BMWG) remains dedicated to the enhancement of the end user experience and improving the administration of the Customs Broker Licensing Exam (CBLE). This quarter, the Modernized Entry Processes

Working Group (MEPWG) continues its National Customs Automation Program (NCAP) discussions and will provide updates on its efforts concerning the reconciliation test. The MEPWG will provide updates regarding areas where CBP could provide further guidance on the Broker Cybersecurity Incident Procedures in the form of Frequently Asked Questions. The remaining working group, the Customs Interagency Industry Working Group (CIIWG), was not active this past quarter but will provide a report on topics that the working group will focus on in the coming quarter.

3. The Secure Trade Lanes Subcommittee will provide updates on its seven active working groups: the Centers Working Group, the Cross-Border Recognition Working Group, the De Minimis Working Group, the Export Modernization Working Group, the FTZ/Warehouse Working Group, the Pipeline Working Group, and the Trade Partnership and Engagement Working Group. The proposed recommendations presented by the De Minimis Automation Task Force in the December meeting will be put forward for a vote in the March meeting. These proposed recommendations could not be voted on at the December meeting, due to the lack of quorum for COAC. The Export Modernization Working Group met to discuss the rail Electronic Export Manifest after much anticipation for its release. The Export Modernization Working Group continues the discussion on progressive filing in the export environment. The Drawback Task Force, within the Export Modernization Working Group, met to discuss the general rulings and the drawback desk review process and hopes to submit proposed recommendations this quarter surrounding the streamlining of the manufacturing rulings process. The Centers Working Group continues to meet within the Structure and Operations Sub-Working Groups. The Centers Working Group continues to evaluate previous the recommendations that were put forward and will determine if any additional proposed recommendations may come from that review and with new topics that are discussed within the Sub-Working Groups. The FTZ/Warehouse Working Group continues to review 19 CFR part 146 and intends to have proposed recommendations for review surrounding ACE functionality for the March public meeting. The Pipeline Working Group has not met yet this quarter and will not have any proposed recommendations. The Cross-Border

Recognition Working group has not met this quarter and will finalize the evaluation for the Statement of Work to determine next steps.

Meeting materials will be available on February 24, 2025, at: <https://www.cbp.gov/trade/stakeholder-engagement/coac/coac-public-meetings>.

**George Bogden,**

*Executive Director, Office of Trade Relations.*

[FR Doc. 2025–02621 Filed 2–13–25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9111–14–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 332–599]

### Distributional Effects of Trade and Trade Policy on U.S. Workers, 2026 Report

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of termination of investigation.

**SUMMARY:** On February 4, 2025, the Commission received a letter from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) withdrawing its request made on January 25, 2023, that the Commission prepare a series of public reports on the potential distributional effects of goods and services trade and trade policy on U.S. workers and underrepresented and underserved communities. Therefore, the Commission has terminated Investigation No. 332–599, “Distributional Effects of Trade and Trade Policy on U.S. Workers, 2026 Report”, and will not release a report related to this investigation. The USTR requested the investigation and report under authority delegated by the President and pursuant to section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

#### DATES:

*January 25, 2023:* Receipt of request for the investigation.

*February 4, 2025:* Receipt of letter withdrawing request for the investigation.

*February 10, 2025:* Termination of investigation.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Andberg, Office of External Relations ([jennifer.andberg@usitc.gov](mailto:jennifer.andberg@usitc.gov) or 202–205–3404). Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its website (<https://www.usitc.gov>).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Background:* The Commission had instituted Investigation No. 332–599 under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332(g)). See 88 FR 45922 (July 18, 2023).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 11, 2025.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2025–02632 Filed 2–13–25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE****Drug Enforcement Administration**

[Docket No. 23–1]

**Robert L. Carter, D.D.S.; Decision and Order**

On September 29, 2022, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Robert L. Carter, D.D.S., of Camden Wyoming, Delaware (Respondent). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Appendix (RFAAX) A, at 1, 9. The OSC proposes the revocation of Respondent's DEA registration in Delaware, Number BC5574048 (Registration), and the denial of Respondent's application for a DEA registration in New Jersey, Application Number W20128194C (Application), pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1), (a)(3), and (a)(4), and 823(g)(1), because Respondent materially falsified multiple renewal applications and his registration is inconsistent with the public interest.<sup>1</sup> OSC, at 1.

**I. Procedural Background**

The OSC notified Respondent of the right to request a hearing. OSC, at 7–8 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). On October 25, 2022, Respondent timely requested a hearing in this matter. RFAAX B. The matter was placed on the docket of DEA Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney, II (the Chief ALJ), who, on October 26, 2022, issued an Order for

<sup>1</sup> The OSC also proposes an additional ground for denial of Respondent's application for a DEA registration in New Jersey on the basis that he lacks authority to handle controlled substances in New Jersey. The record contains no evidence showing that Respondent has regained authority to handle controlled substances in New Jersey in the time since his New Jersey controlled dangerous substance license expired, but that evidence dates back to 2022. RFAA, GX 6. Even without considering Respondent's state authority to handle controlled substances in New Jersey, the Agency has ample grounds to deny Respondent's 2020 application due to the substantial record evidence that Respondent materially falsified multiple applications and that granting the application would be inconsistent with the public interest.

Prehearing Statements. RFAAX C. The Order for Prehearing Statements directed the parties to submit prehearing statements and explained the criteria these statements must meet to be considered adequate. *Id.* at 2. Consistent with Agency practice, the Order for Prehearing Statements explained that an adequate prehearing statement must include the names of witnesses expected to testify at the hearing, a summary of their expected testimony, and a list of evidentiary exhibits expected to be offered at the hearing. *Id.*; see also 21 CFR 1316.52(c), 1316.58. The Order for Prehearing Statements further notified the parties that failure to submit a compliant prehearing statement may incur a sanction, to include “a waiver of hearing and an implied withdrawal of a request for hearing.” RFAAX C, at 4. The Order for Prehearing Statements also set the date for the prehearing conference. *Id.* at 3; see also 21 CFR 1316.54.

Both parties submitted timely prehearing statements. RFAAX D & E. The Chief ALJ, however, found Respondent's prehearing statement to be deficient. RFAAX F, at 1. Specifically, the Chief ALJ noted that instead of providing names of witnesses, summaries of testimony, and proposed exhibits as directed, Respondent's prehearing statement stated that Respondent could not comply with the Order for Prehearing Statements because the Government had not turned over documents supporting the OSC. *Id.* at 2. The Chief ALJ found that Respondent's noncompliant prehearing statement amounted to “a refusal to follow the issued directions.” *Id.* The Chief ALJ issued an Order Directing Compliance (Compliance Order) in which he provided Respondent another opportunity to submit a compliant prehearing statement and again informed Respondent that failure to do so could result in “dismissal of his request for hearing.” *Id.* The Compliance Order further explained the tribunal's “[l]ongstanding practice” of requiring parties to identify proposed evidentiary exhibits in their prehearing statements before being directed to exchange evidence. *Id.* at 2 n.3. The Compliance Order additionally informed Respondent that he would be provided the opportunity to file a supplemental prehearing statement at a later time. *Id.*

Instead of submitting a compliant prehearing statement in response to the Compliance Order as directed, Respondent submitted a letter in which he reiterated his position that he cannot comply with the Order for Prehearing Statements or the Compliance Order

until he receives the Government's “supporting documents.” RFAAX G, at 1. Specifically, Respondent stated that he “simply cannot respond without reviewing the documents the Government has referenced” and it is “impossible” to identify witnesses and proposed testimony “without the documents the Government references.”<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 2. Respondent concludes by stating that “once [he] receives the requested documents, [he] will provide an appropriate response,” but until then, he “cannot provide an appropriate response . . . without the documents supporting the Government's case.”<sup>3</sup> *Id.* Attached to this letter were emails between Respondent's counsel and DEA counsel in which it was explained that the Government would supply its evidentiary exhibits to Respondent according to the deadline established by the Chief ALJ at the prehearing conference. *Id.* at 3–11.

Following receipt of Respondent's letter and prior to the deadline set by the Compliance Order, the Chief ALJ issued an Order Terminating Proceedings (Termination Order) in which he found that Respondent had “effectively waived his right to a hearing” by failing to comply with the Order for Prehearing Statements and Compliance Order, and by informing the tribunal that he did not intend to

<sup>2</sup> Respondent's argument that he does “not know what is contained in” the Government's documents underlying the OSC is disingenuous. RFAAX G, at 2. The Government's Prehearing Statement noticed proposed exhibits of Respondent's Delaware registration history, his New Jersey application history, his Delaware dental license and controlled substances registration, his New Jersey dental license, a letter showing the current status of his New Jersey controlled dangerous substances registration, documents from Respondent's New Jersey state administrative case, emails to Respondent, and prescriptions he wrote. RFAAX D, at 14–17. Respondent received a clear description of the exhibits, most of which were publicly available records concerning Respondent, and seven pages of detailed testimony in the Government's Prehearing Statement. It is difficult to believe that Respondent truly felt that he could not prepare a prehearing statement, which he was informed could be supplemented after receiving the Government's evidence.

<sup>3</sup> In his letter to the Chief ALJ, Respondent stated that the Government's documents supporting the OSC “must be produced.” RFAAX G, at 2. The question is not, however, whether the Government's evidence “must be produced”; the issues are whether Respondent is entitled to receive the evidence prior to filing a prehearing statement and whether the prehearing filing schedule should be handled differently in this case than all other matters that come before the tribunal. Respondent provided no authority to support his claim that the evidence “must be produced” on demand at the specific time that he requested it. *Id.* Likewise, he provided no authority to support his expectation that this case be handled differently than how the tribunal typically handles prehearing procedures. *Id.*