	Period to be reviewed
Norsk Hydro Canada Inc.	
Israel: Industrial Phosphoric Acid, C–508–605	1/1/97–12/31/97
Haifa Chemicals Ltd.	
Rotem Amfert Negev Ltd.	
Italy: Certain Pasta, C–475–819	1/1/97–12/31/97
Audisio Industrie Alimentari S.p.L.*	
De Gi Ma s.r.l.*	
Industrie Alimentari Molisane s.r.l.*	
La Molisana Industrie Alimentari S.p.A.*	
Pastifico Antonio Pallante s.r.l.*	
Pastifico Fabianelli S.p.A.*	
Pastifico Laporta S.a.s.*	
Petrini S.p.A.*	
*Inadvertently omitted from previous initiation notice.	
Mexico: Cut-to—Length Carbon Steel Plate, C–201–810	1/1/97–12/31/97
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A. de C.V.	
Republic of Korea: Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, C–580–818	1/1/97–12/31/97
Pohang Iron and Steel Company	
Pohang Coated Steel Co.	
Pohang Steel Industries	
Dongbu Steel Co.	
Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	
Republic of Korea: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products, C–580–818	1/1/97–12/31/97
Pohang Iron and Steel Company	
Pohang Coated Steel Co.	
Pohang Steel Industries	
Dongbu Steel Co.	
Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	
Suspension Agreements	
None.	

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under § 351.211 or a determination under § 351.218(d) (sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

For transition orders defined in section 752(c)(6) of the Act, the Secretary will apply paragraph (j)(1) of this section to any administrative review initiated in 1996 or 1998 (19 CFR 351.213(j)(1–2)).

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1656(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: September 23, 1998.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–26061 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–846]

Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from six exporters,[1] the Department of Commerce is conducting a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order of brake rotors from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") published on April 17, 1997 (*see* 62 FR 18740). The review covers the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that U.S. sales have not been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties for the six PRC exporters subject to this review.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit case briefs in this proceeding should provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 29, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Smith, Everett Kelly, or Barbara Wojcik-Betancourt, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1766, (202) 482–4194, or (202) 482–0629 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the

[1] The six exporters are China National Industrial Machinery Import & Export Company ("CNIM"), Lai Zhou Auto Brake Equipments Factory ("LABEF"), Longkou Haimeng Machinery Co., Ltd. ("Haimeng"), Qingdao Gren Co. ("GREN"), Yantai Winhere Auto-Part Manufacturing Co., Ltd. ("Winhere"), and Zibo Luzhou Automobile Parts Co., Ltd. ("ZLAP").

Act''), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Background

On November 3, 1997, the Department received requests from CNIM, GREN, Haimeng, LABEF, Winhere and ZLAP (hereafter referred to as ''the six respondents'') for a new shipper review pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and § 351.214(b) of the Department's regulations.

Section 751(a)(2) of the Act and § 351.214(b)(2)(i) of the Department's regulations govern determinations of antidumping duties for new shippers. These provisions state that, if the Department receives a request for review from an exporter or producer of the subject merchandise stating that it did not export the merchandise to the United States during the period covered by the original less-than-fair-value (''LTFV'') investigation (the ''POI'') and that such exporter or producer is not affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported the subject merchandise during that period, the Department shall conduct a new shipper review to establish an individual weighted-average dumping margin for such exporter or producer, if the Department has not previously established such a margin for the exporter or producer. The regulations require that the exporter or producer shall include in its request, with appropriate certifications: (i) The date on which the merchandise was first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, or, if it cannot certify as to the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the merchandise for export to the United States or if the merchandise has not yet been shipped or entered, the date of sale; (ii) a list of the firms with which it is affiliated; (iii) a statement from such exporter or producer, and from each affiliated firm, that it did not, under its current or a former name, export the merchandise during the POI, and (iv) in an antidumping proceeding involving inputs from a nonmarket economy country, a certification that the export activities of such exporter or producer are not controlled by the central government. 19 CFR 351.214(b) (ii) and (iii).

The six respondents' requests were accompanied by information and certifications establishing the effective date on which they first shipped and entered brake rotors. Each of the six respondents also claims it has no affiliated companies which exported brake rotors from the People's Republic of China (''PRC'') during the POI. In addition, each of the six respondents also certified that its export activities are not controlled by the central government. Based on the above information, the Department initiated a new shipper review covering the six respondents (*Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews* (62 FR 64206, December 4, 1997)). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214.

In January 1998, the six respondents submitted responses to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. In March and April 1998, the six respondents and the petitioner submitted publicly available information and comments for consideration in valuing the factors of production. Also, the Department issued supplemental questionnaires to the six respondents, each of which submitted responses to those questionnaires in April 1998. On May 4, 1998, we postponed the preliminary results until no later than September 24, 1998. (*See* 63 FR 25821, May 11, 1998).

On July 31, 1998, the respondents and petitioners submitted additional comments on publicly available information submitted for use in the preliminary results.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are brake rotors made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, ranging in diameter from 8 to 16 inches (20.32 to 40.64 centimeters) and in weight from 8 to 45 pounds (3.63 to 20.41 kilograms). The size parameters (weight and dimension) of the brake rotors limit their use to the following types of motor vehicles: Automobiles, all-terrain vehicles, vans and recreational vehicles under ''one ton and a half,'' and light trucks designated as ''one ton and a half.''

Finished brake rotors are those that are ready for sale and installation without any further operations. Semi-finished rotors are those on which the surface is not entirely smooth, and have undergone some drilling. Unfinished rotors are those which have undergone some grinding or turning.

These brake rotors are for motor vehicles, and do not contain in the casting a logo of an original equipment manufacturer (''OEM'') which produces vehicles sold in the United States (*e.g.*, General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Honda, Toyota, Volvo). Brake rotors covered in this investigation are not certified by OEM producers of vehicles sold in the United States. The scope also includes composite brake rotors that are made of gray cast iron, which contain a steel plate, but otherwise meet the above criteria. Excluded from the scope of the review are brake rotors made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, with a diameter less than 8 inches or greater than 16 inches (less than 20.32 centimeters or greater than 40.64 centimeters) and a weight less than 8 pounds or greater than 45 pounds (less than 3.63 kilograms or greater than 20.41 kilograms).

Brake rotors are classifiable under subheading 8708.39.5010 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review (''POR'') covers the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 1997.

Separate Rates

In proceedings involving non-market-economy (''NME'') countries, the Department begins with a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and thus should be assessed a single antidumping duty deposit rate. One of the respondents (*i.e.*, Winhere), although wholly-owned by Hong Kong individuals, is located within the PRC. Two respondents (*i.e.*, Haimeng, ZLAP) are joint ventures between Chinese and foreign companies. The three other respondents are either wholly owned by all the people (*i.e.*, CNIM) or collectively owned (*i.e.*, GREN, LABEF). Thus, for all six respondents, a separate rates analysis is necessary to determine whether the exporters are independent from government control (*see Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Bicycles From the People's Republic of China* (*Bicycles*) 61 FR 56570 (April 30, 1996)).

To establish whether a firm is sufficiently independent from government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under a test arising out of the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) and amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, May 2, 1994) (*Silicon*

Carbide). Under the separate rates criteria, the Department assigns separate rates in NME cases only if the respondent can demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* governmental control over export activities.

1. De Jure Control

Each respondent has placed on the administrative record documents to demonstrate absence of *de jure* control, including the ''Law of the People's Republic of China on Industrial Enterprises Owned by the Whole People,'' adopted on April 13, 1988, (the Industrial Enterprises Law), ''The Enterprise Legal Person Registration Administrative Regulations,'' promulgated on June 13, 1988, the 1990 ''Regulation Governing Rural Collectively-Owned Enterprises of PRC,'' the 1992 ''Regulations for Transformation of Operational Mechanisms of State-Owned Industrial Enterprises' (Business Operation Provisions), and the 1994 ''Foreign Trade Law of the People's Republic of China.''

In prior cases, we have analyzed these laws and have found them to sufficiently establish an absence of *de jure* control of companies ''owned by the whole people,'' joint ventures, or collectively owned enterprises. *See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Furfuryl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China* (*Furfuryl Alcohol*) 60 FR 22544 (May 8, 1995), and *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Partial-Extension Steel Drawer Slides with Rollers from the People's Republic of China* (*Drawer Slides*) 60 FR 29571–29576 (June 5, 1995). We have no new information in this proceeding which would cause us to reconsider this determination with regard to the six respondents mentioned above.

2. De Facto Control

As stated in previous cases, there is some evidence that certain enactments of the PRC central government have not been implemented uniformly among different sectors and/or jurisdictions in the PRC. *See Silicon Carbide* and *Furfuryl Alcohol.* Therefore, the Department has determined that an analysis of *de facto* control is critical in determining whether the respondents are, in fact, subject to a degree of governmental control which would preclude the Department from assigning separate rates.

The Department typically considers four factors in evaluating whether each respondent is subject to *de facto* governmental control of its export functions: (1) Whether the export prices (''EPs'') are set by or subject to the approval of a governmental authority; (2) whether the respondent has authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; (3) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether the respondent retains the proceeds of its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding disposition of profits or financing of losses (*see Silicon Carbide* and *Furfuryl Alcohol*).

Each respondent asserted the following: (1) It establishes its own EPs; (2) it negotiates contracts, without guidance from any governmental entities or organizations; (3) it makes its own personnel decisions; and (4) it retains the proceeds of its export sales, uses profits according to its business needs, and has the authority to sell its assets and to obtain loans. Additionally, the respondents' questionnaire responses indicate that company-specific pricing during the POI does not suggest coordination among exporters. This information supports a preliminary finding that there is de facto absence of governmental control of the export functions of these respondents. Consequently, we have preliminarily determined that each entity has met the criteria for the application of separate rates (*see Pure Magnesium from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Administrative Review,* 62 FR 55215, October 23, 1997).

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of the subject merchandise by each respondent to the United States were made at LTFV, we compared the EP to the normal value (''NV''), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice, below.

Export Price

We used EP methodology in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to unaffiliated customers in the United States prior to importation and constructed export price methodology was not otherwise indicated.

1. CNIM

We calculated EP based on packed, FOB foreign port prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for foreign inland freight and foreign brokerage and handling in the PRC in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. Because foreign inland freight and foreign brokerage and handling fees were provided by NME companies, we based those charges on surrogate rates from India. (*See* Surrogate Country section below). To value foreign inland freight, we used the average truck freight rate contained in the Indian periodical *The Times of India.* We have used this same rate in numerous NME cases in which India has been selected as the primary surrogate. *See Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brake Drums and Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 9164 (February 28, 1997) (*Brake Rotors*). To value foreign brokerage and handling expenses, we relied on public information reported in the antidumping investigation of stainless steel bar from India.

2. GREN

We calculated EP based on packed, CIF U.S. port prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight and foreign brokerage and handling in the PRC, marine insurance and international freight, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. As all foreign inland freight and handling fees were provided by NME suppliers or paid for in a NME currency, we valued these services using the Indian surrogate values discussed above. For marine insurance, we used public information reported in the antidumping investigation of sulfur dyes, including sulfur vat dyes, from India. For ocean freight, we used rates from the U.S. Federal Maritime Commission because GREN used NME freight carriers.

3–6. Haimeng, LABEF, Winhere, and Zlap

We calculated EP based on packed, FOB foreign port prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight and foreign brokerage and handling. As all foreign inland freight and handling fees were provided by NME suppliers or paid for in a NME currency, we valued these services using the Indian surrogate values discussed above.

Normal Value

A. Non-Market Economy Status

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as a NME country.

None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment. Accordingly, we calculated NV in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, which applies to NME countries.

B. Surrogate Country

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act requires the Department to value the NME producer's factors of production, to the extent possible, in one or more market economy countries that (1) are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the NME country, and (2) are significant producers of comparable merchandise. We determined that India is a country comparable to the PRC in terms of overall economic development (*see* Memorandum to Louis Apple, dated January 22, 1998). In addition, based on publicly available information placed on the record, we have determined that India is a significant producer of the subject merchandise. Accordingly, we considered India the primary surrogate country for purposes of valuing the factors of production as the basis for NV because it meets the Department's criteria for surrogate country selection. Where we could not find surrogate values from India, we valued those factors using values from Indonesia.

C. Factors of Production

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, we calculated NV based on the factors of production reported by the companies in the PRC which produced the subject merchandise for the exporters which sold the subject merchandise to the United States during POR. To calculate NV, the reported unit factor quantities were multiplied by publicly available Indian or Indonesian values.

The selection of the surrogate values applied in this determination was based on the quality, specificity, and contemporaneity of the data. As appropriate, we adjusted input prices to make them delivered prices. For those values not contemporaneous with the POR and quoted in a foreign currency, we adjusted for inflation using wholesale price indices published in the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics. For a complete analysis of surrogate values, see the Preliminary Results Valuation Memorandum from the Team to the File, dated September 24, 1998.

To value pig iron and iron scrap, we used domestic price data from the April 1996–March 1997 financial report of Lamina Foundries (Lamina) because the prices reported therein are most contemporaneous to the POR and best represent the costs of those inputs. We removed excise and sales taxes from the pig iron and scrap values because the financial report indicated that these taxes were included in the values. For steel scrap, lubrication oil and limestone, we used the April 1996–March 1997 import value from *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India (Monthly Statistics).* For ferrosilicon and ferromanganese, we used the March-May 1997 import value from *Monthly Statistics.*

For coking coal, we used a 1996–1997 price from the publication *Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce.* To value firewood, we used a 1990 domestic value from the USAID publication, *Marketing Opportunities for Social Forestry in Uttar Pradesh*. To value electricity, we used an April 1996–July 1996 average price for electricity from *Business World*.

We valued labor based on a regression-based wage rate, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3).

To value selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, factory overhead and profit, we calculated simple averages based on financial data from only five Indian producers. We used only those producers' financial reports because they were most contemporaneous with the POR and because we have publicly available information that demonstrates that these companies are producers of the subject merchandise (*i.e.*, Jayaswals Neco Limited (''Jayaswals''), Kalyani Brakes Limited (''Kalyani''), Krishna Engineering Works (''Krishna''), Nagpur Alloy Castings Ltd. (''Nagpur''), and Rico Auto Industries Limited (''Rico'')). Where appropriate, we have removed from the surrogate overhead and SG&A calculations the excise duty amount listed in the financial reports (*see Brake Rotors* at 9160). We also made certain adjustments to the percentages calculated as a result of reclassifying expenses contained in the financial reports.

In utilizing the financial data of the Indian companies, we treated the line item labeled ''stores and spares consumed'' as part of factory overhead because stores and spares are not direct materials consumed in the production process. Based on publicly available information, we have considered the molding materials (*i.e.*, sand, bentonite, coal powder, steel pellets, lead powder, waste oil) to be indirect materials included in the stores and spares consumed category of the financial statements. We based our factory overhead calculation on the cost of goods manufactured rather than on the cost of goods sold. We also included interest and/or financial expenses in the SG&A calculation. In addition, we only reduced interest and financial expenses by amounts for interest income if the Indian financial report noted that the income was short-term in nature. Where a company did not distinguish interest income as a line item within total ''other income,'' we used the relative ratio of interest income to total other income as reported for the Indian metals industry in the *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. For a further discussion of other adjustments made, *see* the Preliminary Results Valuation Memorandum.

To value PRC inland freight, we used the April 1994 truck rate from the *Times of India*.

In accordance with, the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Sigma Corp.* v. *United States*, 117 F. 3d 1401 (1997) we revised our methodology for calculating source-to-factory surrogate freight for those material inputs that are valued based on CIF import values in the surrogate country. Therefore, we have added to CIF surrogate values from India a surrogate freight cost using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest PRC port of exportation to the factory, or from the domestic supplier to the factory on an import-specific basis.

To value adhesive tape, corrugated cartons, pallet wood, nails, polyethylene material for bags, plastic straps and steel strips, we used April 1996–March 1997 import values from *Monthly Statistics of India*.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions pursuant to section 773A(a) of the Act and § 351.415 of the Department's regulations based on the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the six respondents during the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Percent margin
China National Industry Machinery, Import & Export Company (CNIM)	0.00
Lai Zhou Auto Brake Equipments Factory (LABEF)	0.00
Longkou Haimeng Machinery Co., Ltd. (Haimeng)	0.00
Qingdao Gren Co. (GREN)	0.00
Yantai Winhere Auto-Part Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Winhere)	0.00
Zibo Luzhou Automobile Parts Co., Ltd. (ZLAP)	0.00

Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may

request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held at the earliest convenience of the parties. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 63 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 70 days after the date of publication. The Department will issue the final results of this new shipper administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 90 days of issuance of these preliminary results. Upon completion of this new shipper review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. The results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, upon completion of this review, the posting of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and § 351.214(e) of the Department's regulations, will no longer be permitted and, should the final results yield a margin of dumping, a cash deposit will be required for each entry of the merchandise.

If the final results should yield no margin of dumping for the six respondents noted above, then the Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate all entries of the subject merchandise during the POR both produced and exported by GREN, Haimeng, LABEF, Winhere and ZLAP, and subject merchandise exported by CNIM but manufactured by Hanting Casting Factory without regard to antidumping duties.

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this new shipper antidumping duty administrative review for all shipments of brake rotors from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for each reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this new shipper administrative review; (2) the cash deposit rate for PRC exporters who received a separate rate in the LTFV investigation will continue to be the rate assigned in that investigation; and (3) the cash deposit rate for all other PRC exporters will continue to be 43.32 percent, the PRC-wide rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This new shipper administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) and 19 CFR 351.214(d).

Dated: September 23, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–26062 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Reestablishment of the U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Reestablishment of the U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: Having determined that the Committee's work continues to be in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department by law, the U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee (APAC) was reestablished. The reestablishment of the APAC is in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2, and 41 CFR subpart 101–6.10 (1990), Federal Advisory Committee Management Rule.

The APAC was established by the Secretary of Commerce on June 6, 1989, to advise Department of Commerce officials on issues related to sales of U.S.-made auto parts to Japanese markets. It functions as an advisory body in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Authority for the APAC is contained in 15 U.S.C. 4704, as amended by section 510 of Pub. L. 103–236 (April 30, 1994).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Reck, U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, Trade Development, Office of Automotive Affairs, (202) 482–1418.

Dated: September 21, 1998.

Henry P. Misisco,

Director, Office of Automotive Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–26017 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket Number 980722187–8187–01]

RIN 0693–ZA21

Upgrading of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) Accreditation Manual

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability of funds.

SUMMARY: ASCLD/LAB has requested that the Office of Law Enforcement Standards (OLES) at NIST assist in upgrading its laboratory accreditation program to meet applicable international standards. ASCLD/LAB operates an accreditation program for crime laboratories, with members consisting of 139 domestic and 14 foreign laboratories. The work of performing laboratory audits and reviewing audit reports for accreditation is performed on a voluntary basis. The program includes criteria to judge the quality and performance of a crime laboratory and the operation of an evaluation program to identify those laboratories meeting ASCLD/LAB criteria. Accreditation is a tool to ensure that the laboratories' contributions to the criminal justice system are consistent, repeatable, and scientifically based. The current criteria and accreditation program consists of procedures prepared by members of the ASCLD/LAB based on their professional knowledge and experience in crime laboratory operations prior to the establishment of international standards. They must now be modified to conform to established world-wide accepted standards.

As part of the phenomena of globalization of markets, several international organizations have prepared generic criteria for competence of laboratory operations and for operating accreditation programs to measure laboratory competence. The International Organization for Standards (ISO) has prepared ISO Guide 25 General Requirements for the Competence of Calibration and Testing