OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Submission for OMB Review; Request for Comment

AGENCY: Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of Request for Emergency Extension of the Expiration date on OPIC Form 129, U.S. Sponsor Disclosure Report in Support of an Application for Financing (OMB 3420–0018) which expires 10/31/99.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public, the agency shall set forth in the **Federal Register** notice prescribed by § 1320.5(a)(1)(iv), unless waived or modified under this section, a statement that it is requesting emergency processing, and the time period so stated.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the subject form and the request for review prepared for submission to OMB may be obtained from the Agency Submitting Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *OPIC Agency Submitting Officer:* Carol Brock, Records Manager, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, 1100 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20527; 202/336–8563.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Type of Request: Notice of request for emergency extension of the expiration date on the U.S. Sponsor Disclosure Report in Support of an Application for Financing, OPIC–129 (OMB 3420–0018) which expires 10/31/99. A ninety day extension to the expiration date is being requested.

Title: U.D. Sponsor Disclosure Report in Support of an Application for Financing.

Form Number: OPIC–129.

Authority for Information Collection: Sections 231, 234 (b) and (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Abstract (Needs and Uses): The U.S. Sponsor Disclosure Report is the principal document used by OPIC to gather information from project sponsors on whether a project might harm the U.S., and describes sponsor activities with the U.S. Government and other information for the underwriting and analysis of a project.

Dated: October 21, 1999.

James R. Offutt,

Assistant General Counsel for Administrative Affairs Department of Legal Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99–28402 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3210–01–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–811 (Final)]

Drams of One Megabit and Above From Taiwan

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Revised schedule for the subject antidumping investigation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 21, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Carr (202–205–3402), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 19, 1999, the Department of Commerce notified the Commission of its final determination. The Commission must make its final determination in antidumping investigations within 45 days after notification of Commerce's final determination, or in this case by December 2, 1999. The Commission is revising its schedule to conform with this statutory deadline.

The Commission's new schedule for the investigation is as follows: The Commission will make its final release of information on November 15, 1999; and final party comments are due on November 17, 1999.

For further information concerning this investigation see the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and C (19 CFR part 207).

Authority: This investigation is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 25, 1999.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–28364 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Investigations Nos. 303–TA–13 (Review); 701–TA–249 (Review); and 731–TA–262, 263, and 265 (Review)

Iron Metal Castings From India; Heavy Iron Construction Castings From Brazil; and Iron Construction Castings From Brazil, Canada, and China

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission determines,[2] pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on heavy iron construction castings from Brazil would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission further determines [3] that revocation of the countervailing duty order on iron metal castings from India would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission also determines [4] that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on heavy iron construction castings from Brazil, Canada, and China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission further determines [5] that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on light iron construction castings from Brazil and China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on November 2, 1998 (63 FR 58758), and determined on February 4, 1999, that it would conduct full reviews (64 FR 9176, February 24, 1999). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S.

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] Commissioner Carol T. Crawford dissenting.

[3] Vice Chairman Marcia E. Miller and Commissioner Jennifer A. Hillman dissenting.

[4] Commissioner Carol T. Crawford dissenting with regard to heavy iron construction castings from Brazil and China.

[5] Commissioner Carol T. Crawford dissenting.

International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on March 8, 1999 (64 F.R. 11039). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on August 5, 1999, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 25, 1999.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–28363 Filed 10–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–413]

Certain Rare-Earth Magnets and Magnetic Materials and Articles Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determinatin Not To Review an Initial Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; and Request for Submissions on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review a final initial determination (ID) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation finding a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Johnson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3098. 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 Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 4, 1998, the Commission instituted an investigation based on a complaint filed by Magnequench International, Inc. (Magnequench) and Sumitomo Special Metals Co., Ltd. (SSMC). 63 *Fed. Reg.* 47319. The complaint alleged violations of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain rare-earth magnets or magnetic materials, or articles containing the same, that infringe claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, or 11 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,851,058, (the '058 patent); claims 1–6, 10, 14–16, or 18–20 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,802,931 (the '931 patent); claims 13–18 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,496,395 (the '395 patent); claims 1–9, 12–20, 23–27, or 29–34 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,770,723 (the '723 patent); claims 1–6, 8–10, 13–19, 21–24, 27–35, or 37–39 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,792,368 (the '368 patent); or claims 1–3, 5, 15, 18, 19, 21, or 22 of U.S. Patent Letters 5,645,651 (the '651 patent).

On September 22, 1999, the Commission determined not review an ID granting complainants motion to withdraw from the investigation claims 1, 12, 23, 29, 30, and 32 of the '723 patent and claims 1, 13, 14, 22, 27, 32, 33, 34, and 39 of the '368 patent. Hence the claims in issue of the '723 patent and '368 patent are claims 2–9, 13–20, 24–27, 31, 33, and 34 of the '723 patent and claims 2–6, 8–10, 15–19, 21, 23, 24, 28–31, 35, 37, and 38 of the '368 patent.

The following respondents were named in the notice of investigation: Houghes International, Inc. (Houghes) of New York; International Magna Products, Inc. (IMI) of Indiana; Multi-Trend International Corp. a/k/a MTI-Modern Technology Inc. (Multi-Trend) of California; American Union Group, Inc. (AUG) of Maryland; High End Metals Corp. (High End) of Taiwan; Harvard Industrial America Inc. (Harvard) of California; H.T.I.E., Inc. (H.T.I.E.) of Pennsylvania; and CYNNY Magnets (CYNNY) of New Jersey.

On January 11, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID granting complainants' motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add A.R.E., Inc. (A.R.E.) of Pennsylvania; NEOCO, L.C. (NEOCO) of Michigan; Beijing Jing Ma Permanent Magnets Materials Factory (Jing Ma) of China; and Xin Huan Technology Development Co., Ltd. (Xin Huan) of China as respondents.

On February 1, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID terminating the investigation as to respondent IMI on the basis of a consent order. On February 9, 1999, the Commission determined not to review IDs terminating the investigation as to respondents AUG, CYNNY, H.T.I.E., and Houghes on the basis of consent orders.

On May 25, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID granting complainants' motion for partial summary determination on the importation issue. On May 28, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID granting complainants' motion for summary determination on the domestic industry issue.

On August 6, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID finding respondents A.R.E., Jing Ma, and Xin Huan in default. On September 27, 1999, the Commission determined not to review an ID finding respondent Multi-Trend in default.

The prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing were conducted on June 9 to 18, 1999. Complainants, respondent NEOCO, and the Commission investigative attorneys (IAs) participated at the hearing. Following the filing of post-hearing submissions, closing arguments were heard on July 27, 1999.

On September 7, 1999, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337. His determination is based on his findings that the patents in issue are valid and enforceable, and that the accused imported magnets infringed all of the asserted claims, with the exception of claims 13–20, 25–27 and 33 of the '723 patent and claims 15–19, 21, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, and 35 of the '368 patent.

At final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may issue (1) an order that could result in exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair action in the importation and sale of such articles. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, entry for consumption from a foreign trade zone, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or are likely to do so. For background, see In the Matter of: Certain Devices for Connecting Computers Via Telephone Lines, Inv. No. 337–TA–360, USITC Publication No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are the subject of this investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is