

	Period to be reviewed
Pastavilla Kartal Makarnacilik Sanayi Ticaret A.S. The United Kingdom: Industrial Nitrocellulose A-412-803 Imperial Chemical Industries PLC	7/1/96-6/30/97
Countervailing Duty Proceedings	
Italy: Certain Pasta C-475-819 Audisio Industrie Alimentari S.r.l. Delverde, Srl Tamma Industrie Alimentari, Srl LaMolisana Industrie Alimentari S.p.A. F.lli De Cecco di Filippo Fara S. Martino S.p.A. Petrini S.p.A. Industria Alimentare Colavita, S.p.A.	10/17/95-12/31/96

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 order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 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 75(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 C.F.R. 351.213(j)(1-2)).

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b) and 355.34(b).

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: August 22, 1997.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-22967 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Automotive Parts Advisory Committee; Closed Meeting

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.
ACTION: Closed meeting of U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee (the "Committee") advises U.S. Government officials on matters relating to the implementation of the Fair Trade in Auto Parts Act of 1988. The Committee: (1) Reports annually to the Secretary of Commerce on barriers to sales of U.S.-made auto parts and accessories in Japanese markets; (2) assists the Secretary in reporting to the Congress on the progress of sales of U.S.-made auto parts in Japanese markets, including the formation of long-term supplier relationships; (3) reviews and considers data collected on sales of U.S.-made auto parts to Japanese markets; (4) advises the Secretary during consultations with the Government of Japan on these issues; and (5) assists in establishing priorities for the Department's initiatives to increase U.S.-made auto parts sales to Japanese markets, and otherwise provide assistance and direction to the Secretary in carrying out these initiatives. At the meeting, committee members will discuss specific trade and sales expansion programs related to U.S.-Japan automotive parts policy.

DATE AND LOCATION: The meeting will be held on September 16, 1997 from 10:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert Reck, Office of Automotive Affairs, Trade Development, Room 4036, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-1418.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration,

with the concurrence of the General Counsel formally determined on July 5, 1994, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Act, as amended, that the series of meetings or portions of meetings of the Committee and of any subcommittee thereof, dealing with privileged or confidential commercial information may be exempt from the provisions of the Act relating to open meeting and public participation therein because these items are concerned with matters that are within the purview of 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (9)(B). A copy of the Notice of Determination is available for public inspection and copying in the Department of Commerce Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, Main Commerce.

Dated: August 21, 1997.

Henry P. Misisco,

Director, Office of Automotive Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97-22866 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-841]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Vector Supercomputers From Japan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 28, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward Easton or Sunkyu Kim, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1777 or (202) 482-2613.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended ("the 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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to those codified at 19 CFR 353 (April 1, 1996).

Final Determination

We determine that vector supercomputers from Japan are being sold in the United States at less than fair value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 735(b) of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value in this investigation on March 28, 1997, (62 FR 16544, April 7, 1997) ("*Preliminary Determination*"), the following events have occurred.

As discussed in the *Preliminary Determination*, on January 28, 1997, we initiated a sales below the cost of production ("COP") investigation with respect to Fujitsu Ltd.'s ("Fujitsu") home market sales. Section D of the Department's questionnaire requesting COP and constructed value ("CV") data was issued to Fujitsu on February 12, 1997. Fujitsu submitted its response to Section D of the questionnaire on April 14, 1997. Based on our analysis of Fujitsu's response to Section D, we issued a supplemental questionnaire on April 28, 1997. The response to this supplemental questionnaire was due on May 12, 1997. On May 7, 1997, at Fujitsu's request, we met with Fujitsu's counsel and corporate representative concerning the Department's Section D supplemental questionnaire. At the May 7 meeting, Fujitsu raised concerns about the scope of the questions and the availability of requested information. On May 8, 1997, Fujitsu requested an extension of time until May 19, 1997, to submit its response to the supplemental questionnaire. In its letter, Fujitsu stated that it would file as much of its response as it could prepare by May 12, 1997, and file the remainder of its response by May 19, 1997. We granted this request on May 9, 1997.

On May 12, 1997, Fujitsu submitted a portion of its response to the supplemental cost questionnaire. Fujitsu, however, failed to submit the remainder of its response on May 19, 1997. On May 20, 1997, Fujitsu submitted a letter stating that it would no longer participate in the Department's investigation and that it

would concentrate its opposition to the petition in the material injury investigation conducted by the International Trade Commission ("ITC"). In this letter, Fujitsu stated that it based its decision on the conclusion that it could not provide a complete response to the Department's supplemental cost questionnaire by the May 19, 1997 deadline and that the company's resources would be better served by participating in the ITC's investigation. As a result of Fujitsu's decision to not complete its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire, we are applying facts otherwise available in our final determination. For a further discussion, see "Facts Available" section below.

As requested in the Preliminary Determination, comments on the suspension of liquidation instructions were submitted by Fujitsu and the petitioner, Cray Research, Inc. ("Cray"), on May 12, 1997. The petitioner submitted its responses to Fujitsu's comments on May 19, 1997. For a further discussion, see Comments 2, 3, and 4, below.

Both Fujitsu and the petitioner submitted case briefs on July 7, 1997, and rebuttal briefs on July 11, 1997. At the request of Fujitsu, a public hearing was held on July 16, 1997.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are all vector supercomputers, whether new or used, and whether in assembled or unassembled form, as well as vector supercomputer spare parts, repair parts, upgrades, and system software, shipped to fulfill the requirements of a contract entered into on or after April 7, 1997, for the sale and, if included, maintenance of a vector supercomputer. A vector supercomputer is any computer with a vector hardware unit as an integral part of its central processing unit boards.

In general, the vector supercomputers imported from Japan, whether assembled or unassembled, covered in this investigation are classified under heading 8471 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States ("HTS"). Merchandise properly classifiable under HTS Number 8471.10 and 8471.30, however, is excluded from the scope of this investigation. These references to the HTS are provided for convenience and customs purposes. Our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

This scope language has been modified from that issued in our preliminary determination. The reason

for the modification is discussed in Comment 3, below.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation ("POI") is July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996.

Facts Available

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party (1) withholds information that has been requested by the Department, (2) fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested, (3) significantly impedes an antidumping investigation, or (4) provides such information but the information cannot be verified, the Department is required to use facts otherwise available (subject to subsections 782(c)(1) and (e)) to make its determination. Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used against an interested party if that party failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information. See also "Statement of Administrative Action" accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 316, 103rd Cong., 2d Sess. 870 (SAA). Fujitsu's decision not to respond fully to the Department's supplemental cost questionnaire or to other requests for information by the Department demonstrates that it failed to act to the best of its ability in this investigation. Therefore, the Department has determined that an adverse inference is appropriate. In addition, for the reasons described in the *Preliminary Determination*, we find that the application of adverse facts available is appropriate for NEC as well. Consistent with Departmental practice in cases where respondents refuse to participate, as facts otherwise available, we have considered assigning a margin stated in the petition.

A. Fujitsu

In its petition, Cray alleged that Fujitsu had delivered a four processor vector supercomputer system to a U.S. customer, Western Geophysical Co., for petroleum industry modeling applications. Cray alleged also that the U.S. customer had not paid for or contracted to purchase the system and, consequently, was unable to calculate an estimated dumping margin for this Fujitsu sale. (The only calculated estimated dumping margin in the petition concerned vector supercomputer systems offered to a different U.S. customer by NEC Corporation.) After the initiation of this investigation, the petitioner contacted the Department to report that Cray's allegation that Fujitsu had not been paid by Western Geophysical Co. for this sale

was mistaken. See, Memorandum to the File from the Case Analysts, dated August 11, 1997.

Section 776(c) provides that if the Department relies upon secondary information, such as the petition, when resorting to facts otherwise available, it must, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information using independent sources that are reasonably at its disposal. To corroborate the information the petitioner asserted with respect to Fujitsu's U.S. sale, the Department conducted a computerized search of published documents. See, Memorandum to the File, from the Case Analysts, dated August 12, 1997. This search disclosed that the October 23, 1995 issue of the Japan Economic Journal discussed Fujitsu's sale of a four-processor supercomputer to Western Geophysical Co. for a price of \$2 million. The search also disclosed that the November 1, 1995 issue of Japan Economic Institute Report ("JEI Report") discussed the Fujitsu sale of a four-processor supercomputer to Western Geophysical Co. The JEI Report stated that the Fujitsu supercomputer had a list price of \$2 million. Both the Japan Economic Journal and JEI Report reported that the sale was made by Fujitsu; neither publication referred to the participation of a systems integrator. On the basis of this information, the Department adjusted the petition margin calculated for NEC to determine a margin for Fujitsu based on facts otherwise available.

For the export price, we used Fujitsu's \$2 million price for the four-processor supercomputer sold to Western Geophysical Co. as the starting price. We adjusted this starting price to account for the absence of a systems integrator in the Western Geophysical Co. sale. We compared this export price to the CV of a vector supercomputer system calculated in the petition. We adjusted the petition CV to account for the number of processors in Fujitsu's sale to Western Geophysical Co. The resulting dumping margin of 173.08 percent was assigned to Fujitsu as facts otherwise available. See, Memorandum to the File from the Case Analyst, dated August 13, 1997.

B. NEC Corporation

As discussed in the *Preliminary Determination*, NEC Corporation ("NEC") failed to answer the Department's questionnaire. Accordingly, the Department assigned to NEC the margin stated in the petition, 454 percent, as facts otherwise available. At the preliminary determination, the Department corroborated the information contained

in the petition within the meaning of section 776(c) of the Act and found the information to have probative value; *i.e.*, it is both relevant and reliable. Since the preliminary determination, no party (including NEC) has presented to the Department any information to challenge the appropriateness of the information contained in the petition as the basis for a facts available margin for NEC. Accordingly, for the final determination, we continue to assign NEC the margin stated in the petition, 454 percent.

C. The All Others Rate

This investigation has the unusual circumstance of both foreign manufacturer/exporters being assigned dumping margins on the basis of facts otherwise available. NEC and Fujitsu are the only Japanese manufacturers of the subject merchandise which have made competing bids for sales to the United States. Section 735(c)(5) of the Act provides that where the dumping margins established for all exporters and exporters and producers individually investigated are determined entirely under section 776, the Department "* * * may use any reasonable method to establish the estimated all-others rate for exporters and producers not individually investigated, including averaging the estimated weighted average dumping margins determined for the exporters and producers individually investigated." This provision contemplates that we weight-average the facts-available margins to establish the all others rate. Where the data is not available to weight-average the facts available rates, the SAA, at 873, provides that we may use other reasonable methods.

Inasmuch as we do not have the data necessary to weight average the NEC and Fujitsu facts-available margins, we have taken the simple average of these margins to apply as the all others rate. This calculation establishes an all others rate of 313.54 percent.

Interested Party Comments

Comment 1 Use of Facts Available for Fujitsu

The petitioner argues that Fujitsu's decision to end its participation in the Department's investigation gives the Department no option but to assign to Fujitsu a dumping margin based on facts available. Further, the petitioner asserts that Fujitsu has not cooperated with the Department in this investigation and that adverse inferences are appropriate in assigning a facts available margin to Fujitsu.

In choosing the appropriate adverse facts available margin, the petitioner notes that although a facts available margin based solely on the information contained in the petition would be consistent with both the statute and Department practice, an alternative approach based on certain data submitted by Fujitsu and adjusted by the petitioner would be more accurate and, therefore, preferred. Using certain data from Fujitsu's questionnaire responses, the petitioner calculated a facts available dumping margin of 388.74 percent. This margin is based on a comparison of an export price and constructed value for Fujitsu's single U.S. sale made during the POI. In calculating the export price, the petitioner made several adjustments to the export price information submitted by Fujitsu. These adjustments include (1) an estimate of U.S. indirect selling expenses based on SG&A expenses reported by Fujitsu's U.S. subsidiary, Fujitsu America, Inc.'s ("FAI") Supercomputer Group; (2) use of a gross U.S. price which includes service revenues for a shorter period of time than that used by Fujitsu; and (3) a recalculation of freight charges, imputed credit, and inventory carrying costs. In calculating the CV for Fujitsu's U.S. sale, the petitioner calculated a value based on adjusted amounts for the cost of manufacture, research and development, general and selling expenses and profit.

Fujitsu acknowledges that the incompleteness of its unverified information on the record in this investigation requires that the Department establish a dumping margin on the basis of facts otherwise available. Fujitsu asserts that the Department has a great deal of discretion within which to assign a margin and requests that the Department either assign the dumping margin calculated for the preliminary determination or adjust the calculation in the petition that was used to determine an alleged dumping margin for NEC.

DOC Position

The Department has assigned a margin based on facts otherwise available for Fujitsu because Fujitsu refused to cooperate in our investigation and prevented our making an accurate margin calculation. We rejected Fujitsu's request to assign the dumping margin calculated for the preliminary determination as facts available. This preliminary margin was calculated before the Department had received Fujitsu's responses to the cost-of-production and constructed value section of our antidumping

questionnaire. For this final determination, the Department relied upon information in the petition, with appropriate adjustments, which Fujitsu suggested as an alternative to the preliminary determination margin. However, we did not accept adjustments to the petition information that Fujitsu made in its recalculation of the petition margin where we were unable to corroborate the adjustment or verify the data relied upon.

The Department also rejected the petitioner's estimated dumping margin for Fujitsu. The petitioner's estimate relied on unverified submissions as well as several of its own assumptions and adverse inferences. Although the petitioner asserts that its calculation is more accurate than relying on information in the petition, we believe that its approach is speculative.

Comment 2 Entries to be Used in the United States Exclusively by Fujitsu

Fujitsu asserts that the Department should not order the suspension of liquidation on entries of covered merchandise for the exclusive use of Fujitsu in the United States. Alternatively, Fujitsu suggests that liquidation be suspended for such entries and that the cash deposit rate for these entries be set at zero. Fujitsu argues that collecting deposits on these entries is unreasonable inasmuch as they will never be sold. The company cites to several Department determinations which excluded certain products from the scope of an investigation on the basis of end-use certificates.

The petitioner asserts that suspension of liquidation must be ordered for these entries. Without suspension of liquidation, the merchandise will enter the United States without the Department or the U.S. Customs Service being in a position to verify that they were used exclusively by Fujitsu. Similarly, the petitioner asserts that cash deposits in the amount of the assigned antidumping duty margin be collected to ensure that the merchandise is not sold after it's used by Fujitsu. The petitioner would have the cash deposits returned to Fujitsu only after the merchandise were reexported or destroyed under the supervision of the Customs Service.

DOC Position

The Department agrees with the petitioner that liquidation of these entries must be suspended because the merchandise is covered by the scope of the investigation and will enter the customs territory of the United States. In the event that merchandise were to be

sold after entry, the suspension of liquidation would safeguard the government's ability to collect antidumping duties. With respect to the collection of cash deposits, the Department is not authorized to order the suspension of liquidation but then to set the cash deposit rate at zero in circumstances where the entered merchandise is clearly covered by the scope of the antidumping duty investigation.

We have examined the citations offered by Fujitsu. They are concerned with investigations in which the scope was defined by the use of the product and other uses were not covered by the scope of investigation. In this investigation, Fujitsu is claiming that vector supercomputer systems that it imports into the United States for its own use ought to be exempt from cash deposits from the order because a related company will be using the covered merchandise exclusively. This is not the situation where certain uses of a vector supercomputer were excluded from the scope of the investigation.

Comment 3 Contracts Entered Into Prior to Suspension of Liquidation

Fujitsu requests that the Department clarify that the suspension of liquidation instructions do not apply to "follow on" importations pursuant to contracts for the sale of vector supercomputers entered into prior to the date of suspension of liquidation in this investigation, April 7, 1997.

Although the petitioner did not address Fujitsu's request in its pre-hearing submissions, it objected to this request at the hearing.

DOC Position

The Department agrees with Fujitsu. We had intended that the suspension of liquidation instructions in our *Preliminary Determination* would apply to entries pursuant to any contract for the sale of a vector supercomputer system on or after the date of its their publication in the **Federal Register**.

Comment 4 Reporting Requirements

Both the petitioner and Fujitsu commented on the Department's requirements set forth in the *Preliminary Determination* for reporting information to the U.S. Customs Service and the Department on entry of the subject merchandise.

This information included copies of the contracts pursuant to which the entries were being made, a description of the merchandise being entered, the actual or estimated price of the complete vector supercomputer system,

and a schedule of all future shipments to be made pursuant to the contract. Both parties were concerned that much of the information requested by the Department in the *Preliminary Determination* was not necessary.

DOC Position

On the basis of these comments and consultations with the U.S. Customs Service, the Department is requiring only that the U.S. importer submit with its entry summary a detailed description of the merchandise included in the entry with documentation that identifies the contract pursuant to which the merchandise is being imported. After examining this documentation for consistency with the entry summary, the Customs Service will forward the documentation to the Department. Detailed descriptions of entries and the identification of the relevant sales contracts are necessary for the Department to be apprised of entries subject to the order independent of administrative reviews and scope inquiries. We expect, also, that the petitioner will inform the Department when it becomes aware of U.S. vector supercomputer contracts being awarded to Japanese manufacturers.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of vector supercomputers from Japan, as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after April 7, 1997, the date of publication of our preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. For these entries, the Customs Service will require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the normal value exceeds the export price as shown below.

MFR/producer exporter	Margin percentage
Fujitsu Ltd.	173.08
NEC Corp.	454.00
All Others	313.54

Entry summaries covering merchandise within the scope of this investigation must be accompanied by documentation provided by the U.S. importer which identifies the vector supercomputer contract pursuant to which the merchandise is imported and describes in detail the merchandise included in the entry. After examining this documentation for consistency with

the entry summary, the Customs Service will forward the documentation to the Department.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. As our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are causing material injury, or threat of material injury, to the industry within 45 days of its receipt of this notification.

If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury, does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or canceled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order directing Customs officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act.

Dated: August 20, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-22968 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Announcement of an Opportunity To Join a Cooperative Research and Development Consortium on Optical Properties of Materials

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) invites interested parties to attend a meeting on October 7, 1997, to discuss setting up a cooperative research consortium. The goal of the consortium is to identify critical industrial needs for NIST to be involved in performing high accuracy measurements, developing necessary standards and critically evaluating existing data on the optical properties of materials that are important for the evolving optical industries in the USA.

DATES: The Meeting will take place at 10 a.m. on October 7, 1997. Interested parties should contact NIST to confirm

their interest at the address, telephone number or FAX number shown below.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at and inquiries should be sent to Room B268, Building 221, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Raju Datla, 301-975-2131; FAX 301-840-8551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The program will be within the scope and confines of the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-502, 15 U.S.C. 3710a), which provides federal laboratories including NIST, with the authority to enter into cooperative research agreements with qualified parties. Under this law, NIST may contribute personnel, equipment, and facilities—but no funds—to the cooperative research program.

Members will be expected to make a contribution to the consortium's efforts in the form of personnel, data, and/or funds. This is not a grant program.

The R&D staff of each industrial partner in the Consortium will be able to interact with NIST researchers on generic measurement needs in the industry for specific optical properties of materials. The industrial partners will also be able to schedule at NIST collaborative projects in which they could participate. All partners will receive a copy of all data on all materials measured. All partners will have a certain amount of NIST measurements made on materials they request. All partners have some influence as to the type and accuracy of the measurements pursued by the consortium.

Dated: August 22, 1997.

Elaine Buntin-Mines,

Director, Program Office.

[FR Doc. 97-22931 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 970620147-7147-01]

National Voluntary Conformity Assessment System Evaluation (NVCASE) Program

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice: Proposal To Establish Recognition Program.

SUMMARY: NIST hereby proposes to establish a recognition program under NVCASE that will recognize accreditors

of Quality System Registrars. NIST recognized accreditors may then accredit companies (Registrars) which in turn may register organizations that operate under applicable quality system standards that satisfy specific foreign regulatory requirements. The resulting recognition program will allow NIST to designate qualified U.S. conformity assessment bodies and assure their competence to other governments.

The action being taken under this notice only addresses development of generic program requirements. Once a generic program is established, applicants will be required to specify the specific mandated foreign regulation(s) covered by the application. In cases where a Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) covering the mutual recognition of conformity assessment has been negotiated between the United States and another country, the sectors which may be included in an application may be limited to those covered by the MRA.

NIST proposes to apply the requirements contained in the *ISO/IEC Guide 61—"General requirements for assessment and accreditation of certification/registration bodies" to all applicant accreditation bodies. If further proposes that registrars applying for accreditation be assessed against the requirements of *ISO/IEC Guide 62—"General requirements for bodies operating assessment and certification/registration of quality systems". These generic requirements will be supplemented with specific sectoral requirements as necessary. Such specific sectoral requirements will be developed through consultation with appropriate experts in the affected sector. Organizations needing to be registered shall be registered to a quality management system standard appropriate for the regulation/sector involved.

*ISO documents available from: International Organization for Standardization, Casa postale 56, CH-1211, Geneve 20, Switzerland.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by September 29, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted in writing to Robert L. Gladhill, NVCASE Program Manager, NIST, Bldg. 820, Room 282, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, by fax 301-963-2871 or E-mail at robert.gladhill@nist.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert L. Gladhill, NVCASE Program Manager, at NIST, Bldg. 820, Room 282, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, by telephone at 301-975-4273 or by telefax at 301-963-2871.