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 this 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 751(c)(6) of the Act, the Secretary will apply paragraph (j)(1) of the Department's Regulations to any administrative review initiated in 1998 (19 CFR 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: December 21, 1999.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–33657 Filed 12–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–427–009

Industrial Nitrocellulose From France; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On September 15, 1999, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 50107) the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose from France. This review covers the period August 1, 1998, through July 31, 1999. As a result of the withdrawal of the sole request for a review, the Department has now rescinded this administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 28, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyn Johnson or Robin Gray, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1999 (64 FR 43649), a ''Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose from France (48 FR 36303, August 10, 1983). On August 31, 1999, Bergerac, N.C., the respondent in this proceeding, requested an administrative review of the order covering industrial nitrocellulose from France for the review period August 1, 1998, through July 31, 1999. The Department published the notice of initiation of this administrative review in the **Federal Register** on September 15, 1999 (64 FR 50107).

On October 6, 1999, Bergerac, N.C., withdrew its request for a review. Because there were no other requests for review of Bergerac, N.C., we are rescinding this review covering shipments of subject merchandise from France during the period August 1, 1998, through July 31, 1999. The cash-deposit rate for Bergerac, N.C., will remain 13.35 percent, which is the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding (63 FR 49085, September 14, 1998).

This notice rescinding the administrative review is in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d).

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–33655 Filed 12–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–810]

Certain Welded ASTM A–312 Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded ASTM A–312 stainless steel pipe (WSSP) from Korea in response to a request by Avesta Sheffield Pipe Co.; Damascus Tube Division, Damascus-Bishop Tube Co.; and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL–CIO/CLC), herein referred to as ''the domestic industry.'' This review covers exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the period December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998.

We have preliminarily determined that SeAH Steel Corporation Ltd. (SeAH) has made sales below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the constructed export price (CEP) and the NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments are requested to submit with each comment a statement of the issue and a brief summary of the comment.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 28, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Gilgunn, Mark Hoadley, or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230: telephone: (202) 482–0648, (202) 482–0666, and (202) 482–3020, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS: Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise stated, all

citations to the Department's regulations are references to the regulations as codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on WSSP from Korea on December 30, 1992 (57 FR 62301). On December 8, 1998, we published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 67646) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on WSSP from Korea covering the period December 1, 1998 through November 30, 1999.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), the domestic parties requested that we conduct an administrative review of SeAH's sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on January 25, 1999 (64 FR 36821).

During this review, the Department conducted a verification of the information provided by SeAH from November 11, 1999 through November 13, 1999. We used standard verification procedures, including the examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification results for SeAH are outlined in business proprietary and public versions of the verification reports on file with the Central Records Unit, in Room B–099 of the Herbert C. Hoover Building.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this administrative review, WSSP, is austenitic stainless steel pipe that meets the standards and specifications set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) for the welded form of chromium-nickel pipe designated ASTM A–312. WSSP is produced by forming stainless steel flat-rolled products into a tubular configuration and welding along the seam. WSSP is a commodity product generally used as a conduit to transmit liquids or gases. Major applications for WSSP include, but are not limited to, digester lines, blow lines, pharmaceutical lines, petrochemical stock lines, brewery process and transport lines, general food processing lines, automotive paint lines and paper process machines. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following United States Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7306.40.5005, 7306.40.5015, 7306.40.5045, 7306.40.5060 and 7306.40.5075. Although these subheadings include both pipes and tubes, the scope of this order is limited to welded austenitic stainless steel pipes.

Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by SeAH covered by the description in the ''Scope of Review'' section, above, and sold in the home market during the period of review (POR) to be foreign like products for the purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons with U.S. sales. In the Product Characteristics section (B3.1–B3.n and C3.1–C3.n) of our questionnaire, we provided the following hierarchy of product characteristics to be used for reporting identical and most similar comparisons of merchandise: (1) Specification/Alloy; (2) Size; (3) Hot or Cold Finish; (4) Wall Thickness; (5) End Finish; (6) Pipe Length; and (7) Other Characteristics.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise to the United States were made at less than NV, we compared the CEP to NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average home market prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transaction prices.

United States Price

Because SeAH and Pusan Pipe of America (PPA) are affiliated, and the subject merchandise was not sold to an unaffiliated purchaser until after its importation into the United States, we used CEP as United States Price. The starting price for CEP is the price from PPA to unaffiliated customers in the United States.

The Department calculated CEP for SeAH based on the ''ex port duty paid'' (net of discounts) price to PPA's customer in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we reduced CEP by movement expenses (foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage, and U.S. duties). In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we deducted direct selling expenses (credit and warranty expenses) and indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs. Finally, we added Korean duty drawback and made an adjustment for an amount of profit allocated to selling expenses incurred in the United States, in accordance with section 772(c) and (d) of the Act.

Date of Sale

Under the Department's current practice, the invoice date is normally the date of sale. We may, however, use a date other than the invoice date if we are satisfied that a different date better reflects the date on which the exporter or producer establishes the material terms of sale. *See* 19 CFR 351.401(i); *Preamble to the Antidumping Duty Regs.,* 62 FR at 27411.

SeAH reported PPA's date of invoice as its U.S. date of sale. The domestic industry argued that the Department should deny SeAH's reported date of sale. The domestic industry asserts that both price and quantity are established before the date that PPA issues its invoice and that PPA is ''not responsible for the establishment of the terms of sale.''

After examination of SeAH's and PPA's respective roles in sales process, we determined that one of the material terms (*i.e.* quantity) of SeAH's sales to unaffiliated customers are not fixed until PPA's invoice date. Thus, we used the date of PPA's invoice to its unaffiliated customer as the date of sale.

Because most of the information on which we relied to perform our analysis is proprietary, it cannot be discussed in this notice. However, a memorandum detailing our analysis has been prepared. (See the proprietary version of the Memo from Thomas Gilgunn to Barbara E. Tillman regarding ''Date of Sale for SeAH Steel Corporation and Pusan Pipe America'' (Decision Memo), dated December 17, 1999.)

Normal Value

The Department determines the viability of the home market as the comparison market by comparing the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales. We found that SeAH's quantity of sales in its home market exceeded five percent of its sales to the United States. We therefore have determined that SeAH's home market sales are viable for purposes of comparison with sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and section 351.404 of our regulations. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the price, net of discounts, at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the CEP sales. *See* the ''Level of

Trade section'' below. We determined what home market merchandise was most similar to the merchandise sold in the United States on the basis of product characteristics set forth in sections B and C of the Department's questionnaire.

For comparisons to CEP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses (credit expenses) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for movement expenses, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (a)(6)(B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in the costs of manufacture for subject merchandise and matching foreign like products, attributable to their differing physical characteristics, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act, and, based upon our level of trade analysis, discussed below, for home market indirect selling expenses up to the amount of U.S. indirect selling expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and section 351.412(f) of the Department's regulations. *See Analysis Memorandum* (December 17, 1999).

Cost of Production

In the last completed segment of this proceeding, the Department disregarded sales below the cost of production (COP). *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From The Republic of Korea,* 57 FR 53693, (November 12, 1992). We therefore have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review may have been made at prices below COP. Pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we initiated a COP investigation of sales in the home market. Using market sales and COP information provided by the respondent, we compared sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market with the model-specific COP figure for the POR. In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, including all costs and expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed and ready for shipment.

After calculating COP, we tested whether comparison market sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below COP and, if so, whether the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and at prices that did not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Because each individual price was compared to the POR-long average COP, any sales that were below cost were also determined not to be at prices which permitted cost recovery within a reasonable period of time. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported comparison market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given model during the POR were at prices less than the weighted-average COPs for the POR, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they were made over an extended period of time in substantial quantities in accordance with sections 773(b)(2) (B) and (C) of the Act, and were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used constructed value (CV) as the basis for NV when there were no above-cost contemporaneous sales of identical or similar merchandise in the comparison market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondents in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the home market at the same level of trade (LOT) as U.S. sales. The NV LOT is the level of the starting-price sale in the home market or, when NV is based on constructed value, the level of the sales from which we derive selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A) and profit. For export price, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer. To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than export price or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa,* 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

For merchandise sold in the home market during this POR, SeAH claimed two distribution channels and one LOT. Regardless of the distribution channel, the selling functions performed by SeAH were substantially the same. Therefore, we concluded all sales in the home market were made at one LOT. Further, because all U.S. sales were CEP sales made in the same distribution channel and SeAH performed the same selling functions for all customers, we concluded that all sales in the U.S. market were made at one LOT.

We then compared the selling functions in the U.S. and home markets. At the level of CEP sales to the United States, *i.e.,* after eliminating from consideration the selling functions associated with deductions made under section 772 of the Act, we found that the CEP sales were made at a different and less advanced level of trade than home market sales.

Because there are no sales in the home market made at the same LOT as sales in the United States, we were not able to determine whether the difference in LOT affects price comparability. Therefore, we made a CEP offset adjustment. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.412(f)(2), we deducted indirect selling expenses from NV to the extent of U.S. indirect selling expenses deducted in calculating CEP. For a further discussion of the Department's

LOT analysis with respect to SeAH, see *Analysis Memorandum* (December 17, 1999).

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A of the Act. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. The Department considers a ''fluctuation'' to exist when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent or more. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation to have existed, we generally substitute the benchmark rate for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice. (An exception to this rule is described below.) (For an explanation of this method, see Policy Bulletin 96–1: Currency Conversions (61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996).)

Our analysis of the U.S. dollar/Korean won exchange rates demonstrates that the Korean won declined rapidly in November and December 1997. Specifically, the won declined more than 40 percent over this two-month period. The decline was, in both speed and magnitude, many times more severe than any change in the dollar-won exchange rate during recent years, and it did not rebound significantly in a short time. As such, we determine that the decline in the won during November and December 1997 was of such magnitude that the dollar-won exchange rate cannot reasonably be viewed as having simply fluctuated at that time, *i.e.,* as having experienced only a momentary drop in value relative to the normal benchmark. Accordingly, the Department used actual daily exchange rates exclusively in November and December 1997. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip from the Republic of Korea,* 64 FR 30664, 30670 (June 8, 1999) (''*SSSS from Korea*''). We note, however, that we have refined our methodology somewhat from that applied in *SSSS from Korea.* We recognize that, following a large and precipitous decline in the value of a currency, a period may exist wherein it is unclear whether further declines are a continuation of the large and precipitous decline or merely fluctuations. Under the circumstances of this case, such uncertainty may have existed following the large, precipitous drop in November and December 1997. Thus, we devised a methodology for identifying the point following a precipitous drop at which it is reasonable to presume that rates, more than 2.25 percent from the benchmark, were merely fluctuating. Following the precipitous drop in November and December 1997, we continued to use only actual daily rates until the daily rates were not more than 2.25 percent below the average of the 20 previous daily rates for five consecutive days. At that point, we determined that the pattern of daily rates no longer reasonably precluded the possibility that they were merely ''fluctuating.'' Using a 20-day average for this purpose provides a reasonable indication that it is no longer necessary to refrain from using the normal methodology, while avoiding the use of daily rates exclusively for an excessive period of time. Accordingly, from the first of these five days, we resumed classifying daily rates as ''fluctuating'' or ''normal'' in accordance with our standard practice, except that we began with a 20-day benchmark and on each succeeding day added a daily rate to the average until the normal 40-day average was restored as the benchmark. *See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand,* 64 FR 56759, 56763 (October 21, 1999). *See also Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke in Part,* 64 FR 62648, 62649 (November 17, 1999).

Applying this methodology in the instant case, we used daily rates from November 3, 1997, through January 13, 1998. We then resumed the use of our normal methodology, starting with a benchmark based on the average of the 20 reported daily rates from January 14, 1998. We used the normal 40-day benchmark from February 12, 1998 to the close of the review period.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the weighted-average dumping margin for the period December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998 to be as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
SeAH	2.44

The Department will disclose to the parties to the proceeding calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results of review within five days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 2 days after the date of filing of rebuttal briefs or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed not later than five days after the date of filing of case briefs. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.202(b), we calculated an importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for each reviewed company will be that established in the final results of review (except that no deposit will be required for firms with *de minimis* margins, *i.e.,* margins less than 0.5 percent); (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation, which was 6.83 percent. 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) 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 administrative review and notice are issued in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 U.S.C 1677f(i)(1)).

Dated: December 17, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–33654 Filed 12–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 99–030. Applicant: University of Massachusetts, Biology Department, Morrill Science Center, Amherst, MA 01003-5810. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model Tecnai 12. Manufacturer: FEU Company, The Netherlands. Intended Use: The instrument is intended to be used to view the end products of experiments, including immunolabeling of specific proteins, properties of genetically altered organisms and protein complexes under different ionic conditions. The specific research objectives vary widely but all aim to generate basic information about organisms, cells or subcellular components. In addition, the instrument will be used to demonstrate transmission electron microscopy for several courses, including Biology 523 (Histology) and Biotechnology. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: December 6, 1999.

Docket Number: 99–031. Applicant: University of Vermont, Department of Surgery, Given E–305, Burlington, VT 05405. Instrument: HVS Video Tracking System, Pool and Platform, Model 2020. Manufacturer: HVS Image Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: The instrument is intended to be used for the study of multiple minor head injuries using a rat model in order to provide information that may be helpful in understanding why there are anecdotes in the human population of poor outcomes after seemingly minor recurrent head injuries. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: December 6, 1999.

Docket Number: 99–032. Applicant: University of California, Los Alamos National Laboratory, BUS–6, P.O. Box 1663, MS C308, Los Alamos, NM 87545. Instrument: Solid State Quantum Computer, Model Multiprobe S. Manufacturer: Omicron Vakuum Physik GmbH, Germany. Intended Use: The first scaleable solid state quantum computer will be used to produce an array of atoms on a Si (001) surface. The work requires using a scanning tunneling microscope for the precise placement in individual atoms of phosphorus in an array with 20 nanometer spacing on an atomically cleaned silicon substrate surface. The work also includes studying the stability and properties of such a structure at different temperatures. This investigation will also include work that will determine the best phosphorus bearing chemical species to use in this application. A silicon overlayer will bury this array. Electric contact gates will be positioned on top of the overlayer over the phosphorus sites.

Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: December 8, 1999.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 99–33656 Filed 12–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 122299A]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Large Pelagic Fishing Survey.

Agency Form Number: None.

OMB Approval Number: 0648–0380.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Burden Hours: 5,032 hours.

Number of Respondents: 20,000 (multiple responses).

Average Hours Per Response: Ranges between 2 and 15 minutes depending on the requirement.

Needs and Uses: The Large Pelagic Fishing survey consists of dockside and telephone surveys of recreational anglers for large pelagic fish (tunas, sharks, and billfish) in the Atlantic Ocean. The survey provides the National Marine Fisheries Service with information to monitor catch of bluefin tuna and marlin. Catch monitoring in these fisheries and collection of catch and effort statistics for all pelagic fish is required under the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The information collected is essential for the U.S. meet its reporting obligations to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna.

Affected Public: Individuals, businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion, weekly.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5027, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230 (or via the Internet at LEngelme@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: December 17, 1999.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–33666 Filed 12–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F