

be provided for each loan. RUS generally obtains a lien on all the property financed by the loans. The borrower will need to provide adequate security and execute the appropriate legal documents.

Evaluation Criteria

Loan applications will be accepted as of the date of this notice and will be processed and approved on a first-come, first served basis throughout FY 2001 until the appropriation is utilized in its entirety provided that:

- (1) The loan is for approved loan purposes for broadband telecommunications services in rural areas;
- (2) The loan is deemed to be feasible and adequate security is provided;
- (3) The system design is appropriate; and
- (4) All other applicable Federal requirements are met.

Dated: November 27, 2000.

Christopher A. McLean,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 00-30872 Filed 12-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE AND TIME: December 12, 2000; 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m.

PLACE: Cohen Building, Room 3321, 330 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20237.

Closed Meeting

The members of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) will meet in closed session to review and discuss a number of issues relating to U.S. Government-funded non-military international broadcasting. They will address internal procedural, budgetary, and personnel issues, as well as sensitive foreign policy issues relating to potential options in the U.S. international broadcasting field. This meeting is closed because if open it likely would either disclose matters that would be properly classified to be kept secret in the interest of foreign policy under the appropriate executive order (5 U.S.C. 552b.(c)(1)) or would disclose information the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed agency action. (5 U.S.C. 552b.(c)(9)(B)) In addition, part of the discussion will relate solely to the internal personnel and organizational issues of the BBG or the International Broadcasting Bureau. (5 U.S.C. 552b.(c)(2) and (6)).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Persons interested in obtaining more information should contact either Brenda Hardnett or Carol Booker at (202) 401-3736.

Dated: December 1, 2000.

Carol Booker,

Legal Counsel.

Certification

Based on the information provided to me, the meeting scheduled by the Broadcasting Board of Governors for December 12, 2000, may be closed to the public pursuant to sections (c)(1), (2), (6), and 9(B) of the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b.).

Issues qualifying for closure of the meeting will be inextricably intertwined with issues which do not so qualify. During the course of the meeting there will be discussions relating to foreign policy options (c)(1), internal BBG or IBB personnel, budgetary, and organizational matters (c)(2), the performance or selection of personnel (c)(6), and options for negotiations or other sensitive discussions within the U.S. or abroad. (c)(9)(B).

Carol Booker,

BBG Legal Counsel.

[FR Doc. 00-31031 Filed 12-1-00; 2:29 pm]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-823-805]

Suspension Agreement on Silicomanganese from Ukraine; Preliminary Results of Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of the administrative review of the suspension agreement on silicomanganese from Ukraine.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Eramet Marietta Inc. (petitioner), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the suspension agreement on silicomanganese from Ukraine ("the Agreement") for the period November 1, 1998 through October 31, 1999, to review the current status of, and compliance with, the Agreement. For the reasons stated in this notice, the Department preliminarily determines that the Government of Ukraine ("the GOU") is not in compliance with the Agreement.

The preliminary results are listed in the section titled "Preliminary Results of Review," infra. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the arguments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 5, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean Kemp or Carrie Blozy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4037 or (202) 482-0165, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, 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 ("Act") by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

Background

On October 31, 1994, the Department signed an agreement with the Government of Ukraine which suspended the antidumping investigation on silicomanganese from Ukraine. *See Silicomanganese from Ukraine; Suspension of Investigation*, 59 FR 60951 (November 29, 1994). In accordance with section 734(g) of the Act, on December 6, 1994, the Department published its final determination of sales at less than fair value in this case. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicomanganese From Ukraine*, 59 FR 62711 (December 6, 1994).

On November 30, 1999, petitioner submitted a request for an administrative review pursuant to the notice of *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 64 FR 62167 (November 16, 1999). On December 28, 1999, the Department initiated a review of the Agreement. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews ("Initiation Notice")*, 64 FR 72644 (December 28, 1999).

On August 4, 2000, the Department extended the time limit for the preliminary results of review by 120 days. *See Notice of Extension of Time*

Limits for the Preliminary Results of Administrative Review of the Suspension Agreement on Silicomanganese From Ukraine, 65 FR 47959 (August 4, 2000). On October 6, 2000, petitioner submitted a letter to the Department requesting that the Department determine within the administrative review that the Government of Ukraine has violated the Agreement. On November 14, 2000, the Department placed on the record of this administrative review a copy of the public version of all sales reports filed by the GOU which cover the reporting periods during the period of review.

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act.

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this agreement is silicomanganese. Silicomanganese, which is sometimes called ferrosilicon manganese, is a ferroalloy composed principally of manganese, silicon, and iron, and normally containing much smaller proportions of minor elements, such as carbon, phosphorous and sulfur. Silicomanganese generally contains by weight not less than 4 percent iron, more than 30 percent manganese, more than 8 percent silicon and not more than 3 percent phosphorous. All compositions, forms and sizes of silicomanganese are included within the scope of this agreement, including silicomanganese slag, fines and briquettes. Silicomanganese is used primarily in steel production as a source of both silicon and manganese. This agreement covers all silicomanganese, regardless of its tariff classification. Most silicomanganese is currently classifiable under subheading 7202.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTS"). Some silicomanganese may also currently be classifiable under HTS subheading 7202.99.5040. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review ("POR") is November 1, 1998 through October 31, 1999.

Preliminary Results of Review

Section 751(a)(1)(C) of the Act specifies that the Department shall "review the current status of, and compliance with, any agreement by reason of which an investigation was suspended.* * *" In this case the Department and the GOU signed the Agreement suspending the antidumping

duty investigation on silicomanganese from Ukraine on October 31, 1994. In order to effectively restrict the volume of exports of silicomanganese from Ukraine to the United States, the Agreement provides for the implementation by the GOU of certain provisions (Article VII). Moreover, Article IX of the Agreement (Monitoring) requires the GOU to "provide to the Department such information as is necessary and appropriate to monitor the implementation of and compliance with the terms of {the} Agreement." One of the tools the Department uses to monitor the Agreement is sales reports filed by the GOU. Specifically, the GOU is required to collect and provide to the Department sales data on silicomanganese from Ukraine to the United States, in the home market, and to countries other than the United States in the format specified in Appendix B. Although the Agreement specifies that these sales reports are to be submitted to the Department on a semi-annual basis, subsequent to the signing of the Agreement the GOU agreed to submit the sales reports on a quarterly basis. See Paris Minutes, Memorandum of Consultations Regarding Administration of the Silicomanganese Suspension Agreement, (May 28, 1998), which are attached as exhibit 1 to petitioner's October 6, 2000 letter.

For the first three reporting periods of the POR, the GOU timely submitted their sales reports; however, to date, the GOU has not filed a sales report for the fourth reporting period of the POR.¹ In their October 6, 2000 letter, which was filed on the record of this administrative review, petitioner, arguing that the GOU has violated the Agreement and that the Agreement can no longer be effectively monitored, calls for the Department to cancel the Agreement, issue the antidumping duty order and take the other actions required by law when a suspension agreement has been violated. Specifically, as evidence that the GOU has violated the Agreement, petitioner cites the failure by the GOU to file a sales report for the last four reporting periods² as well as other alleged sales reporting and implementation violations, which were alleged in a February 3, 1998 letter to the Department, a copy of which is attached as an exhibit to the October 6, 2000 letter.

It is indisputable that the GOU failed to file a required sales report for the last period of the POR. Although parties

¹The report covering the period August 1, 1999 to October 31, 1999 was due on December 1, 1999.

²This includes three reporting periods outside of the POR.

may dispute whether this omission alone constitutes non-compliance with the Agreement, absent complete and verifiable information on sales of silicomanganese from Ukraine during the POR, the Department cannot conclusively determine whether the GOU has complied with the provisions of the Agreement restricting the price and volume of direct and indirect exports of silicomanganese from Ukraine to the United States over the POR. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that the GOU has not been in compliance with the Agreement during the POR. Nevertheless, at this time we are not reaching a determination on petitioner's allegation that the Agreement has been violated. As stated at the beginning of this section, the purpose of this administrative review is to "review the current status of, and compliance with" the Agreement. Consequently, within this administrative review, the Department will determine the status of the Agreement and whether the GOU was in compliance with the Agreement over the POR. If the Department makes a final determination of non-compliance, it will then be necessary to determine whether this non-compliance rises to the level of a violation as defined in Article XII of the Agreement.

Therefore, to provide all interested parties an opportunity to address our preliminary finding of non-compliance and whether such non-compliance constitutes a violation, we are extending the deadline for submission of factual information, other than the reports required under the Agreement, until 30 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Public Comment

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 60 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. At the hearing, each party may make an affirmative presentation only on issues raised in that party's case brief, and may make rebuttal presentations only on arguments included in that party's rebuttal brief. See 19 C.F.R. 351.310(c).

Any hearing, if requested, will be held 67 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case

briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 60 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. If this review proceeds normally, 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.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 29, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-30955 Filed 12-4-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty new shipper review: stainless steel bar From India.

SUMMARY: On October 4, 2000, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Atlas Stainless Corporation. This review covers sales of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period February 1, 1999 through January 31, 2000. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review but received no comments. The final results do not differ from the preliminary results of review, in which we found that the respondent did not make sales in the United States at prices below normal value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 5, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Blanche Ziv or Ryan Langan, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4207 or (202) 482-1279, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's ("the Department's") regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

Background

On October 4, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its new shipper review of stainless steel bar from India. See *Preliminary Results of the New Shipper Review*, 65 FR 59173 (October 4, 2000). We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. We received no comments. The Department has now completed the new shipper review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of stainless steel bar ("SSB"). SSB means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), wire (*i.e.*, cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The SSB subject to these orders is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.10.0005, 7222.10.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the

Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Final Results of the Review

We received no comments from interested parties on our preliminary results. In addition, we have determined that no changes to our analysis are warranted for purposes of these final results. The weighted-average dumping margin for Atlas for the period February 1, 1999 through January 31, 2000, is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter		Margin
Atlas Stainless Corporation ("Atlas")	0.00%

Because the weighted-average dumping margin is zero, we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate entries made during this review period without regard to antidumping duties for the subject merchandise that Atlas exported.

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of stainless steel bar from India, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash-deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate indicated above; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed companies, 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 or any previous review or the original less-than-fair-value 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; and (4) the cash-deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 12.45 percent, the all-others rate.

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

This notice serves as a final 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