testimony *in camera* no later than 7 days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written submissions.—Each party to the reviews may submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.65 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is June 26, 2003. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.67 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is July 17, 2003; witness testimony must be filed no later than three days before the hearing. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the reviews may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the reviews on or before July 17, 2003. On August 7, 2003, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before August 11, 2003, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.68 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: March 17, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–6740 Filed 3–20–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–U

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–468]

Certain Microlithographic Machines and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review a Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337 Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the final initial determination (''ID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on January 29, 2003, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the above-captioned investigation. Accordingly, the Commission has terminated the investigation with a finding of no violation of section 337.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Timothy P. Monaghan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3152. Copies of the public version of the ID and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons 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*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS–ON–LINE) at *http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this patent-based section 337 investigation on January 24, 2002, based on a complaint filed by the Nikon Corporation of Tokyo, Japan, and Nikon Precision Inc. and Nikon Research Corporation of America of Belmont, California (collectively, ''Nikon''). The respondents named in the investigation were ASM Lithography Holding N.V. and ASM Lithography B.V. of the Netherlands and ASM Lithography, Inc. of Tempe, Arizona (collectively, ''ASML''). The complaint alleged that ASML has violated section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 by importing into the United States, selling for importation, and/or selling within the United States after importation certain microlithographic machines and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of seven U.S. patents: U.S. Patents Nos. 6,008,500 (the '500 patent), 6,271,640 (the '640 patent), 6,255,796 (''the '796 patent''), 6,323,935 (''the '935 patent''), 5,473,410 (''the '410 patent''), 5,638,211 (''the '211 patent''), and 6,233,041(''the '041 patent).

On January 29, 2003, the ALJ issued his final ID finding no violation of section 337 based on his finding that claims 1 and 7 of the '500 patent and claim 1 of the '640 patent are anticipated by the Micrascan machine; claim 30 of the '640 is anticipated by the Doran '242 patent and is not enabled; ASML's Twinscan machine does not infringe claims 1 and 16 of the '796 patent or claims 1, 78, and 84 of the '935 patent, nor do Nikon's domestic machines practice claims 1 of the '796 patent or claim 1 of the '935 patent; claim 1 of the '935 patent is invalid for failure to satisfy the written description requirement and is not enabled under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1, and is invalid for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2; claim 19 of the '410 patent is invalid as obvious and is unenforceable by reason of inequitable conduct; and ASML's Twinscan machine does not infringe any claim at issue of the '211 and '041 patents, nor do Nikon's domestic machines practice any claim of the '211 or '041 patents.

On February 10, 2003, Nikon, ASML, and the Commission investigative attorneys filed petitions for review of the final ID. On February 19, 2003, the parties filed responses to each other's petitions for review.

Having reviewed the record in this investigation, including the parties' written submissions, the Commission determined not to review (*i.e.*, to adopt) the ID in its entirety, except that it determined to take no position on the ALJ's finding that claim 30 of the '640 patent is anticipated by the Doran '242 patent and his findings on criteria (A) and (B) of the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3) when a domestic product is made partly or wholly abroad.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and section 210.42 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 19 CFR 210.42.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 17, 2003.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–6854 Filed 3–20–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 701–TA–432 and 731–TA–1024–1028 (Preliminary)]

Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand From Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a))(the Act), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from India of prestressed concrete steel wire strand (''PC strand'') that are alleged to be subsidized by the Government of India and by reason of imports from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand of PC strand that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV). The subject merchandise is provided for in subheading 7312.10.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the Department of Commerce (Commerce) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 703(b) and 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in the investigations under sections 705(a) and 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

Background

On January 31, 2003, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by American Spring Wire Corp., Bedford Heights, OH; Insteel Wire Products Co., Mt. Airy, NC; and Sumiden Wire Products Corp., Stockton, CA, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of subsidized imports of PC strand from India and by reason of LTFV imports of PC strand from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand. Accordingly, effective January 31, 2003, the Commission instituted countervailing duty investigation No. 701–TA–432 and antidumping duty investigations Nos. 731–TA–1024–1028 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of February 7, 2003 (68 FR 6511). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on February 21, 2003, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on March 17, 2003. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3589 (March 2003), entitled Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand: Investigations Nos. 701–TA–432 and 731–TA–1024–1028 (Preliminary).

Issued: March 17, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–6853 Filed 3–20–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

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

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation TA–2104–6]

U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement: Potential Economywide and Selected Sectoral Effects

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation and scheduling of public hearing.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 3, 2003.

SUMMARY: Following receipt of a request on January 21, 2003, from the United States Trade Representative (USTR), the Commission instituted investigation No. TA–2104–6, U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement: Potential Economywide and Selected Sectoral Effects, under section 2104(f) of the Trade Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 3804(f)).

Background: As requested by the USTR, the Commission will prepare a report as specified in section 2104(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 3804(f)(2)) assessing the likely impact of the U.S.-Singapore FTA on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors and the interests of U.S. consumers. Specifically, the report will—

assess the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

In preparing its assessment, the Commission will review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and will provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement. Section 2104(f)(2) requires that the Commission submit its report to the President and the Congress not later than 90 days after the President enters into the agreement, which he can do 90 days after he notifies the Congress of his intent to do so. The President notified the Congress on January 30, 2003, of his intent to enter into the FTA with Singapore.