

Benchmarks That Reflect Market Conditions in Jurisdiction in Which the Good Is Provided

Comment 21: Whether Private Standing Timber in the Maritimes is Comparable to Standing Timber in Provinces East of British Columbia

Comment 22: Whether Quebec's Private Forest Is More Competitive than That of the Maritimes

Comment 23: Whether the Department Market Conditions in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Are Similar Enough to Be Combined into a Single Benchmark Price

Comment 24: Whether the Private Stumpage Prices in the Maritimes, as Reported by AGFOR, Reflect Actual Stumpage Transactions

Comment 25: Whether Tree Diameters in Alberta and the Maritimes are Sufficiently Comparable

4. Use of U.S. Prices as Benchmark for Measuring the Adequacy of Remuneration

Comment 26: Montana as an Alternate Benchmark for Alberta

Comment 27: Use of Cross-Border Benchmark

Comment 28: Whether Fundamental Differences in Log Market Conditions Exist in the U.S. Pacific Northwest and British Columbia

Comment 29: Whether U.S. Log Price Data Are Complete, Representative, and Reliable

Comment 30: B.C. Log Import and Export Data

D. *Stumpage Calculation Issues*

1. Calculation of Maritime Benchmark

Comment 31: Data Used to Index Private Maritime Stumpage Prices to the POR

Comment 32: Rounding of the Maritimes Stumpage Index

Comment 33: Method Used to Weight Average Benchmark Prices in New Brunswick

Comment 34: Weighting of Benchmark Studwood Stumpage Prices in Nova Scotia

Comment 35: Method for Deriving a Single Weight Average Price for Standing Timber Prices from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia

Comment 36: Application of Marketing Fees Added to Maritimes Benchmark

Comment 37: Calculation of Marketing Board Levies Added to Private Stumpage Prices in New Brunswick

Comment 38: Calculation of Silviculture Fee Added to Private Stumpage Prices in Nova Scotia

2. Calculation of British Columbia Benchmark

Comment 39: Factor Used to Convert from Tons to Thousand Board Feet

Comment 40: Log Market Report Data Relate Only to Small Log Sales

Comment 41: High Value of Cypress

Comment 42: Log Price Data from Other States that Border British Columbia

Comment 43: Negative Species-Specific Benefit

Comment 44: Volume Conversion Factors Used for U.S. Log Prices Expressed in Thousand Board Feet

Comment 45: Pond Values

Comment 46: Stud Log Values

Comment 47: Additional U.S. Log Price Data

Comment 48: Averaging of U.S. Benchmark Log Values

3. Adjustments to Government Stumpage Prices

a. Alberta

Comment 49: Whether the Department Properly Adjusted the GOA's Administered Stumpage Price

b. British Columbia

Comment 50: Old-Growth Adjustment
Comment 51: Other Harvesting Costs for B.C. Interior

Comment 52: Proper Calculation of Profit Earned by B.C. Tenureholders

c. Saskatchewan

Comment 53: Whether the Department Properly Adjusted the GOS's Administered Stumpage Price

d. Manitoba

Comment 54: Whether the Department Properly Adjusted the GOM's Administered Stumpage Price

e. Ontario

Comment 55: Whether the Department Properly Adjusted the GOO's Administered Stumpage Price to Account for Road Costs

Comment 56: Whether the Department Properly Adjusted the GOO's Administered Stumpage Price to Account for Longer Distances from Stump to Mill and Mill to Market

Comment 57: Whether Maritimes "Studwood" Is More Comparable To Timber Entering Ontario Sawmills Than Maritimes "Sawlogs"

f. Quebec

Comment 58: Quebec Road Costs
E. Whether to Measure the Adequacy of Remuneration of the Administered Stumpage Programs Under Tier III of the Department's Regulations

Comment 59: Market Principles as Benchmark Under Third-Tier Category

F. *Miscellaneous Comment*

Comment 60: Tenure Security

G. *Non-Stumpage Program Issues*

Comment 61: Whether Loans Provided by Community Futures Development Corporations Provide a Countervailable Subsidy

Comment 62: Western Economic Diversification Program

Comment 63: Whether the Canadian Forest Service Industry, Trade and Economics Program Provides a Countervailable Subsidy

Comment 64: Article 28 of Investissement Quebec

Comment 65: SGF-Rexfor

Comment 66: Whether the Land Base Investment Program (LBIP) is Countervailable

Comment 67: Whether the Private Forest Development Program (PFDP) Is Countervailable

Comment 68: Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) Softwood Lumber Marketing Research Subsidies Under the Value-to-Wood Program (VWP) and the National Research Institutes Initiative (NRII)

Comment 69: Whether Forestry Innovation Investment ("FII") Expenditures Are Countervailable

Comment 70: Denominator Used to Calculate the FII Subsidies

Comment 71: Litigation-Related Payments to Forest Products Association of Canada (FPAC)

Comment 72: British Columbia Private Forest Land Tax Program

[FR Doc. 05-23921 Filed 12-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-540 and 541 (Second Review)]

Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Korea and Taiwan

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Commission determination to conduct full five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Korea and Taiwan.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Korea and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 5, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202-205-3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-

impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 5, 2005, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act. The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (70 FR 52124, September 1, 2005) was adequate but that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. However, the Commission found that other circumstances warranted conducting full reviews.¹ A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

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: December 7, 2005.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E5-7245 Filed 12-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Technology Administration

Request for Nominations of Members to Serve on the National Medal of Technology Nomination Evaluation Committee

AGENCY: Technology Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of request for nominations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Technology Administration) is requesting nominations of individuals

to serve on the National Medal of Technology Nomination Evaluation Committee. Technology Administration will consider nominations received in response to this notice as well as from other sources. The **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice provides Committee and membership criteria.

DATES: Please submit nominations within 30 days of the publication of this notice.

ADDRESSES: Submit nominations to Mildred Porter, Director, National Medal of Technology Program, Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 4817, Washington, DC 20230. Nominations also may be submitted via fax at 202-482-6275, or e-mail to: nmt@technology.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mildred Porter, Director, National Medal of Technology Program, Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 4817, Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482-5572.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Committee was established in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (Title 5, United States Code, Appendix 2). The following provides information about the Committee and membership.

1. Committee members are appointed by and serve at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce. The Committee provides advice to the Secretary on the implementation of Public Law 96-480 (15 U.S.C. 3711). Public Law 105-309; 15 U.S.C. 3711, Section 10, approved by the 105th Congress in 1998, added the National Technology Medal for Environmental Technology.

2. The Committee functions solely as an advisory body under the FACA. Members are appointed to the 12-member Committee for a period of three-years. Each will be reevaluated at the conclusion of the three-year term with the prospect of renewal, pending Advisory Committee needs and the Secretary's concurrence. Selection of membership is made in accordance with applicable Department of Commerce guidelines.

3. Members are responsible for reviewing nominations and making recommendations for the Nation's highest honor for technological innovation, awarded annually by the President of the United States. Members of the Committee have an understanding of, and experience in, developing and

utilizing technological innovation and/or they are familiar with the education, training, employment and management of technological human resources.

4. Under the FACA, membership in a committee must be balanced. To achieve balance, the Department is seeking additional nominations of candidates from small, medium-sized, and large businesses or with special expertise in the following sub sectors of the technology enterprise:

- Medical Innovations/Bioengineering and Biomedical Technology
- Technology Management/Computing/IT/Manufacturing Innovation
- Technology Manpower/Workforce Training/Education

Committee members are present or former Chief Executive Officers, former winners of the National Medal of Technology; presidents or distinguished faculty of universities; or senior executives of non-profit organizations. As such, they not only offer the stature of their positions but also possess intimate knowledge of the forces determining future directions for their organizations and industries. The Committee as a whole is balanced in representing geographical, professional, and diversity interests.

Nomination Information:

1. Nominees must be U.S. citizens, must be able to fully participate in meetings pertaining to the review and selection of finalists for the National Medal of Technology, and must uphold the confidential nature of an independent peer review and competitive selection process.

2. The Department of Commerce is committed to equal opportunity in the workplace and seeks a broad-based and diverse Committee membership.

Michelle O'Neill,

Acting Under Secretary for Technology, Technology Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-7185 Filed 12-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of the

¹ Chairman Stephen Koplan and Commissioners Jennifer A. Hillman and Shara L. Aranoff dissenting.