

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd day of December 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.*

**John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-32355 Filed 12-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 937]

#### Grant of Authority for Subzone Status Fossil Partners, L.P.; (Watches, Sunglasses, Accessories) Richardson, Texas

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

*Whereas*, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act "To provide for the establishment . . . of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes," as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

*Whereas*, the Board's regulations (15 CFR part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

*Whereas*, an application from the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board, grantee of FTZ 39, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the warehousing/distribution facility (watches, sunglasses and accessories) of Fossil Partners, L.P., in Richardson, Texas, was filed by the Board on March 12, 1997, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 15-97, 62 FR 13595, 3-2-97); and,

*Whereas*, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

*Now, therefore*, the Board hereby authorizes the establishment of a subzone (Subzone 39E) at the Fossil Partners, L.P. facility in Richardson, Texas, at the location described in the

application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd day of December 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.*

**John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-32354 Filed 12-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-405-071]

#### Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Viscose Rayon Staple Fiber From Finland

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

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

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request by the petitioners, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on viscose rayon staple fiber from Finland. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Kemira Fibres Oy, during the review period, March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results of review. Parties who submit comments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, please contact Laurel LaCivita or Alexander Amdur at Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4740 or (202) 482-5346, 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 (URAA). In addition,

unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1997).

#### Background

On March 21, 1979, the Treasury Department published in the **Federal Register** (44 FR 17156) the antidumping duty finding on viscose rayon staple fiber from Finland. This finding was revoked on November 7, 1994 (59 FR 55441), effective as of April 1, 1993. The revocation was rescinded on February 22, 1997 (61 FR 6814). On March 28, 1997, the petitioners, Courtalds Fibers Inc. ("Courtalds") and Lenzing Fibers Corporation ("Lenzing"), requested that the Department of Commerce ("the Department") conduct an antidumping administrative review of Kemira Fibres Oy ("Kemira"), the only known producer of viscose rayon fiber in Finland, and any related, affiliated, or successor company or companies. On April 24, 1997, we published a notice of initiation of this administrative review covering the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997, (62 FR 19988) for Kemira. We issued a questionnaire on May 20, 1997. We received section A, B and C questionnaire responses from Kemira on July 3, 1997. We issued a supplemental questionnaire on August 15, 1997. We received a supplemental response from Kemira on September 10, 1997. We issued a second supplemental questionnaire on September 22, 1997. Kemira responded to this letter on October 6, 1997. On October 27, 1997, Kemira submitted information concerning sales of VISIL fiber, which it maintains are outside of the scope of the finding.

On August 28, 1997, the Department solicited comments from all interested parties concerning the model match criteria and methodology to be used in this review. It received comments from the petitioners on September 11, 1997 and October 24, 1997, and from the respondent on September 16, 1997 and November 4, 1997.

We conducted a verification of home market and United States sales at Kemira's headquarters in Valkeakoski, Finland from November 3, 1997 to November 7, 1997.

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

#### Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is viscose rayon staple fiber, except solution dyed, in noncontinuous form, not carded, not combed and not otherwise processed, wholly of filaments (except laminated filaments

and plexiform filaments). The term includes both commodity and specialty fiber. This product is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) item numbers 5504.10.00 and 5504.90.00. The HTS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the finding remains dispositive.

### Scope Issues

Kemira claims that short-cut (LK) fibers and semi-viscose fire-retardant (VISIL) fibers are excluded from the scope of the finding, while petitioners claim that they are included.<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, Kemira argues that LK fiber is excluded from the scope of the finding because it is cut in small sizes (specifically, 1/4-inch to 1/2-inch sizes), has a unique production line, and is used by the paper industry, rather than the textile industry. Petitioners claim that the scope of the finding does not limit the definition of rayon staple fiber based on fiber length or end use and that, consequently, LK fiber should be included in the scope of the review.

Kemira claims that VISIL fiber is excluded from the scope of the finding because it is a hybrid fiber containing substantial non-viscose content; and is a patented product that is not produced by any other manufacturer. Kemira also notes that this fiber has been "finished/laminated with aluminum." However, Kemira notes that VISIL fiber is classified for Customs purposes under HTS 5504.10.00, the same tariff classification as viscose rayon staple fiber. The petitioners claim that VISIL fiber should be included within the scope of the finding. They argue that there is nothing in the scope of the finding that limits the applicability of the finding to "standard" fiber.

For the purposes of the preliminary results of review, we have included both LK and VISIL fibers within the scope of the finding, and have included sales of both LK and VISIL fibers in our margin analysis. However, because of the complexity of the issues relating to LK and VISIL fibers, the Department is commencing a scope inquiry to determine whether LK and VISIL fibers are covered by the scope of the finding.

### Verification

We conducted verification of home market and U.S. sales information provided by Kemira using standard verification procedures, including on-

site inspection of Kemira's sales and production facility, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and original documentation containing relevant information.

### Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of viscose rayon staple fiber to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) to the normal value (NV), as described in the "Export Price", "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2), we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for normal value and compared these to individual U.S. transactions. We made corrections to the reported U.S. and home market sales data for clerical errors found at verification, as appropriate.

We excluded certain U.S. sales from our calculations. First, we excluded any zero-priced sample sales in accordance with *NSK LTD., et al v. United States*, 969 F. Supp. 34 (CIT 1997). Second, we excluded any sales that were shipped to the United States by a third country reseller if the respondent did not have any reason to know at the time of sale to the reseller that the merchandise was destined for the United States (for a detailed explanation, see Concurrence Memorandum, December 1, 1997). Third, we excluded any U.S. sales of entries that were liquidated prior to the period of review (POR), i.e., prior to suspension of liquidation. Such sales were only excluded if we were able to make a direct link to an entry prior to suspension of liquidation (see, e.g., *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From France: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 177 (September 11, 1996)).

We excluded a home market sale to an affiliated party because this sale failed to pass the Department's arm's-length test in accordance with 19 CFR 353.45(a) (see Concurrence Memorandum, December 1, 1997).

### Facts Available

During the current POR, the Department requested that Kemira report all of its home market and U.S. sales of subject merchandise in accordance with the instructions in the questionnaire. Kemira did not report its home market and U.S. sales of second quality and sub-standard merchandise. Kemira stated in its narrative response that it sold second quality and sub-standard merchandise only to customers in Europe. On August 15, 1997, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Kemira, requesting

again that Kemira report all sales of viscose rayon fiber that are not specifically excluded from the scope of the finding. In its response to the supplemental questionnaire, Kemira again did not report its home market and U.S. sales of second quality and sub-standard merchandise. In both requests for information, the Department advised Kemira that failing to provide the requested information could result in the application of facts available (FA).

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party withholds information that has been requested by the Department, fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form requested, significantly impedes a proceeding under the antidumping statute, or provides information that cannot be verified, the Department will use FA in reaching the applicable determination. Kemira failed to report all the information requested by the Department, so the Department will use FA in reaching the margin determination for Kemira's sales of second quality and sub-standard merchandise.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used with respect to a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information. See also Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) at 870. Kemira's failure to report the sales data requested by the Department, despite two requests for data from the Department, demonstrates that Kemira has failed to cooperate to the best of its ability in this review. Additionally, the Department explicitly told Kemira the possible consequences of not reporting the data. We find that, in selecting among the FA for Kemira, an adverse inference is warranted. Section 776(b) states that an adverse inference may include reliance on information derived from: (1) The petition; (2) the final determination in the LTFV investigation; (3) any previous review under section 751 of the Act or investigation under section 753 of the Act; or (4) any other information placed on the record. See also SAA at 829-831.

Therefore, for sales of second quality and sub-standard merchandise, we are applying as adverse FA, the higher of the margin calculated for Kemira in this review or 8.7 percent, the highest calculated rate for Kemira from any previous segment of the proceeding (*i.e.*, the margin calculated for Kemira in both the investigation and in the first period of review (44 FR 2219, January 10, 1979 and 46 FR 19844, April 1, 1981)).

<sup>1</sup> Kemira also claims that hydrophobic fibers are excluded from the scope of the order, but since Kemira did not sell these fibers in the U.S. during the period of review, we have not addressed this issue.

In the event that we apply as adverse FA the 8.7 percent rate, section 776(c) of the Act provides that when the Department relies on such secondary information in using FA, it must, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The SAA provides that "corroborate" means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value (see SAA at 870). To determine probative value, we examine, to the extent practicable, the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations and reviews. However, if the Department relies on a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding as FA, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin. With respect to relevance, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal that would render a margin not relevant (see *Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate from France*; Preliminary Results of Review, 61 FR 30853 (June 18, 1996)). We have no information indicating that the 8.7 percent rate is inappropriate as FA; therefore, we consider the corroboration requirements satisfied.

#### **Export Price**

The Department used the EP, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, where the subject merchandise was sold by the manufacturer or exporter to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation and the CEP methodology was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record. We calculated EP based on packed, delivered prices. We made deductions, where appropriate, for early payment discounts, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, Finnish and U.S. insurance expenses, and brokerage and handling fees in Finland and in the United States, in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act.

#### **Constructed Export Price**

We calculated CEP, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States (the starting price). We found that CEP was warranted for certain sales in the United States that were made (before or after the date of importation) by or for the account of the producer or exporter (see Concurrence Memorandum, December 1, 1997). We calculated CEP based on

the price to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made deductions from the gross unit price (starting price) for early payment discounts, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, insurance expenses, brokerage and handling, U.S. duty, U.S. brokerage and U.S. inland freight, as appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and the Uruguay Round Agreements Act Statement of Administrative Action (SAA at 823-824), we made additional adjustments to the starting price by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities in the United States, including commissions, warranty, and credit. We allocated the total reported commission for the POR for VISIL fiber sales over the total U.S. sales of VISIL fiber during the POR. We recalculated warranty expenses based on such expenses incurred during the current period (see Calculation Memorandum, December 1, 1997). Finally, we made an adjustment for CEP profit in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act.

#### **Normal Value**

##### *A. Viability*

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating normal value (NV), we compared the respondent's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Because the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we found that the home market was viable. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales.

##### *B. Model Match*

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market, fitting the description specified in the "Scope of Review" section above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. The petitioners recommended that we determine home market matches based on the criteria of linear density (denier/decitex), fiber length, luster and end-use. We found that the product model names used by Kemira incorporated all such information. Therefore, where possible, we matched each model sold in the United States with an identical home market model, based on Kemira's

product codes, that was sold within the contemporaneous window which extends from three months prior to the U.S. sale until two months after the sale. We found contemporaneous home market sales of identical merchandise for all U.S. sales of non-VISIL. Therefore, we did not establish a model match hierarchy to determine the next most similar model in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act. With respect to U.S. sales of VISIL products for which there were no home market sales of identical merchandise during the contemporaneous window, we matched models based on most similar size and made an adjustment to NV for differences in physical characteristics (difmer). Because Kemira did not provide sufficient supporting documentation for its reported model-specific cost data, we could not determine the actual amount of any difmer. Therefore, as facts available, we made a difmer adjustment equal to twenty percent of the reported variable cost of manufacture (TCOM) of VISIL products sold in the United States. Interested parties are invited to comment on the appropriate difmer adjustment relevant to the sales at issue.

Furthermore, in conducting our margin calculations for Kemira, we discovered a number of VISIL sales for which there were no contemporaneous sales of identical or similar merchandise in the home market.

Since Kemira did not provide constructed value (CV) information, we are unable to calculate a margin for these sales. Therefore, we are compelled to use FA with regard to these sales for the purposes of the preliminary results. As FA we have selected the weighted-average margin calculated for those U.S. VISIL sales with contemporaneous home market matches.

##### *C. Price-to-Price Comparisons*

We based NV on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the home market to an unaffiliated party 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 or EP, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. For purposes of this review, we determined that the same level of trade exists for Kemira in both markets (see Concurrence Memorandum, December 1, 1997). Accordingly, pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EP or CEP of the individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product. In accordance with sections 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we

reduced home market price by deducting early payment discounts. We increased home market price by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act and reduced it by home market packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.56(a), we made circumstance of sale (COS) adjustments for direct selling expenses, including credit and (recalculated) warranty expenses. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b), we made an offset to NV for U.S. commissions. Since Kemira was not able to quantify the indirect selling expenses incurred for home market sales, the amount of this offset, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.56(b), was the lesser of (the recalculated) home market inventory carrying costs or U.S. commissions (see Concurrence Memorandum and Calculation Memorandum, December 1, 1997). No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

**Preliminary Results of Review**

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the weighted-average dumping margin for the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997 to be as follows:

Manufacturer	Margin (percent)
Kemira Fibres Oy .....	13.63

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

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 of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, 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 prior review, or the original 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; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 3.9 percent, the "new shipper" rate established in the first review conducted by the Department, as explained below.

On March 25, 1993, the Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993) and *Federal-Mogul Corporation v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) decided that once an "all others" rate is established for a company, it can only be changed through an administrative review. The Department has determined that in order to implement the above-mentioned decisions, it is appropriate to reinstate the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation (or that rate as amended for correction of clerical errors or as a result of litigation) in proceedings governed by antidumping duty orders.

However, in proceedings governed by antidumping findings, unless we are able to ascertain the "all others" rate from the Treasury LTFV investigation, the Department has determined that it is appropriate to adopt the "new shipper" rate established in the first final results of administrative review published by the Department (or that rate as amended for correction of clerical errors as a result of litigation) as the "all others" rate for the purposes of establishing cash deposits in all current and future administrative reviews (see, e.g., Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan, 58 FR 64720, (December 9, 1993)).

Therefore, the "all others" rate applied is the rate of 3.9 percent from Viscose Rayon Staple Fiber From Finland, Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Finding (46 FR 19844, April 1, 1981), the first review conducted by the Department in which a "new shipper" rate (or in this case, a rate for all shipments of the subject merchandise, including new shippers) was established.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of this administrative review.

**Assessment Rates**

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service upon completion of this review. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the final results of this review and for future deposits of

estimated duties. For assessment purposes, we intend to calculate importer-specific assessment rates for viscose rayon staple fiber. For both EP and CEP sales, we will divide the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP (or CEP)) for each importer) by the entered value of the merchandise. Upon the completion of this review, we will direct Customs to assess the resulting *ad valorem* rates against the entered value of each entry of the subject merchandise by the importer during the POR.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 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.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication of this notice. A hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days from the date of publication of this notice at the main Commerce Department building.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, case briefs from interested parties are due within 30 days of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted no later than 37 days of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The Department will subsequently publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

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, Room B-099, within ten 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; (3) a list of issues to be discussed. In accordance

with 19 CFR 353.38(b), issues raised in hearings will be limited to those raised in the respective case briefs and rebuttal briefs.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(5).

Dated: December 1, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-32356 Filed 12-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Overseas Trade Missions: 1988 Trade Missions (February Through September) Application Opportunity

**AGENCY:** US Department of Commerce (DOC), International Trade Administration (ITA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice serves to inform the public of the opportunity to apply to participate in a number of trade missions to be held between December 1997 and September 1998.

**DATES:** Applications should be submitted to the Project Officer indicated for the specific mission of interest by the closing date specified in each mission statement. Applications received after the closing date will be considered only if space and scheduling constraints permit.

**ADDRESSES AND REQUESTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Requests for further information and for application forms should be addressed to the Project Officer for each trade mission indicated below. Information is also available via the International Trade Administration's (ITA) internet homepage at "http://www.ita.doc.gov/uscs/doctm." Numbers listed in this notice are not toll-free. An original and two copies of the required application materials should be sent to the Project Officer. Applications sent by facsimile must be immediately followed by submission of the original application.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Commerce invites U.S. companies to apply to participate in a number of trade missions to be held between February and September 1998. For a more complete description of the trade mission, obtain a copy of the mission statement from the Project Officer indicated below. The recruitment and selection of private sector participants for these missions will be conducted according to the

Statement of Policy Governing Department of Commerce Overseas Trade Missions announced by Secretary Daley on March 3, 1997.

**TASBI Healthcare Technologies Matchmaker, United Kingdom, Italy, Spain and Greece, February 12-24, 1998. Recruitment Closes: December 19, 1997.**

Contact information: Yvonne Jackson, Tel: (202) 482-2675/Fax: (202) 482-0178.

**Health Industries Reverse Trade Mission from Russia to Los Angeles, CA, February 21-27 1998. Recruitment Closes: February 1, 1998.**

Contact information: Jeffrey Gren, Tel: (202) 482-2587/Fax: (202)482-0975.

**Saudi Businesswomen Reverse Trade Mission to New York City and Chicago, April 29-May 6, 1998. Recruitment Closes: March 22, 1998.**

Contact information: Isabella Cascarano, ODO, Tel: (202)482-2488/Fax: (202)482-0687.

**US Computer Industry Trade Mission to Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Shenzhen and HK, China, May 6-15, 1998. Recruitment Closes: March 7, 1998.**

Contact information: Bryan Larson, Office of Computers and Business Equipment. Tel: (202)482-1987/Fax: (202)482-0943. E-mail: Bryan-Larson@ita.doc.gov.

**Women in Trade Business Development Mission, Milan, Italy, Madrid, Spain, May 10-15, 1998. Recruitment Closes: April 1, 1998.**

Contact information: Ms. Loretta Allison, Women In Trade Business Development Missions. Telephone: (202)482-5479/Facsimile: (202)482-1999.

**E" Award Business Development Mission to Vietnam and Brunei, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City and Bandar Seri Begawan, April 6-13, 1998. Recruitment Closes: March 1, 1998.**

Contact information: James Price, Tel: (202)482-5658/Fax: (202)482-1999.

**Architecture, Construction and Engineering Matchmaker Trade Delegation, April 20-24, 1998. Recruitment Closes: February 27, 1998.**

Contact information: Sam Dhir, Tel: (202)482-4756/Fax: (202)482-0178.

**Spring '98 High-Tech Dealmaker, Ottawa, Canada, June 2-4, 1998. Recruitment Closes: March 31, 1998.**

Contact information: Deborah Anderson, Telephone: (202)482-2736/Facsimile: (202)501-4585.

**TASBI Franchising Matchmaker Trade Delegation, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece, June 15-26, 1998.**

Recruitment Closes: April 30, 1998. Contact information: Sam Dhir, Tel: (202)482-4756/Fax: (202)482-0178.

**Safety and Security Matchmaker Trade Delegation, Chile and Venezuela, June 22-26, 1998 (Optional Spin-off to Guayaquil, Ecuador). Recruitment Closes: May 8, 1998.**

Contact information: Gordon Keller, Tel: (202)482-1793/Fax: (202)482-0178.

**Healthcare Technologies Matchmaker Trade Delegation, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, July 23-31, 1998. Recruitment Closes: June 12, 1998.**

Contact information: Gordon Keller, Tel: (202)482-1793/Fax: (202)482-0178.

**Plastics Industry Mission to Mexico City-Monterrey, Mexico, September 8-11, 1998.**

Contact information: Kim Copperthite, Office of Metals, Materials, and Chemicals. Recruitment Closes: August 7, 1998. Tel: (202)482-5124/Facsimile: (202)482-2565.

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 1512.

Dated: December 4, 1997.

**Molly C. Costa,**

*Acting Director, US&FCS/Office of Public/Private Initiatives.*

[FR Doc. 97-32235 Filed 12-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Institute of Standards and Technology

#### Announcement of an Opportunity to Join a Cooperative Research and Development Consortium for CD-Metrology Below 0.25 Microns

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The National Institute of Standards and Technology invites interested parties to attend a meeting on January 9, 1998, to discuss setting up a cooperative research consortium. The goal of the consortium is to achieve commercially available reference standards to support CD-metrology for feature linewidths below 0.25 microns. Parties participating in the consortium will be loaned (110) and (100) BES01 chips and asked to perform a selection of CD measurements.

**DATES:** The Meeting will take place at 10 a.m. on January 9, 1998. Interested parties should contact NIST to confirm their interest at the address, telephone number or FAX number shown below.