

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| A-428-811 | <i>Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products.</i> |
| C-429-812 | Inland Steel Bar Company and USS/Kobe Steel Company (Petitioners)—Anticircumvention inquiry to determine whether Saarstahl A.G. and Thyssen Stahl A.G. are circumventing the order by shipping leaded steel billets to the United States, where they are converted into the hot-rolled carbon steel products covered by the order. |
| Country | Italy |
| A-475-818 | <i>Certain Pasta.</i> |
| | Borden, Inc., Hershey Foods Corp., Gooch Foods, Inc., (Petitioners)—Anticircumvention inquiry to determine whether Barilla S.r.L. is importing pasta in the United States in bulk (defined as packages of greater than five pounds) and repackaging the pasta into packages of five pounds or less for sale in the retail market; and whether such repackaging constitutes circumvention of the antidumping duty order. |

Interested parties are invited to comment on the accuracy of the list of pending scope clarification requests. Any comments should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: July 28, 1998.

Maria Harris Tildon,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-20798 Filed 8-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

[Docket No. 980212036-8172-03]

Request for Comments on the Enhancement of the .us Domain Space

AGENCY: National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice, Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce requests comments on future expansion and administration of the .us domain space. The registry for .us domain space, administered by the Information Sciences Institute at the University of California, is currently administered as a locality based hierarchy in which second level domain space is allocated to states and U.S. territories. The .us domain space has typically been used by branches of state and local government, although some commercial names have been assigned. This notice, through a series of questions, requests public comment on issues relating to future administration, and possible expansion, of the .us domain space.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 3, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The Department invites the public to submit written comments in paper or electronic form. Comments may be mailed to Karen Rose, Office of

International Affairs (OIA), National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), Room 4701, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230. Paper submissions should include a version on diskette in ASCII, Word Perfect (please specify version), or Microsoft Word (please specify version) format.

Comments submitted in electronic form may be sent to usdomain@ntia.doc.gov. Electronic comments should be submitted in the formats specified above.

Comments received will be posted on the NTIA website at <http://www.ntia.doc.gov>. Detailed information on electronic filing is available at <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/efiling/>.

Comments should be numbered and organized in response to the questions set forth in this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Rose, NTIA/OIA, (202) 482-0365.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 20, 1998, NTIA published "Improvement of Technical Management of Internet Names and Addresses; Proposed Rule," 63 Fed. Reg. 8825 (1998) (also posted at <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/domainname/domainname130.htm>). The notice analyzed issues of generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs), including the future of gTLD registries and the possible creation of new gTLDs. Section VII. D. briefly addressed the national or "country-code" domain (ccTLD) for the United States, .us as follows:

At present, the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) at the University of Southern California administers .us as a locality based hierarchy in which second-level domain space is allocated to states and US territories. This name space is further subdivided into localities. General registration under localities is performed on an exclusive basis by private firms that have requested delegation from IANA. The .us name space has typically been used by branches of state and local governments, although some commercial names have been assigned. Where registration for a locality has not been delegated, the IANA itself serves as the registrar.

Some in the Internet community have suggested that the pressure for unique identifiers in the .com gTLD could be relieved if commercial use of the .us space was encouraged. Commercial users and trademark holders, however, find the current locality-based system too cumbersome and complicated for commercial use. Expanded use of the .us TLD could alleviate some of the pressure for new generic TLDs and reduce conflicts between American companies and others vying for the same domain name.

Clearly, there is much opportunity for enhancing the .us domain space, and the .us domain could be expanded in many ways without displacing the current geopolitical structure. Over the next few months, the U.S. government will work with the private sector and state and local governments to determine how best to make the .us domain more attractive to commercial users. It may also be appropriate to move the gTLDs traditionally reserved for U.S. government use (i.e. .gov and .mil), into a reformulated .us ccTLD.

The U.S. government will further explore and seek public input on these issues through a separate Request for Comment on the evolution of the .us name space. However, we welcome any preliminary comments at this time.¹

On June 10, 1998, NTIA published a Statement of Policy on DNS administration, "Management of Internet Names and Addresses," 63 Fed. Reg. 31741 (1998) (also posted at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/domainname/6_5_98dns.htm). The document summarized the responses to the .us comment solicitation as follows:

Many commenters suggested that the pressure for unique identifiers in the .com gTLD could be relieved if commercial use of the .us space was encouraged. Commercial users and trademark holders, however, find the current locality-based system too cumbersome and complicated for commercial use. They called for expanded use of the .us TLD to alleviate some of the pressure for new generic TLDs and reduce conflicts between American companies and others vying for the same domain name. Most commenters support an evolution of the .us domain designed to make this name space more attractive to commercial users.²

The document also restated the U.S. Government's intent to request public comment on the future of .us.³

¹ 63 Fed. Reg. at 8831.

² 63 Fed. Reg. at 31798.

³ 63 Fed. Reg. at 31798.

While administration of .us is managed by the same personnel as the IANA services, it does not fall under the DARPA/IANA contract and should therefore be considered a separate service of the Information Sciences Institute (ISI) at the University of Southern California.

We are now formally soliciting public comment on the future of the .us domain space. Respondents should find it useful to review the full text of "Improvement of Technical Management of Internet Names and Addresses" and "Management of Internet Names and Addresses" for general background information on the Internet domain name system and its management. Respondents should also find useful RFC 1480: "The .US Domain" (<http://www.isi.edu/in-notes/rfc1480.txt>), as well as ISI's posted policies for .us (<http://www.isi.edu/in-notes/usdnr/>) for information regarding current the structure and management of the .us domain.

Additional Background

The Statement of Policy "Management of Internet Names and Addresses" invited the international community of private sector Internet stakeholders to work together to form a new, private, not-for-profit corporation to manage DNS functions. The new corporation would gradually assume various responsibilities for the administration of the domain name system now performed by or on behalf of the U.S. Government. The document noted, however, that national governments would continue to have authority to manage or establish policy for their own ccTLDs.

Other country-code domains are managed by a variety of entities, either non-profit or for-profit, but almost always on an exclusive basis. In many cases, the registry remains delegated to the same university or research institute to which it was assigned in the early days of the Internet. In a few cases, the assigned entity is an ISP cooperative (e.g., Nominet, the registry for .uk). In virtually all cases (with the notable exception of Nominet), the registry maintenance and registration functions are handled by the same entity and not treated separately. In the event of disputes over the assignment of country-code registries, ISI defers to national governments, some of which operate their registry through a public agency.

Many of the allocation and governance issues under .us and other country-codes are ultimately analogous to the issues in gTLDs. The early availability and extensive use of gTLDs by U.S. companies, however, allowed

.us to develop separately under a hierarchical geopolitical structure. By contrast, other country-code TLDs typically offer second-level domains on a more or less open and unrestricted basis or allow unrestricted third-level domains under a few two-character sector codes, such as .co for commercial or .ac for academic. To our knowledge, no other country-code domain is managed under a geopolitically ordered regime similar to .us.

Some have suggested using domain space for purposes such as zoning or credentialing. With respect to zoning for example, there have been suggestions that creating a domain for adult entertainment could facilitate filtering while reducing liability risk for those businesses that register under it. Likewise, a wide range of credentialed domains are possible, i.e., domains in which the registrant warrants that it meets some standard or in which a third party authority (e.g., a trade organization, a licensing agency, a bank) certifies the identity or characteristics of the registrant. It may be desirable to delegate such domains to a certifying entity, or to an entity that sets and maintains the standard in the case of self-certifying registrants. To our knowledge, no national registry has attempted such a regime of industry identifiers or other classifications at the second or lower levels.

Questions for Public Comment

While the public is free to comment on any issue related to the .us domain space, the Department is particularly interested in receiving input from the questions provided below:

1. How should the present geographic structure of .us be extended or modified? What changes should be made in RFC 1480 or the posted policies for .us?

2. What are the benefits and costs of different options for allocating second-level domains under .us? How should the allocation of such second-level domains be decided and administered? What should be the terms of delegation?

3. Specifically, should special-purpose second-level domains be created under .us? What are the benefits and costs of creating particular special-purpose domains (e.g., industry-specific, credentialing, zoning)? How should such domains be created and administered? Are there reasons to map names and other addressing and identification systems (e.g., postal addresses, telephone numbers, longitude and latitude, uniform resource numbers or others) into .us?

4. Alternatively, should .us be treated as an unrestricted top-level domain like

.com or should one or more specific second-level domains such as .co.us or .com.us be used for unrestricted assignment of domain names (as in .com)? How should such unrestricted domains be administered and by whom?

5. How should conflicting proposals and claims to manage or use .us subdomains be resolved? Who should have responsibility for coordinating policy for .us over the long term? What public oversight, if any, should be provided?

6. What rules and procedures should be used to minimize conflicts between trademarks and domain names under .us? Should this problem be treated differently at international, national, state, and local levels? Should special privileges be accorded to famous trademarks, such as a right to register directly under .us or a procedure to preempt the use of the trademark in a range of subdomains?

7. What role should states play in the allocation and registration of their respective subdomains? Should commercial names be permitted under states as third-level domains? Or should such third-level domains be limited to special categories such as domestic corporations or other state-licensed entities? Should states and localities operate registries and accept registrations directly? To what extent should state policies be coordinated and through what mechanisms and procedures?

8. How well has the system of delegating third-level domains (localities) to private registrars on an exclusive basis worked? How could it be improved? Should registrars be accountable to their delegated localities (just as country-code registries are accountable to national governments)? Should registrars be limited to a single jurisdiction? Should multiple competing registrars be able to register under any local, state, or special-purpose domain under .us as in the plan proposed for generic Top-Level Domains?

9. How should the operation of the .us registry be supported? Should uniform registration (and renewal) fees be instituted? Should registrars contribute to the operation of the registry?

10. What are best management and allocation practices for country-code domains? What practices should be emulated or avoided?

11. By what type of entity should .us be administered? Private, governmental, or quasi-governmental? For profit or not-for-profit? What are the advantages and disadvantages of using one type of

entity (private, public, for profit, not-for-profit) over the others?

Kathy Smith,

Acting Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 98-20732 Filed 8-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Amendment of Visa Requirements for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the Republic of Turkey

July 29, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs amending visa requirements.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 10, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Unger, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1862, as amended.

Effective on August 10, 1998, the existing export visa arrangement between the Governments of the United States and Turkey is being amended to include the coverage of textile products in Categories 352, 652 and merged Categories 352/652, produced or manufactured in Turkey and exported from Turkey on and after August 10, 1998. As a result, an export visa will be required for such products.

Merchandise in merged Categories 352/652 may be accompanied by either the appropriate merged category visa or the correct category visa corresponding to the actual shipment. There will be a grace period from August 10, 1998 through September 8, 1998 during which products exported from Turkey in Categories 352, 652 and 352/652 shall not be denied entry for lack of a visa.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the **CORRELATION:** Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 62 FR 66057, published on December 17, 1997). Also

see 52 FR 6859, published on March 5, 1987.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

July 29, 1998.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on March 2, 1987, as amended, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns export visa requirements for certain cotton and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Turkey for which the Government of Turkey has not issued an appropriate export visa.

Effective on August 10, 1998, you are directed to require a visa for products in Categories 352 and 652, produced or manufactured in Turkey and exported from Turkey on and after August 10, 1998. Merchandise in Categories 352 and 652 may be visaed as merged Categories 352/652 or the correct category corresponding to the actual shipment. There will be a grace period from August 10, 1998 through September 8, 1998 during which products exported from Turkey in Categories 352, 652 and 352/652 shall not be denied entry for lack of a visa.

Shipments entered or withdrawn from warehouse according to this directive which are not accompanied by an appropriate export visa shall be denied entry and a new visa must be obtained.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98-20736 Filed 8-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board Task Force on National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA)

ACTION: Notice of advisory committee meetings.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) will meet in closed session on July 30-31, 1998 at SAIC, 4001 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia. In order for the Task Force to obtain time sensitive classified briefings, critical to the understanding of the issues, this meeting is scheduled on short notice.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting the Task Force will review the objectives and plans of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to meet the needs of the national and military intelligence customers as they enter the 21st Century.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. No. 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1994)), it has been determined that this DSB Task Force meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) (1994), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: July 28, 1998.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 98-20662 Filed 8-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Acting Deputy Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before September 3, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Danny Werfel, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708-8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information