

implementation date by sixty days, to July 26, 1998.

On June 30, 1998, NIST announced that an insufficient number of laboratories would be accredited by July 26, 1998 to perform the volume of inspection and testing required by the Act and extended the implementation date to October 25, 1998.

On August 14, 1998, President Clinton signed Public Law 105-234. This law amends the Fastener Quality Act by creating an exemption for certain aircraft fasteners. The law also delays the effect of the regulations until the later of June 1, 1999 or 120 days after the Secretary of Commerce submits to Congress a report on: (1) changes in fastener manufacturing processes that have occurred since the enactment of the fastener Quality Act; (2) a comparison of the Fastener Quality Act to other regulatory programs that regulate the various categories of fasteners, and an analysis of any duplication that exists among programs; and (3) any changes in that Act that may be warranted because of the changes reported under paragraphs (1) and (2). The law requires the Secretary to submit this report by February 1, 1999.

To provide Congress a comprehensive report on these issues, the Secretary seeks comments from impacted industries including, but not limited to, the auto industry fastener manufacturers, and federal agencies involved in the investigations that led to the passage of the Act in 1990, and from any other interested parties.

Request for Public Comment

The Secretary requests information on how fastener manufacturing processes have changed since the enactment of the Fastener Quality Act and on other regulatory programs that regulate the various categories of fasteners. The Secretary has identified the following topics on which he particularly requests public comments:

1. Basis of the Act.

When the Act was passed in 1990, the Congress based it on the following findings:

- The American economy uses billions of fasteners each year,
- Millions of mismarked, substandard, counterfeit, and other nonconforming fasteners have been sold in commerce to end-users in the United States, and their use has dramatically increased the risk of equipment and infrastructure failures,
- Both the military and civilian sectors of the economy have encountered unnecessary, unwarranted, and dangerous equipment and

construction failures, as well as extraordinary expenses, as a result of the use of nonconforming fasteners,

- The purchase and use of nonconforming fasteners stem from material misrepresentations about such fasteners made by certain manufacturers, importers, and distributors engaged in commerce,
- Current fastener standards of measurement evaluate bolts and other fasteners according to multiple criteria, including strength, hardness and composition, and provide grade identification markings on fasteners to make the characteristics of individual fasteners clear to purchasers and users,
- Current tests required by consensus standards, designed to ensure that fasteners are of standard measure, are adequate and appropriate for use as standards in a program of high strength fastener testing.
- The lack of traceability of fasteners sold in commerce is a serious impediment to effective quality control efforts, and
- The Health and safety of Americans is threatened by the widespread sale in commerce of mismarked, substandard, and counterfeit fasteners, a practice which also harms American manufacturers, importers and distributors of safe and conforming fasteners, and workers in the American fastener industry.

Are these findings still valid? If not, how have they changed and why?

2. Coverage of the Act

The Act defines the fasteners to be covered in Section 3.(5); a screw, nut, bolt, or stud having internal or external threads or a load-indicating washer; with a nominal diameter of 5 millimeters (1/4 inch) or greater; and which contains any quantity of metal; and which is held out to meet a standard or specification which requires through-hardening; or which bears as ASTM A 307 Grade A or produced in accordance with ASTM F 432 are exempt.

Based on changes in fastener manufacturing processes that have occurred since 1990 and other existing regulatory programs covering various categories of fasteners, is this definition appropriate? If not, what changes in coverage are appropriate for the Act and why?

3. Testing and Certification

The Act requires samples of specific size, selection, and integrity to be inspected and tested by an accredited laboratory. The laboratory must issue a report to the manufacturer at the conclusion of the tests. The report must bear the original signature of a

laboratory employee responsible for the accuracy of the report.

Are there aspects of current manufacturing technology where sampling, testing, and issuing a laboratory report with an original signature is not feasible? If so, why? What alternate methods are more appropriate for testing, sampling, and reporting compliance to standards and specifications?

4. Sale of Fasteners

The Act requires fasteners of foreign origin to be accompanied by a manufacturers' certificate and an original laboratory report when purchased and imported.

Is this process appropriate? If not, please provide a description and explanation of an appropriate process for handling fasteners of foreign origin?

5. Record Keeping

The Act requires laboratories to retain all records concerning inspection, testing, and certification for 5 years.

Are the Act's recordkeeping and reporting requirements appropriate? If not, what information should be required to be maintained in order to assess compliance? For what period of time should any reporting or recordkeeping requirement be maintained?

Persons interested in commenting on the issues outlined above, or any other topics related to the FQA, should submit their comments in writing to the above address. All comments received in response to this notice will become part of the public record and will be available for inspection and copying at the Department of Commerce Central Reference and Records Inspection facility, room 6228, Hoover Building, Washington, DC 20230.

Authority: Pub. L. No. 105-234.

Dated: October 1, 1998.

Andrew J. Pincus,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 98-26834 Filed 10-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-BW-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Sensors and Instrumentation Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Partially Closed Meeting

The Department of Commerce will hold a meeting of the Sensors and Instrumentation Technical Advisory Committee on October 20, 1998, 9:00 a.m., in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 1617M-2, 14th Street between

Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues, NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration on technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to sensors and instrumentation equipment and technology.

Agenda

General Session

1. Opening remarks by the current Chairman.
2. Election of Committee Chairman.
3. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
4. Update on Wassenaar Arrangement List review.
5. Update on India Entities.

Executive Session

6. Discussion of matters properly classified under Executive Order 12958, dealing with the U.S. export control program and strategic criteria related thereto.

The General Session of the meeting will be open to the public and a limited number of seats will be available. Reservations are not required. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. The public may submit written statements at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate distribution of public presentation materials to the Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials two weeks prior to the meeting date to the following address: Ms. Lee Ann Carpenter, CLO MS: 3886C, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel, formally determined on December 3, 1997, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, that the series of meetings of the Committee and of any Subcommittees thereof, dealing with the classified materials listed in 5 U.S.C., 552b(c)(1) shall be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in section 10(A)(1) and 10(a)(3), of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The remaining series of meetings or portions thereof will be open to the public.

A copy of the Notice of Determination to close meetings or portions of meetings of the Committee is available for public inspection and copying in the Central Reference and Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, U.S.

Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. For further information or copies of the minutes, contact Lee Ann Carpenter on (202) 482-2583.

Dated: October 1, 1998.

Lee Ann Carpenter,

Director, Technical Advisory Committee Unit.

[FR Doc. 98-26870 Filed 10-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-808]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From The People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On June 10, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping order on chrome-plated lug nuts (lug nuts) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The review covers one exporter of the subject merchandise and the period September 1, 1996 through August 31, 1997.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from Jiangsu Rudong Grease Gun Factory (Rudong). We did not receive rebuttal comments. After considering these comments, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results of review and have determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV), as explained below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 7, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Scheier, Thomas Gilgunn, or Maureen Flannery, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4052, (202) 482-0648 and (202) 482-3020 respectively.

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 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 351.

Background

On June 10, 1998, the Department published the preliminary results of review (63 FR 31719). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by the order and this review are one-piece and two-piece chrome-plated and nickel-plated lug nuts from the PRC. The subject merchandise includes chrome-plated and nickel-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, which are more than $1\frac{1}{16}$ inches (17.45 millimeters) in height and which have a hexagonal (hx) size of at least $\frac{3}{4}$ inches (19.05 millimeters) but not over one inch (25.4 millimeters), plus or minus $\frac{1}{16}$ of an inch (1.59 millimeters). The term "unfinished" refers to unplated and/or unassembled chrome-plated lug nuts. The subject merchandise is used for securing wheels to cars, vans, trucks, utility vehicles, and trailers. Excluded from the order are zinc-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, stainless steel capped lug nuts, and chrome-plated lock nuts.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under item 7318.16.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

This review covers the period September 1, 1996 through August 31, 1997.

Interested Party Comments

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received comments from Rudong. We did not receive rebuttal comments from any party.

Comment 1. Rudong argues that the October 1996 Indian import statistics used to value steel wire rod are aberrational. For the preliminary results, the Department used the then available Indian import statistics for September, October, November, and December 1996. Rudong states that Indian imports of steel wire rod as valued by the October 1996 data are 3.5 times greater than the value of steel wire rod in the September, November, and December