person who assembles or completes the merchandise sold in the United States from the parts or components produced in the foreign country with respect to which the order applies; and (C) whether imports into the United States of the parts or components produced in such foreign country have increased after issuance of such order.

I. Statutory Criteria

Class or Kind, U.S. Assembly From Components Produced in the Foreign Country, and Difference In Value

Neither the Committee nor Camesa challenged our preliminary determination that the steel wire rope sold in the United States was of the same class or kind of merchandise as that subject to the order and that the subject steel wire rope was processed in the United States from steel wire strand produced in Mexico, the country to which the antidumping duty order applies. In addition, neither the Committee nor Camesa challenged our preliminary determination, based on the best information available (BIA), that the difference between the value of the wire strand produced in Mexico and the value of the steel wire rope sold in the United States is small within the meaning of section 781(a) of the Tariff Act. Therefore, we affirm our preliminary determination regarding these three criteria.

II. Factors

Subsequent to our preliminary determination, we did not request additional information regarding the pattern of trade, the relationship between the parties, and the volume of imports of steel wire strand. Neither party challenged our preliminary determination regarding these factors. Based on our analysis of these factors, we affirm our preliminary determinations that (A) the data on the pattern of trade indicate a shift from sales in the United States of steel wire rope produced in Mexico toward sales of steel wire rope processed in the United States from steel wire strand produced in Mexico; (B) respondents are related parties; and (C) imports of steel wire strand into the United States increased subsequent to the issuance of the antidumping duty order.

Final Affirmative Determination of Circumvention

Based on the foregoing analysis, we determine that the respondent, Camesa, is circumventing the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Mexico. The merchandise produced in the United States, steel wire rope, is of the same class or kind of merchandise as that subject to the order, and is completed from an intermediate product produced in Mexico, the country to which the order applies. Further, based on BIA, we determine that the difference in value between the imported and finished products is small. We also determine that the pattern of trade, increase in imports of the intermediate product, and relationship between Grupo Camesa and Camesa Inc., are consistent with an affirmative determination of circumvention. We note that our analysis of the difference in value and resulting determination of ''small'' in this case are not necessarily synonymous with such determinations that the Department will formulate in future circumvention inquiries since Congress has directed us to make determinations regarding the difference in value on a case-by-case basis.

Based on this final affirmative determination of circumvention, we have determined that steel wire strand, when manufactured in Mexico by Camesa and imported into the United States for use in the production of steel wire rope, falls within the scope of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Mexico. We will inform Customs of this decision, and will instruct it to continue to suspend liquidation of, and require cash deposits, at the applicable rate, on entries of steel wire strand manufactured in Mexico by Camesa.

No suspension of liquidation or collection of cash deposits is required for steel wire strand produced by other manufacturers in Mexico. In addition, no suspension of liquidation or collection of cash deposits is required for steel wire strand produced by Camesa in Mexico that enters with an end-use certificate certifying that the steel wire strand will not be used for processing into steel wire rope. However, if this documentation is not presented at the time of entry, the merchandise produced by Camesa should be subject to the applicable cash deposit requirement.

Interested parties should be advised that data and statements supporting the exclusion of steel wire strand from this antidumping duty order are subject to verification by the United States Government.

Interested parties may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice.

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibilities concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This final affirmative determination of circumvention is in accordance with section 781(a) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1677j(a)) and 19 CFR 353.29(e).

Dated: February 17, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–4900 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 950124027–5027–01]

RIN 0693–AB38

Intent To Develop a Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) for a Data Standard for Record Description Records—Request for Comments

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Commerce.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: NIST is considering the development of a Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) for the data elements which, when taken together, will describe information objects of many different kinds, both electronic and non-electronic. The standard would apply to a wide range of information-creating software products. It would apply also to document management and object repository software products. Federal agencies would use the standard in specifying many software products used to create documents or information objects (e.g., electronic mail systems), and also when specifying document or object storage and management software products. This notice uses the word ''record'' as a broadly-encompassing term to include ''documents'' and ''objects,'' regardless of media or application.

The framework for this proposed FIPS was developed by a working group of the interagency Integrated Services Panel, under the Federal Information Resources Management Policy Council. NIST solicits comments on the scope, purpose, background, and rationale for the proposed standard, and on certain technical issues. After analyzing the comments, NIST may propose a FIPS for review and comment.

DATES: Comments on this effort must be received on or before May 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Director, Computer Systems

Laboratory, ATTN: Data Standard for Records Description, Technology Building, Room B154, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899.

Written comments received in response to this notice will be made part of the public record and will be made available for inspection and copying in the Central Reference and Inspection Facility, Room 5020, Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Bruce K. Rosen, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Technology Building, Room A–266, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, (301) 975–3246, Internet mail brosen@nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Computer Systems Laboratory of the National Institute of Standards and Technology is considering the development of a Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) for the data elements—their identification, representation, arrangement, and object binding—to describe information objects. Such objects include but are not limited to electronic mail messages, word processing documents, spreadsheets, forms, voice-mail messages, images, and publications. This notice refers to all such objects with the single term ''record'' as a generic term to encompass documents, messages, and information objects of all kinds.

The set of data elements will constitute a Record Description Record (RDR). The RDR will be created whenever e-mail messages, word processing documents, image documents, spreadsheet documents, voice-mail messages, etc., are created, using either commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software products or non-COTS software. It will accompany those information objects when they are passed to a document management (storage and retrieval) or object repository product (either COTS or non-COTS), or when they are passed to some other software being used to store and retrieve them.

By applying the standard to document management or object repository software products, it will become possible to use these products to manage non-electronic records stored externally in addition to the electronic information objects stored in and under the control of the document management or repository products.

Terminology

1. Record

The computer industry is developing a new class of information technology products designed to organize, store, retrieve, and manage such electronic expressions of information as textual memos and reports, sound recordings, scanned images, and computer software. As a group, the information expressions are called ''documents,'' or ''objects.'' The latter tends to be a broader term, to include computer software. Both my include sound recordings, images, and what are being called ''compound documents'' and ''multimedia'' documents or objects. The products being developed are usually called object repositories or document repositories or document management systems or document storage and retrieval systems.

2. Record Management System

Throughout this notice, the term ''record management system'' is used broadly to include all software products intended to store, retrieve, and manage electronic documents and information objects. It is intended to encompass such products as those that are called ''object repository,'' ''document repository,'' ''document manager,'' and ''document storage and retrieval system.'' These products may be stand-alone or they may be integrated with other products in an office suite. They may have their own directory, or they may share directory services with other software products with which they are integrated. What distinguishes them is their functionality of receiving documents or information objects—what this notice calls ''records'', storing them for future retrieval, use, and disposition, and also managing their integrity, access, and life-cycles.

Background, Purpose and Rationale

Like many private sector enterprises, Federal Government agencies are re-engineering their programs, missions and administrative activities to perform them faster, better, and at less cost. In general, this means replacing paper-based processes with electronic, computer-based workflows. Examples include the electronic commerce programs, and electronic submission of regulatory reports and filings.

As activities are migrated from paper to electronic workflows, transactions, and submissions, information objects pass between different software environments. Those records must be identified and described not only to support search and retrieval, but also to substantiate their trustworthiness in legal proceedings and support their transfer to the National Archives should such transfer be required.

Federal Government agencies will be procuring record management products, both COTS and non-COTS, some of which will be stand-alone and some of which will be integrated with such creation software as word processing, e-mail, and workgroup computing. Thus, the possible interfaces between the software used to create records and the software used to store and retrieve them can very from many different packages bought from many different vendors in many different procurements, to a single integrated suite of software bought at one time in one procurement from one contractor.

This proposed standard would enable Federal agencies to avoid reinventing in every procurement or system installation the identification data for messages, letters, images, etc., and the way that data is recorded and arranged. It will avoid the necessity for suppliers of software products to customize their products differently for different Federal agencies, or for Federal agencies to engage individually in complex integration efforts and to develop agency-unique solutions to a requirement common to all.

Issues

1. Basic Architecture and Applicability

The Record Description Record (RDR) is a set of descriptive attribute that are identified, arrange, and bound in a prescribed manner to whatever is being described. The attributes are sometimes referred to as metadata, because they identify and describe the record, and may or may not be a part of it. The RDR is itself called a record because it a logically-related set of discrete data elements.

Whenever a record is created using a computer, the creating software would be expected to generate a corresponding RDR. That RDR would be passed to a record management system along with the record itself. For records created and stored outside the computer environment, e.g., non-electronic records or electronic records stored ''off-line,'' the RDR information may be entered manually into a record management system, thereby using the system to manage records in general, without restriction as to the record media. In essence, the FIPS would be specifying a standard record to be used to describe other records of many different kinds.

The RDR is envisioned as comprising three sets of data elements. The first is a small set that wou8ld be mandatory in

all RDRs and would apply universally to all records, regardless of their nature or content. The second is a small set that would be mandatory for certain classes of records, or conditions that apply to them. An example would be records sent electronically from one party to another, as contrasted with those that are printed and communicated by hand, mail, messenger, or facsimile. The third is a potentially large set of optional data elements to be specified by individual agencies.

This approach would yield a single RDR standard that would prescribe how the data elements are identified, arranged, and represented, and how the RDR for an electronic record is to be bound to the record it describes. It presents two issues on which public comment is desired. One is whether it is reasonable to establish a single RDR standard for all applications, e.g., word processing, e-mail, voice-mail, groupware, etc. The second is whether the three-level specification of data elements is appropriate.

2. RDR Binding

There must be some binding between an electronic record and the RDR that describes it. Because of the different ways in which record management systems work, the actual RDR contents are likely to be handled differently, stored differently, and used differently in the various proprietary products. The RDR contains the kind of descriptive data that these systems put in their directories, if they have directories. To a great degree, the RDR may be viewed as being a support to or enhancement of the directory functions of those record management systems that have directories.

Record management systems need to know how the RDRs for electronic records will be delivered to them—whether they will come as physically separate records, as headers, or as trailers. If this aspect is not standardized, then software products that create records would be free to create the corresponding RDRs in any way whatsoever. A standard approach could be established by which an RDR is bound to what it describes, so that record management system products can accept records from any source and understand their accompanying RDRs.

The RDR standard is seen as essential to support a Federal agency's mix-and-match of software products from different vendors. However, in the case of integrated office suites where the passing of a record from the creating software to the storing/retrieving software is handled internally or where the record is created and stored in just one place, a standard for data element identification and arrangement and for object binding may not be needed, and when adopted might not necessarily apply. However, the RDR information content would still be necessary. When a record is transferred out of a record management system, to either another record management system or to the National Archives, the accompanying RDR would have to be bound according to the standard.

Both implementors of software products that create records and implementors of record management system software products are asked to comment on how binding should be accomplished, and why. Prospective implementors are invited to propose specification language.

3. E-Mail Receipt Data

Just the conduct of electronic commerce and regulatory activities—let alone intra-agency and inter-agency communications—requires that agencies keep data about the origin and receipt of electronic transactions and submissions. Much of that data is generated internally by e-mail software packages.

The treatment of e-mail receipt data poses a special binding case. An e-mail message may be sent to one or more receivers, who may receive it at different times, or not at all. At some point, the e-mail system may transfer the message and its accompanying data from its own message store to a record management system. If some receipt data for that message is generated in the e-mail system after the message to which it applies has been transferred out, there is a question about what the e-mail system should do with that subsequent receipt data. It could, of course, be purged by the e-mail system. Alternatively, it could be put into an RDR and passed out to the record management system. If put into an RDR and passed out, the record management system would need to link it to the message to which it applies, and for which one or more RDRs already exist.

Both implementors of e-mail software and implementors of a record storage software are asked to comment on how this issue might be resolved, and are invited to propose specification language to address it.

4. Data Element Identification

The RDR will be a set of data elements. A standard mechanism must be established to identify the elements that are present, because the record will be a combination of mandatory and optional data elements. If a record management system is receiving records from e-mail, word processing, voice-mail, electronic commerce, etc., it will be receiving different RDRs depending on which package created the record, and perhaps also on the kind of record being stored. Thus, the format of the RDR must be standardized in a fashion analogous to a message header or a file label. Because there are many possible ways of formatting RDRs, the lack of a standard format would result in the creating software packages putting out RDRs that record management systems might not understand.

Comments are desired on how the RDR should be formatted, and how data elements should be identified and represented, and why. Prospective implementors are invited to propose specification language.

5. Universal Mandatory Elements

In general, these elements will address the questions of (a) what kind of record it is, or what software was used to create it; (b) which individual or organization created it; (c) when it was created; (d) what it deals with; and (e) what unique identifier(s) has been given to it. With respect to these and all other data elements, relevant existing FIPS for data element representations would be expected to be used. Representation standards would be established only for those elements for which such Federal standards do not presently exist.

Comments are solicited on the specific data elements that should be considered to be universal and mandatory. Their selection criteria are (1) their importance in record identification and description, and (2) their applicability across the broad spectrum of software used to create records of different kinds.

6. Conditional Mandatory Elements

Conditional mandatory elements are those that would be prescribed for records based on such characteristics as their application of origin, their storage media or location, or some statutory or regulatory requirement. The condition of greatest immediate concern is electronic communication, where the process of communication adds its own dimensions of time and place. Examples would be electronic mail, file transfer, and the many other applications that exist at the application layer of a multi-layer data communications reference model.

As mentioned above, electronic commerce and electronic submission of regulatory reports and filings necessitate the inclusion of ''transmission'' data in the RDR for an electronic mail message. It is expected that these activities will necessitate a comparable requirement in

such other communications-based applications as file transfers and electronic data interchange transactions. Thus far, all that is reasonably certain is that some data that is generated internally by e-mail systems or created by message originators—e.g., the identities of message originators, identities of receivers, the date and time of origination, and/or the date and time of receipt—must be bound to the message in the RDR. That is a relatively small set of data elements. However, two important questions surround it. The first is which of those elements should be mandatory and which optional, and the second is whether those mandatory elements should apply to all applications.

Comments are desired on both of these questions, as well as on the mandatory descriptive elements that should apply to voice-mail, scanned image documents, compound documents, and multimedia documents.

7. Optional Elements

Optional elements may be associated with records such as e-mail messages that are common across many Federal agencies, or they may be associated with common descriptive characteristics such as case number or client number, or they may be unique to a particular agency. Some common elements may be candidates for standardization, but that is not an issue in this context.

What is of principal concern with respect to the RDR is the production of optional elements by the information creation software, and their acceptance by the record management system. The data element identification standard discussed above should cover the aspect of identifying each optional element that is present in an RDR, but questions remain concerning the number of optional elements that a record management system must be able to accept, and what specifications should apply to information creation software for the creation of the optional elements.

Comments are solicited on these, and any other aspects of optional data elements in RDRs.

Dated: February 22, 1995.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 95–4855 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–CN–M

Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, DOC.

ACTION: Notice of partially closed meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that the National Institute of Standards and Technology Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology will meet on Tuesday, March 14, 1995, from 10:45 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and on Wednesday, March 15, 1995, from 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. The Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology is composed of nine members appointed by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology who are eminent in such fields as business, research, new product development, engineering, labor, education, management consulting, environment, and international relations. The purpose of this meeting is to review and make recommendations regarding general policy for the Institute, its organization, its budget, and its programs within the framework of applicable national policies as set forth by the President and the Congress. On Tuesday, March 14, 1995, presentations will be given on the Board on Assessment of NIST Programs' annual report; the Applied Technology Program focus report on Materials Processing for Heavy Manufacturing; the National Quality Award's pilot programs in healthcare and education; and national and international standards. A discussion on the Institute's budget, including funding of the Applied Technology Program and staffing of management positions at NIST, scheduled to begin at 10:45 a.m. and to end at 11:45 a.m. on March 14, 1995, will be closed. On Wednesday, March 15, 1995, the committee members will tour the molecular measurement laboratory.

DATES: The meeting will convene March 14, 1995, at 8:30 a.m. and will adjourn at 10:00 a.m. on March 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in Lecture Room A, Administration Building, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris E. Kuyatt, Visiting Committee Executive Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, telephone number (301) 975–6090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel, formally determined on February 7, 1995, that portions of the meeting of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology which involve examination and discussion of the budget for the Institute may be closed in accordance with Section 552(b)(9)(B) of Title 5, United States Code, since the meeting is likely to disclose financial information that may be privileged or confidential.

Dated: February 22, 1995.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 95–4856 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 021495C]

New Bedford Harbor Trustee Council; Scoping Meetings

AGENCIES: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce; and Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS); request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS, acting as Administrative Trustee, and DOI announce the intention of the New Bedford Harbor Trustee Council (Council) to prepare an EIS for a proposed plan to address the restoration of natural resources that have been injured by the release of hazardous substances, including polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), in the New Bedford Harbor environment. The Council also announces its initiation of a public process to determine the scope of issues under consideration. The purpose of this notice is to inform the public of this process and of the opportunity to participate in the development of the restoration plan/EIS. All persons affected by, or otherwise interested in, the proposed restoration plan are invited to participate in determining the scope of significant issues to be considered in the EIS by submitting written comments or by attending scoping meetings. The scoping process will identify and prioritize alternatives for potential restoration activities.

DATES: The Council will hold scoping meetings in each of the affected communities within the New Bedford Harbor environment. The scoping meetings are scheduled as follows:

1. February 28, 1995, 6:30 p.m.–9 p.m., New Bedford, MA
2. March 1, 1995, 6:30 p.m.–9 p.m., North Dartmouth, MA