business on August 20, 1998 at the address listed below: U.S. Small Business Administration, Disaster Area 4 Office, P.O. Box 13795, Sacramento, CA 95853–4795 or other locally announced locations.

The interest rates are:

	Percent
For Physical Damage:	
Homeowners with credit available elsewhere	8.000
Homeowners without credit available elsewhere	4.000
Businesses with credit available elsewhere	8.000
Businesses and non-profit organizations without credit available elsewhere	4.000
Others (including non-profit organizations) with credit available elsewhere	7.250
For Economic Injury:	
Businesses and small agricultural cooperatives without credit available elsewhere	4.000

The number assigned to this disaster for physical damage is 299005 and for economic injury the number is 967000.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008)

Dated: November 20, 1997.

Aida Alvarez,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–31496 Filed 12–1–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Region III Advisory Council; Public Meeting

The U.S. Small Business Administration, Region III Advisory Council, located in the geographical area of Clarksburg, West Virginia, will hold a public meeting at 10:30 am–3:30 pm, on Thursday, December 4, 1997, at U.S. Small Business Administration, Charleston Branch Office, 4th Floor Conference Room, 405 Capitol Street, Charleston, WV, 25301 to discuss such matters as may be presented by members, staff of the U.S. Small Business Administration, or others present.

For further information, write or call Ms. Jayne Armstrong, State Director, U.S. Small Business Administration, 168 West Main Street, Clarksburg, WV, 26301, (304) 623–5631.

Gene Carlson,

Associate Administrator, Office of Communications & Public Liaison.

[FR Doc. 97–31497 Filed 12–1–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 2655]

Bureau of Political-Military Affairs; Determination Under the Arms Export Control Act

Pursuant to Section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, notice is hereby given that the Acting Secretary of State has made a determination pursuant to Section 81 of the Arms Export Control Act and has concluded that publication of the determination would be harmful to the national security of the United States.

Dated: November 19, 1997.

Thomas E. McNamara,

Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–31465 Filed 12–1–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–25–M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice No. 2659]

Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Private International Law (ACPIL); Study Group on Electronic Commerce Meeting Notice

The Department of Commerce and the Department of State's Advisory Committee Study Group on Electronic Commerce will cosponsor a meeting Monday, December 15 in Washington, DC, from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Department of Commerce. The purpose of the meeting is to review international and national developments concerning computer-based signature and message integrity systems, and consider possible approaches to international rules and related domestic concerns. In particular, consideration will be given to meetings on these and related topics at the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), the OECD and other international bodies.

The Advisory Committee will also consider, where relevant, recent developments at the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL), legislative initiatives by states within the U.S., and programs of various federal agencies.

Issues that may be reviewed by the Advisory Committee include, but are not limited to, prior U.S. views encouraging international bodies to examine all forms of electronic signatures, and to encompass both regulated/licensed systems as well as unregulated private sector systems; whether rules for signature systems should distinguish between commercial and consumer transactions; possible rules on risk allocation, attribution and reliance; whether third party assurance providers, such as certifying authorities, should have to meet minimum levels of assurance; what role information security standards should play in this process; whether rules are needed on incorporation by reference; what types of rules for cross-certification between different countries are feasible; whether agreement should be sought on underlying rules for accreditation, and if so, in what international bodies, and other related issues. Jurisdictional issues will also be discussed as appropriate.

Participants may wish to review the recently completed UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce, available with a Guide to Enactment from U,N. document outlets as Doc. V.97–22269, May 1997, or from the Office of the Legal Adviser at the address below, which covers the legal effect and validity of computer messages in commercial transactions; functional equivalents of signatures, writing, etc.; attribution of messages; time and place where communications are deemed to have taken place, and other matters.

The meeting is open to the public up to the capacity of the meeting room, and members of the public may participate subject to rulings of the Chair. The meeting will be held at the Department of Commerce in Conference Room 5855; entry to the Commerce Department should be through the main entrance on 14th Street between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues. Participants should register in advance since space may be limited. Please advise either the Office of Legal Adviser (L/PIL) at the State Department by calling Rosie Gonzales at (202) 776–8420 or by fax 776–8482, or e-mail at: pildb@his.com., or Brian Hengesbaugh at the Commerce Department, Office of Chief Counsel for International Commerce, (202) 482–4602 or fax (202) 482–4076, of your name and government agency identification, or affiliation and address, as well as telephone and fax number, and e-mail if available.

Members of the public who cannot attend are welcome to request available documentation and to comment in writing on this topic, including any recommendations for possible U.S. positions to be put forward at international meetings on electronic signatures. For documentation or additional information contact Harold Burman at the State Department Office indicated above. The mailing address is: Office of the Legal Adviser, Suite 355

South Building, 2430 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037–2800.

Harold S. Burman,

Executive Director, Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Private International Law.

[FR Doc. 97–31662 Filed 12–1–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–08–M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. WTO/D–23]

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding U.S. Antidumping Duties on Dynamic Random Access Semiconductors (DRAMS) of One Megabyte or Above From Korea

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 127(b)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that the government of Korea has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO) to examine the continuing imposition by the United States of antidumping duties on dynamic access memory semiconductors (DRAMS) of one megabyte or above from Korea. Specifically, on July 16, 1997, in its final determination in the administrative review of an antidumping order on DRAMS from Korea, the Department of Commerce determined not to revoke the order. 62 FR 39809 (July 24, 1997). Commerce declined to revoke the order because it found that one of the regulatory criteria for revocation had not been satisfied; namely, based on the evidence before it, Commerce was not satisfied that future dumping of DRAMS by the Korean producers in question was ''not likely.''

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before January 5, 1998, to be assured of timely consideration by USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Ileana Falticeni, Litigation Assistant, Office of Monitoring and Enforcement, Room 501, Attn: Korea DRAMS Dispute, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William D. Hunter, Office of the General Counsel (202) 395–3582.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By letter dated November 6, 1997, the Government of Korea requested the establishment of a panel to examine the Department of Commerce's continuing imposition of an antidumping order on DRAMS of one megabyte or above from Korea. Although there currently are no scheduled meetings of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) during the remainder of 1997, it is possible that a meeting could be scheduled during this time and that the DSB could establish a panel before the end of 1997. Under normal circumstances, the panel, which will hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report detailing its findings and recommendations within six to nine months after it is established.

Major Issues Raised by the Government of Korea and Legal Basis of Complaint

In its request for the establishment of a panel, the Government of Korea has identified as the measures at issue (1) the July 16 determination by Commerce; and (2) the U.S. Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1673 *et seq.*) and the relevant Commerce regulations (19 CFR Part 353 (1997), both as applied and on their face. The Government of Korea alleges that these measures are inconsistent with several provisions of the WTO agreements, including the following specific allegations:

- Commerce's final determination not to revoke the antidumping order, after findings of no or *de minimis* dumping margins, and respondent companies' certification that they would not dump in the future and agreement to reinstatement in the order in the event they were to dump the merchandise in the future, is inconsistent with Article 11 of the Antidumping Agreement and Article VI of GATT 1994;
- The ''not likely'' criterion under Commerce's regulations gives Commerce wide discretion in deciding on revocation, and allows Commerce to maintain an order in an arbitrary and unjustifiable manner despite the absence of dumping for several years, respondents' certification not to dump in the future, and the agreement to reinstatement of the order in the event they dump DRAMS in the future. This criterion, both as applied in Commerce's final determination and on its face, is inconsistent with Article 11 of the Antidumping Agreement and Article VI of GATT 1994 and exceeds the scope of those agreements;
- The negative standard of the ''not likely'' criterion and Commerce's practice as applied in the final determination shifted the burden of proof from the United States to the respondents in contradiction of Article II of the Antidumping Agreement;
- The United States has failed to publish promptly, and in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them, objective and specific factors regarding the ''not likely'' criterion, and Commerce impermissibly accepted and rejected data in a biased fashion inconsistent with Article X of GATT 1994 and Articles 11 and 17 of the Antidumping Agreement;
- The U.S. maintenance of the antidumping order on DRAMS without considering whether the injury to the U.S. industry would be likely to continue or recur if the duty were removed is inconsistent with Article 11 of the Antidumping Agreement;
- Commerce's decision regarding the products subject to the order is inconsistent with Articles 2 and 3 of the Antidumping Agreement because it included products that were never found to have been dumped or to have caused injury, and it arbitrarily excluded products that were like products to those investigated;
- Commerce's final determination not to revoke the order based on unverified information from the petitioner and mere conjecture without any substantial data, and Commerce's failure to give adequate consideration to information submitted by the Korean respondents in the administrative review is inconsistent with Articles 2, 6 and 17.6(I) of the Antidumping Agreement and Article VI of GATT 1994;
- Commerce's selection of the period of review for the ''not likely'' criterion was improper and not objective, and therefore is inconsistent with Article 17.6(I) of the Antidumping Agreement and Article X of GATT 1994;
- Commerce's final determination is inconsistent with Article I of GATT 1994 in that it denied to the Korean respondents the revocation of the antidumping order after three consecutive reviews finding no or *de minimis* dumping margins, and after those respondents certified that they would not dump in the future, and after they agreed to the reimposition of the order if dumping occurred, even though Commerce revoked antidumping orders in the same circumstances involving other Members;
- Commerce's standard for determining whether to revoke antidumping orders is impossible to meet in proceedings involving cyclical industries such as the DRAMS industry, and, therefore, both on its face and as