

two minutes per response. Thus each respondent will incur a recordkeeping burden of 312 (156×312/60).

Accordingly, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-2 is 8,424 hours (7,020+1,404).

The Commission does not maintain the risk disclosure document, however, it must be retained by the broker-dealer for at least three years following the date on which the risk disclosure document was provided to the customer, the first two years in an accessible place. The collection of information required by the rule is mandatory. The risk disclosure document is otherwise governed by the internal policies of the broker-dealer regarding confidentiality, etc.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

Written comments regarding the above information should be directed to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503; and (ii) Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: June 21, 1999.

Margaret H. McFarland,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-16202 Filed 6-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 3076]

Policy on Munitions Export Licenses to Nigeria

AGENCY: Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State.

ACTION: Public Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Sections 38 and 42 of the Arms Export Control Act, notice is hereby given that it is no longer the policy of the United States to deny all requests for licenses and other approvals to export defense articles or defense services to Nigeria. Therefore, U.S. persons registered with the Department of State's Office of Defense Trade Controls may henceforth submit

requests that will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William J. Lowell, Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State (703) 875-6644 or FAX (703) 875-6647.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Effective immediately, it is no longer the policy of the U.S. Government to deny all requests for licenses and other approvals to authorize the export of defense articles and defense services to Nigeria. Since the death of General Sani Abacha in June 1998, Head of State Abubakar has made significant and steady contributions toward Nigeria's transition to a democratically elected government and to human rights reform, and a democratic election was held in February 1999. Nigeria has reversed many of the policies of the Abacha regime and inaugurated the democratically elected administration of Olusegun Obasanjo. It is because of these changes that U.S. persons registered with the Department of State's Office of Defense Trade Controls may henceforth submit requests that will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Reinstatement of Nigeria to the sales territory of any manufacturing license and/or technical assistance agreement should be addressed through an amendment to the agreement to be submitted to the Office of Defense Trade Controls.

This action has been taken pursuant to Sections 38 and 42 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2791) and Section 126.7 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

Dated: June 18, 1999.

Eric D. Newsom,

Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99-16254 Filed 6-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-25-P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Request for Public Comment Regarding the Economic and Environmental Effects of Tariff Elimination in the Forest Products Sector

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative and Council on Environmental Quality.

ACTION: Request for written public comment.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) are seeking public comment about the economic and environmental effects of the initiative to eliminate remaining tariffs on forest products. These comments are sought in the context of a written analysis which CEQ and USTR are undertaking of that initiative. The initiative, which is now the subject on negotiations within the World Trade Organization (WTO), is part of an eight sector accelerated tariff liberalization (ATL) proposal. The other ATL sectors are environmental goods and services, gems and jewelry, medical equipment and scientific instruments, chemicals, energy, fish and toys.

The ATL proposal in forest products covers all of Chapters 44, 46, 47, 48, 49 on the HTS as well as portions of chapter 38 (certain wood chemicals), and 94 (furniture and prefabricated buildings.)

The complete list of tariff lines included in the initiative can be found in the **Federal Register** notice announcing ITC Investigation No. 332-392, Advice Concerning APEC Sectoral Trade Liberalization, (Federal Register, April 1, 1998, Vol. 63, No. 62).

The analysis will address the following broad subject areas: the history of the initiative, a description of how the forest products ATL relates to other U.S. government goals and objectives in the forest policy arena, the likely economic impact of tariff elimination in terms of shifts in production and consumption of forest products and the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of these shifts, and appropriate policy responses. The report is intended to focus on the effects of the ATL initiative on the United States but will also address broader global implications of the initiative. Specific information regarding, or empirical studies of, the economic and environmental impacts of past trade liberalization in this sector which interested parties may have would be particularly welcome.

Testimony related to the subject of this request which has been submitted in response to the following will be made a part of the record of this study and does not need to be resubmitted: ITC Investigation No. 332-392, "Advice Concerning APEC Sectoral Trade Liberalization" (**Federal Register**, April 1, 1998, Vol 63, No. 62); USTR Notice "Negotiation of Sectoral Market Opening Agreements" (**Federal Register**, May 15, 1998, Vol. 63, No. 94);

USTR Trade Policy Staff Committee Notice "Request for Public Comment Regarding Negotiations on Market Access and Other Issues in the World Trade Organization and Under the Free Trade Area of the Americas" (**Federal Register**, April 14, 1999, Vol. 64, No. 71); and ITC Investigation 332-400, "Conditions of Competition in U.S. Forest Products Trade".

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Environment and Natural Resources Section, telephone 202-395-7320 or the Council on Environmental Quality, International Affairs, telephone 202-456-6224.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background

A. History of Tariff Liberalization in the Forest Products Sector

The United States sought elimination of all tariffs in the forest products sector during the Uruguay Round. The round resulted in a "zero for zero" (reciprocal tariff elimination) agreement which

included the United States, Canada, Finland, Austria, Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, EU, Korea and New Zealand for paper products (chapters 47, 48 and 49 of the HTS) by 2004. At the same time there was agreement to reduce, over five years, tariffs on wood products. In the United States, such reductions amounted to just over a one-third cut in average tariff levels from an average tariff level of 3.1% to an average tariff level of 1.8%. Under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and its accompanying Statement of Administrative Action, Congress listed a number of industrial or agricultural sectors in which complete tariff elimination was not achieved in the Uruguay Round but for which Congress determined that obtaining further reductions and elimination of tariffs was a priority objective. Under section 11(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, Congress provided the Administration with ongoing authority to seek reductions in tariffs on wood products, among other sectors.

B. Initiative Begun in APEC

In mid 1997, APEC Ministers called for the nomination of sectors for Early Voluntary Sectoral Liberalization (EVSL) among APEC economies. Four nominations were received in the forest product area from the United States, Canada, Indonesia and New Zealand. These four proposals were merged together in September 1997, with New Zealand agreeing to act as coordinator for the proposal. Indonesia, the United States and Canada have remained active proponents of the proposal in a co-sponsor role. At the APEC summit in Kuala Lumpur in November 1998, APEC leaders agreed to move the tariff portions of the EVSL initiative to the WTO in order to seek a critical mass of support for concluding an agreement on all eight sectors by the end of 1999. The non-tariff, building standards and economic and technical cooperation areas of the proposal continue to be worked on within APEC.

C. Major global importers and exporters of forest products, 1996:

Importers	1000 US\$	Exporters	1000 US\$
USA	\$22,558,540	Canada	\$25,333,160
Japan	18,890,400	USA	16,939,900
Germany	11,926,820	Sweden	10,996,200
United Kingdom	8,476,689	Finland	10,301,020
Italy	6,148,593	Germany	9,438,751
France	5,356,351	Indonesia	5,206,522
Netherlands	4,489,773	France	4,193,914
Korea, Republic of	4,425,527	Malaysia	4,161,279
China (excl. Hong Kong)	3,858,254	Austria	4,149,678
Spain	3,552,249	Brazil	3,233,476
Belgium-Luxembourg	3,544,574	Russian Federation	2,995,568
Hong Kong, China	3,488,083	Italy	2,486,782
Taiwan	3,040,661	Netherlands	2,406,430
Canada	2,622,203	Belgium-Luxembourg	2,180,694
Switzerland	2,501,957	Norway	2,059,960
World	138,652,200	World	134,656,400

Source: FAO

D. Trade Barriers Faced by Sector

The sector faces a range of barriers. Tariffs remain particularly significant barriers. The 1998 FAO publication *Trade Restrictions and Their Impact on International Trade in Forest Products* which is available in hard copy and on the FAO website [www.fao.org/ur] provides a detailed explanation of the barriers faced in this sector.

Applied tariffs in OECD economies for these products, in general, are relatively low, however, tariffs for specific products remain high. This is especially true for wood panel products, builders' woodwork items, and furniture for those countries that did not agree to the zero for zero on furniture rates for particular products are higher, commonly 10-15%. Tariffs in other

countries are higher than this, with rates commonly falling between 10 and 60%.

Tariffs, Selected Countries

HTS Product Chapters: 44, 47, 48, 49, 94 (part).

	Tariff % MFN average
Australia	2.88
Canada	3.88
Chile	11
China	20.86
Taiwan	3.22
Hong Kong, China	0
Indonesia	9.7
Japan	1.14
Korea	4.98
Malaysia	12.26
Mexico	11.32
New Zealand	6.06

	Tariff % MFN average
Singapore	0
Thailand	20.04
USA	1.4
EU	5.26

Source: FAOSTAT Website

E. Scope

The ATL proposal covers all forest products—from rosin (ex 3804), to logs and wood products (ch44), ratan products (ex 46), pulp, paper and paper products (ch 47, 48 and 49), wooden furniture (ex 9401, ex 9403) and prefabricated buildings made of wood (ex 9406).

F. The Tariff Proposal Target

Existing parties to the Uruguay Round zero for zero agreement to accelerated removal of tariffs in chapters 47, 48 and 49 of the HTS (pulp, paper and paperboard and printed material) would agree to move up the elimination of tariffs in these sectors from 1 January 2004 to 1 January 2000. Others would attempt to remove tariffs by the same date but countries could delay tariff removal until 1 January 2002 on a case by case basis for a limited number of specific products.

The proposal calls for the commencement to tariff cuts on all other products with the goal of eliminating tariffs by 1 January 2002, but accepts that in special circumstances and on a case by case basis elimination could be delayed to 1 January 2004.

G. Non-Tariff Measures

As part of the original APEC EVSL agreed to in November 1997, APEC economies agreed to hire a consultant to undertake a study of non-tariff measures which may be affecting trade in the forest products sector. This past April, APEC issued a request for proposals for the study. The United States is the APEC coordinator for the study. Under the terms of reference, the study will include:

- A comprehensive inventory of non-tariff measures and other policies affecting trade in forest products;
- An identification of the most frequently used measures and policies;
- A qualitative and quantitative analysis of the impact of these measures/policies on trade, including a broader analysis of the policy goals underlying those measures/policies and the economic and environmental costs and benefits stemming from their application.

APEC members have been asked to notify and cross notify on NTMs in effect in their own economies and the economies of other APEC members. The study is to be completed by August 30, 1999, after which an APEC forest experts groups will formulate appropriate recommendations for the voluntary elimination of any unjustified measures identified in the report. APEC economies are then to submit individual, voluntary reports on timetables for the implementation of those recommendations.

H. Economic and Technical Cooperation

Four proposals have been received to date for projects under the environmental and technical

cooperation (Ecotech) portion of the APEC EVSL. APEC economies have agreed that Ecotech cooperation projects in support of the forestry initiative should be focused on programs which further environmental goals, such as forest fire prevention, pest control, and adoption of sound phytosanitary standards. The four Ecotech projects under consideration are

- Projects to increase communities' forestry knowledge and their ability to develop solutions to such issues as forest resource assessment using criteria and indicators;
- Enhancement of local industry development in a sustainable manner through training programs on sustainable forest management;
- Cooperation to enhance collaborative work on forest fire prevention and management systems and development of fire monitoring and information systems; and
- Cooperation in such areas as (1) enhanced infrastructure, personnel and exchange of information on standards and technical regulations in the sector; (2) making information and training programs available on paper making, paper stock collection and utilization, recycling and waste reduction, panel production, furniture design, finishing and packaging, and builder's carpentry and joinery design; (3) enhancing transparency in customs procedures applied to the forestry sector through the Subcommittee on Customs Procedures of the APEC Committee on Trade and Investment; (4) promoting exchange of market information through cooperation among relevant organizations; and (5) improving information and monitoring systems associated with harmful pests.

2. Written Comments

Persons wishing to submit written comments in response to this notice should provide 20 copies no later than 30 days from the date of this notice to Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, ATTN: Forest Products ATL, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Room 122, 600 Seventeenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20508. Any business confidential submissions must be clearly marked as such on cover page and succeeding page. Such submission must be accompanied by a non-confidential summary thereof.

Non-confidential submissions will be available for public inspection at the USTR Reading Room, Room 101, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 Seventeenth Street, NW, Washington, DC. An appointment to review the file

may be made by calling Brenda Webb at (202) 395-6186. The Reading Room is open to the public from 10 a.m. to 12 noon and from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Frederick L. Montgomery,
Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.

Dinah Bear,
General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality.

[FR Doc. 99-16242 Filed 6-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-5863]

Decision That Certain Nonconforming Motor Vehicles are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of decision by NHTSA that certain nonconforming motor vehicles are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces decisions by NHTSA that certain motor vehicles not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they are substantially similar to vehicles originally manufactured for importation into and/or sale in the United States and certified by their manufacturers as complying with the safety standards, and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: These decisions are effective as of June 25, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. § 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. § 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to