companies and distributors (made at the same level of trade as U.S. sales). There are no differences in the selling functions Saha Thai performs for these customers in the home market or in the U.S. Therefore, we conclude that EP and NV sales are made at the same LOT and no adjustment is warranted.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A of the Act, based on exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation to have existed, we substitute the benchmark rate for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice. *See* Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions, 61 FR 9434 (March 8, 1996).

Our preliminary analysis of Federal Reserve dollar-baht exchange rate data shows that the value of the Thai baht in relation to the U.S. dollar fell on July 2, 1997 by more than 18 percent from the previous day and did not rebound significantly in a short time. This decline was many times more severe than any single-day decline during several years prior to that date. Had the baht rebounded quickly enough to recover all or almost all of the loss, the Department might have been inclined to view this decline as nothing more than a momentary drop, despite the magnitude of that drop. However, there was no significant rebound. Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that the decline in the baht from July 1, 1997 to July 2, 1997 was of such a magnitude that the dollar-baht exchange rate cannot reasonably be viewed as having simply fluctuated at this time, i.e., as having experienced only a momentary drop in value, relative to the normal benchmark. Therefore, for exchange rates between July 2 and August 27, 1997, the Department relied on the standard exchange rate model, but used as the benchmark rate a (stationary) average of the daily rates over this period. In this manner we used a post-precipitous drop benchmark, but at the same time avoided undue daily fluctuations in exchange rates. For the period after August 27, 1997, we used the standard (rolling 40-day average) benchmark.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Saha Thai	3/1/97–2/28/98	12.83

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, within 120 days from the date of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we calculated importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rates for the class or kind of merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries that particular importer made during the POR. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon the publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by Section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.67 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

These preliminary results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 31, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–9193 Filed 4–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–423–806]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Belgium; Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest or Eva Temkin, Group II, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUMMARY: On March 16, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its final results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996 (64 FR 12982) (*Final Results*). Subsequent to the publication of the *Final Results,* we received comments from the petitioners alleging various ministerial errors. After analyzing the comments submitted, we are amending our final results to correct certain ministerial errors. Based on the correction of these ministerial errors, we have changed the net subsidy for Fabriqure de Fer de Charleroi, S.A. (Fafer). We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 1999.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). In addition, all citations to the Department's regulations reference 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On March 16, 1999, the Department published the final results of its administrative review of the countervailing duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996 (64 FR 12982). After publication of our *Final Results,* we received timely allegations from petitioners that we had made ministerial errors in calculating the final results. We also received timely rebuttal comments from the respondent.

A summary of the allegation and rebuttal comments along with the Department's response is included below. We corrected our calculations, where we agree that we made ministerial errors, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act.

Clerical Error Allegation

Allegation: Petitioners allege that we inadvertently allocated the two grants received by Fafer's affiliate, Parachevement et Finitions de Metaux (PFM), over the average useful life (AUL) of Fafer's assets rather than properly expensing them in the year of receipt. Petitioners cite the *General Issues Appendix* appended to *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From Austria* (*GIA*), 58 FR 37217, 37226 (July 9, 1993) (proposed 19 C.F.R. section 355.49(a)(3)(i)(A)) and state that under the Department's standard grant methodology, the sum of grants provided under a particular domestic subsidy program in a given year are expensed in the year in which the grant was provided when this sum is less than 0.50 percent of the firm's total sales. Petitioners further cite the Department's comments on the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments* (*1989 Proposed Regulations*), 54 FR 37217, which state that the ''purpose of this rule is to avoid any anomalies caused by the interaction of the Department's allocation formula and the *de minimis* rule'' * * * *See* 54 FR 23376 (May 31, 1989).

Petitioners assert that PFM received two grants under the 1970 Law in 1996 and that these benefits are 0.425 percent of Fafer's domestic sales in 1996. Therefore, petitioners contend that these grants should be expensed in the year of receipt.

In rebuttal, the respondent, Fabrique de Fer de Charleroi (Fafer), argues that the issues raised by petitioners in its allegation are not a ministerial matter, but rather a methodological approach to calculations by the Department. The respondent cites the Department's regulations at 19 C.F.R. 351.224, which define a ministerial error as, ''an error in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other similar type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial.'' The respondent asserts that the Department used its discretion in the final results and correctly calculated the benefit by expensing a portion of the benefits in this case rather than expensing the entire benefit during the period of review. Fafer contends that the Department chose this calculation methodology to avoid significant substantive anomalies that would result from expensing the entire benefit during the 1996 review period, a distortively high countervailing duty rate.

The respondent cites *Final Rule; Countervailing Duties,* 63 FR 65358 (November 25, 1998) (*Final Rule*) which states that the Department will normally expense grant amounts for a program in the year that they were given, if those amounts are less than 0.5 percent of the total value of sales for that year. The respondent maintains that the 0.5 test is an exception to the general rule of allocating non-recurring grants which is applied to reduce the administrative burden in cases where the impact is minuscule. The respondent asserts that the Department has the discretion to apply the 0.5 test on a case by case basis and in this case has chosen to use its general practice of allocating non-recurring grants over the AUL instead. The respondent argues that there is no administrative burden in this case because the calculations have been completed. Moreover, to change the allocation methodology would have a significant impact on Fafer's countervailing duty rate which would no longer be *de minimis* and would result in a duty being assessed for the POR.

In response to petitioners' assertion that the purpose of using the 0.5 percent test is to avoid anomalies between the allocation formula and the *de minimis* rule, the respondent argues that the only anomaly created would be from expensing these grants in a given year which would result in an affirmative countervailing duty rate rather than a *de minimis* one. The respondent argues that this is not the correct application of the 0.5 percent test exception for the allocation of grants. The respondent contends that the Department chose the calculation methodology which had no distortive effects.

Furthermore, the respondent argues that PFM's benefits should not be expensed in total during the review period, because, notwithstanding petitioners' claim that PFM's grants benefitted the subject merchandise, PFM did not in any way affect merchandise attributed to Fafer that was imported into the United States. Therefore, if PFM's benefits are attributed to Fafer, respondent argues that they should be calculated on the same basis as the calculations applied to Fafer.

Department's Position: We agree with petitioners that the Department made a ministerial error and should have expensed PFM's grants in the 1996 review period. We have changed the net subsidy rate accordingly. In the *Final Results,* the Department stated that it ''employed the standard grant allocation methodology'' as explained in the *GIA,* with respect to the grants received by S.A. Charleroi Deroulage (CD) and PFM. *See* 64 FR at 12984, *citing GIA.* However, inconsistent with the *GIA* and our application of the standard grant methodology throughout this proceeding, we inadvertently failed to apply the 0.50 percent test to the CD and PFM grants, and, consequently, allocated these grants over Fafer's AUL. Therefore, to correct this ministerial error, we applied this test and found

that the 1993 and 1996 grants were less than 0.50 percent of total domestic sales in the year that they were given. As a result, we have expensed the sum of PFM's grants provided in 1996 and included the total benefit of 0.42 percent *ad valorem* in the net subsidy rate for the 1996 review period. Moreover, we have determined that the grant provided in 1993 to Fafer's other affiliate, CD, would have been expensed in the 1993 review period and have not included CD's 1993 benefit in the net subsidy rate for the 1996 POR.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of the amended net subsidy calculations, we determine the net subsidy for Fafer to be 0.69 percent *ad valorem* for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996.

We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess countervailing duties of 0.69 percent *ad valorem* on shipments of the subject merchandise from Fafer exported on or after January 1, 1996, and on or before December 31, 1996. The Department will also instruct Customs to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties of 0.69 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from Fafer as amended by this determination. The amended deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Because the URAA replaced the general rule in favor of a country-wide rate with a general rule in favor of individual rates for investigated and reviewed companies, the procedures for establishing countervailing duty rates, including those for non-reviewed companies, are now essentially the same as those in antidumping cases, except as provided for in section 777A(e)(2)(B) of the Act. The requested review will normally cover only those companies specifically named. *See* 19 CFR 351.213(b). Pursuant to 19 CFR section 351.212(c), for all companies for which a review was not requested, duties must be assessed at the cash deposit rate, and cash deposits must continue to be collected at the rate previously ordered. As such, the countervailing duty cash deposit rate applicable to a company can no longer change, except pursuant to a request for a review of that company. *See Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company* v. *United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) and *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except those covered by this review will be unchanged by the results of this amended final results of administrative review.

We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company. Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by this order will be the rate for that company established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding conducted under the URAA. If such a review has not been conducted, the rate established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding pursuant to the statutory provisions that were in effect prior to the URAA amendments is applicable. *See Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From Belgium* 58 FR 37273. These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested. In addition, for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR section 355.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 U.S.C. 1677f(i)(7)).

Dated: April 6, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–9194 Filed 4–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 040699B]

Western Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold a meeting of its Precious Corals Plan Team and Advisory Panel.

DATES: The meeting will be held on May 3, 1999, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at NMFS Honolulu Laboratory, 2570 Dole St., Rm. 112, Honolulu, HI 96822–2396, telephone: 808–983–5300.

Council address: Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, 1164 Bishop St., Suite 1400, Honolulu, HI 96813.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kitty M. Simonds, Executive Director; telephone: 808–522–8220.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the Precious Corals Plan Team and Advisory Panel will discuss possible adjustments to established management measures in the Council's precious corals fishery management plan. These adjustments include suspending the harvest quota for live gold coral at the Makapu'u Bed; redefining the term ''live coral''; prohibiting the harvest of black coral unless it has attained a minimum height of 48 inches or a stem diameter of 1 inch; applying size limits to harvested live coral only; prohibiting the use of non-selective gear; prohibiting the harvest of pink coral from any established or conditional bed unless it has attained a minimum height of 10 inches; revising the boundaries of Brooks Bank; increasing the annual harvest quota for live pink coral at Brooks Bank; suspending the harvest quota for live gold coral at Brooks Bank; classifying the FFS-Gold Pinnacles Bed as a conditional bed; setting the annual harvest quota for all types of live precious coral at the FFS-Gold Pinnacles at zero; and revising reporting and record keeping requirements.