

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 63, No. 240

Tuesday, December 15, 1998

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-580-818]

Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat-Rolled Products and Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat-Rolled Products from the Republic of Korea; Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51893), in response to requests from Pohang Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd., Pohang Steel Industries Co., Ltd., Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd., and Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd. (respondents), the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated administrative reviews of the countervailing duty orders on cold-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products and corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products from the Republic of Korea, for the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department is now terminating these reviews because the respondents have withdrawn their requests for reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 15, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eva Temkin or Christopher Cassel, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations as codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On August 31, 1998, the Department received requests for administrative reviews of these countervailing duty orders from the respondents for the period January 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997. No other interested party requested reviews of these countervailing duty orders. On September 29, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 51893) a notice of "Initiation of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review" initiating the administrative reviews of respondents for that period. On November 24, 1998, respondents withdrew their requests for reviews.

Section 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations stipulates that the Secretary may permit a party that requests a review to withdraw the request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. In this case, respondents have withdrawn their requests for reviews within the 90-day period. No other interested party requested a review and we have received no other submissions regarding respondents' withdrawal of their requests for reviews. Therefore, we are terminating these reviews of the countervailing duty orders on cold-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products and corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products from the Republic of Korea.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: December 7, 1998.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement Group II.

[FR Doc. 98-33211 Filed 12-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-559-001]

Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore

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

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 15, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria K. Dyczak or Rick Johnson, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Group III, Office IX, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1874, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-1398, or 482-3818, respectively.

SUMMARY: On August 11, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the Agreement suspending the countervailing duty investigation on certain refrigeration compressors from the Republic of Singapore.

In our preliminary results of review, we preliminarily determined that the signatories to the Suspension Agreement complied with the terms of the Agreement during the period of review (POR). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from petitioner Tecumseh Products Company ("Tecumseh") and respondents, the Government of the Republic of Singapore (GOS), Matsushita Refrigeration Industries (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. (MARIS), and Asia Matsushita Electric (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. (AMS).

We have now completed this review, the fourteenth review of this Agreement, and determine that the Government of the Republic of Singapore, MARIS, and AMS, the signatories to the Suspension Agreement, have complied with the terms of the Agreement during the period April 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the results from those

presented in the preliminary results of review.

Applicable Statute: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations set forth at 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 11, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 42825) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the Agreement suspending the countervailing duty investigation on certain refrigeration compressors from the Republic of Singapore.

In our preliminary results of review, we preliminarily determined that the signatories to the Suspension Agreement complied with the terms of the Agreement during the period of review (POR). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from petitioner and respondents. We have now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of hermetic refrigeration compressors rated not over one-quarter horsepower from Singapore. This merchandise is currently classified under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item number 8414.30.40. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review period is April 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997, and includes two programs. The review covers one producer and one exporter of the subject merchandise, MARIS and AMS, respectively. These two companies, along with the GOS, are the signatories to the suspension agreement.

Under the terms of the suspension agreement, the GOS agrees to offset completely the amount of the net bounty or grant determined by the Department to exist in this proceeding with respect to the subject merchandise. The offset entails the collection by the GOS of an export charge applicable to the subject merchandise exported on or after the effective date of the agreement.

See Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Suspension of the Countervailing Duty Investigation. ("Suspension Agreement") 48 FR 51167, 51170 (November 7, 1983).

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: Petitioner claims that Singapore's tax laws permit delays in assessment and collection that can result in erroneous determinations of the proper export charge under the Suspension Agreement. Petitioner notes that under Singapore's tax laws, assessment and collection of taxes can be negotiated up to six years following the year under consideration. Thus, as a result, the Department must complete its final determination for each annual review period based upon the provisional data. For example, petitioner notes that, following the publication of the final results of the most recently completed review, MARIS submitted for the record on the current review another calculation for the export charge for the previous review. Petitioner argues that if the updated tax information had been received prior to the final results of review, the export charge rate would have doubled. Petitioner notes that essentially the same fact pattern was in effect in the two most recent administrative reviews (12th and 13th). Petitioner contends that the Department's determinations in the 12th and 13th reviews may not reflect the total benefits relating to those periods as their respective tax assessments have not been finalized.

Petitioner argues that the Department should require respondents to submit information on all tax liabilities made final during the POR, regardless of when the liability accrued, and then to adjust the current POR's calculations to reflect the benefits not previously accounted for in the earlier POR. Petitioner contends that the Department's use of provisional tax data where final assessments are not available provides an incentive to respondents to delay final determination of tax liabilities until an administrative review has been concluded.

Respondents argue that there is no basis for the Department to reexamine benefits allegedly provided in prior reviews. Respondents assert that the Singapore tax system allows for negotiation of assessments for the purpose of ensuring a fair tax assessment, not, as petitioner contends, for the purpose of delay or forgiveness of the tax liability. Respondents contend that the Singapore tax system functions like those of many other countries in allowing the taxpayer to object to and

appeal a tax interpretation with which it disagrees. Respondents argue that the Department should reject petitioner's request to require respondents to submit information on tax liabilities made final during any POR, regardless of when the liability accrued, and then to adjust current year calculations to reflect any benefits recognized after reviews were completed. In support of their position, respondents make the following five arguments.

First, respondents assert that both petitioner and the Department have long been aware of the Singapore tax system and how it operates, and that the Department knowingly used provisional tax computations when final tax computations were not available. Second, respondents note that the Department has made many determinations involving the Singaporean tax system, and has a long-standing practice of calculating benefits received based on the latest income tax information available (citing, e.g., *Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from Singapore*, 57 FR 4987 (Feb. 11, 1992); *Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from Singapore*, 56 FR 9681 (March 7, 1991); *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Singapore*, 54 FR 15520 (April 18, 1989)). Additionally, respondents argue that the Department has consistently taken the position that it will not adopt a change in methodology absent some intervening change in either the basic facts or the governing law (citing *Certain Compressors from the Republic of Singapore*, 55 FR 53028, 53029 (Dec. 26, 1990)). Respondents contend that no such change in either the facts of the case or to the governing law has occurred and therefore, the Department has no basis to revise its practice.

Third, respondents argue that there is no support for petitioner's contention that respondents have no incentive to prepare an accurate and timely tax return. Respondents contend that the Department has explicitly relied on the IRAS's oversight function to ensure that taxation figures submitted to the Department are accurate and verified the accuracy of those figures over the last fifteen years during previous reviews (citing, e.g., *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore*, 53 FR 25647, 25648 (July 8, 1988); *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore*, 53 FR 7778, 7779 (March 10, 1988); *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of*

Singapore, 50 FR 6025, 6026 (Feb. 13, 1985)).

Fourth, respondents argue that as a matter of law, the Department cannot open prior administrative reviews. Respondents assert that under U.S. law (specifically, 19 U.S.C. § 1675(a)(1)), each administrative review is a separate proceeding, conducted based upon its own record. Additionally, respondents contend that previous entries that were covered in a prior review cannot be assessed an additional export charge once their countervailable status has been determined (citing *FAG Kugelfischer Georg Schafer KGaA v. United States*, 932 F.Supp. 315 (CIT 1996)).

Finally, respondents contend that the Suspension Agreement does not allow further adjustments to an export charge once a final export charge has been imposed, and that there is no provision providing for the collection of any other charges after the collection of the annual adjustment. Respondents point out that the Suspension Agreement explicitly requires the GOS to collect the annual adjustment "within 30 days of notification by the Department of its determination" in a review. See Suspension Agreement at paragraph B.4.c, reprinted in *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore*, 48 FR 51167, 51170 (Nov. 7, 1983) ("Suspension Agreement").

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioners. At the request of the Department in this and the previous review, respondents have provided updated tax information as it became available. See, e.g., *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Fourteenth Administrative Review*, Questionnaire Response, September 10, 1998; *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Thirteenth Administrative Review*, Questionnaire Response, April 6, 1998. We first note that the revised calculation submitted by respondent was not finalized during the current review, and indeed respondents reported that no tax assessments for any prior period of review had been finalized during the current period of review. See *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Fourteenth Review*, Rebuttal to Petitioner's Comments, May 21, 1998. As such, no benefits relating to a prior review were recognized during the current period of review.

Even if we were to recalculate the margin using the most recent revised tax calculation (submitted in the current review after the corresponding review had been completed), the total

countervailing duty rate calculated for respondents for the relevant period of review would still remain de minimis. See *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Fourteenth Review*; Petitioner's Brief, September 10, 1998, Exhibit 1. Similarly, the Department reviewed petitioner's same assertion during the previous review, and determined that an export charge calculation based on the revised information would have remained de minimis. See *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR at 32851 (June 16, 1998).

Nevertheless, we disagree with respondents' assertion that they are only required to provide the Department with updated tax computations when the updates occur prior to the completion of the administrative review to which they pertain. Under paragraph C.1. of the Suspension Agreement, the signatories to the Agreement "agree to supply to the Department any information and documentation the Department deems necessary to demonstrate that they are in full compliance with the Agreement." See Suspension Agreement at 51170. Despite respondents' argument presented in its rebuttal brief, we note that, in response to the Department's request, respondents appeared to acknowledge this authority. That is, respondents did in fact provide tax statements for the previous period of review, even though that review had been completed. See Supplemental Questionnaire Response of September 3, 1998, Exhibit A. While the Department does not reopen prior administrative reviews, this procedural restriction does not equate with a lack of authority to review overall compliance with the Suspension Agreement, particularly when the Suspension Agreement itself allows for such review. Indeed, under section 751(a)(1)(C) of the Act, the Department can "review the current status of, and compliance with, any agreement by reason of which an investigation was suspended, and review the amount of any net countervailable subsidy * * * involved in the agreement * * *". Therefore, the Department has full authority to require respondents to provide tax assessment information, not only for the present period of review, but for all prior reviews where tax assessments were revised or finalized during the instant POR.

Comment 2: Petitioner claims that respondents have refused to provide the information required by the Suspension Agreement and requested by the Department. Petitioner claims that

respondent has not met its obligations to provide complete and updated information, specifically with regard to respondent's income tax liabilities (as argued in Comment 1 by petitioner). Petitioner notes that respondents made several commitments: to advise the Department if MARIS's tax liability increased; to provide final tax calculations; and to provide this information regardless of the period currently under review. Petitioner claims that MARIS failed to notify the Department of its modified tax assessment for the 12th and 13th reviews during the course of the 13th administrative review period.

Petitioner argues that the Department should require respondents to provide more regular reporting of information relating to taxes owed. Petitioner suggests that, as the Government of Singapore is required by the Suspension Agreement under paragraph C.2.2 (See Suspension Agreement at 51170) to provide a quarterly certification that it continues to be in compliance with the Agreement, the Department should require that tax liability information (updated quarterly) be included in the quarterly report. Petitioner also suggests that the Department should advise respondents that failure to adhere to promises to supply information will result in the application of adverse information available.

Respondents argue that there is no basis in the Suspension Agreement to require the GOS to provide financial or tax information on a quarterly basis. Respondents assert that, contrary to petitioner's contention, they have consistently indicated in their responses that the tax calculations submitted were provisional and that respondents would supplement their response if assessments were finalized prior to the completion of the review. Additionally, respondents point out that each of the alleged failures to provide information relate to prior reviews, and that petitioner has no basis for complaint in the current review.

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioner. Petitioner contends that respondents failed to provide information during the course of the previous review. This argument was considered by the Department in the previous review, where we found that respondents had not failed to provide information in response to requests from the Department. See *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Final Results of Countervailable Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR at 32852 (June 16, 1998). Petitioner has not made any contention regarding a failure to submit

information during the current POR, and therefore, there is no basis to further consider petitioner's claims within the context of this administrative review. While we do not agree with respondent's assertion that the Suspension Agreement provides no basis to require the GOS to provide financial or tax information on a quarterly basis (see Suspension Agreement, paragraph C, 48 FR at 51170), at this time, we do not find it necessary to require such information from the GOS.

Comment 3: Petitioner claims that respondents have submitted false information to the Department. Petitioner claims that respondents submitted false information on three separate occasions: (1) statements made during the previous review regarding the availability and filing date of tax assessments; (2) statements made in the previous review regarding the volume and value of sales of subject merchandise; and (3) statements relating to the testing and rating of compressors made during the hearing for the previous review. Petitioner suggests that the Department instruct respondents that any subsequent submissions of false information will result in the immediate imposition of adverse facts available.

Respondents argue that petitioner's reference to any alleged failure to adhere to obligations to provide information relate solely to the previous review. Respondents cite to the final results of the previous administrative review (see *Certain Refrigeration Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Final Results of Countervailable Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR at 32855 (June 16, 1998)), and assert that the Department considered petitioner's contention in the previous administrative review and found that respondents had not failed to cooperate with the Department, and had acted to the best of their ability in complying with all requests for information. Respondents contend, therefore, that the Department should reject petitioner's suggestion to advise respondents that failure to comply with requests to provide information will result in the application of adverse facts available.

Department's Position: We agree with respondents. All of petitioner's allegations of false information relate to the previous review, where they were fully considered by the Department and found to be without merit. See *Certain Compressors from the Republic of Singapore: Final Results of Countervailable Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR at 32855 (June 16, 1998). Petitioner has made no allegation of

false information submitted in the current review, and the Department has no reason to believe that the information respondent provided for the record is inaccurate.

Comment 4: Petitioner claims that the problems cited in comments 1 and 2 require the Department to review the effectiveness of the current Suspension Agreement. Petitioner notes that the Suspension Agreement requires that benefits received by MARIS and AMS are to be offset completely by payments to the Government of Singapore. Petitioner asserts that the value of these benefits is sometimes not established at the time the Department makes its final determination in a particular administrative review. Petitioner suggests that, in order to ensure that the Suspension Agreement is fully and fairly implemented, the Department adopt the following measures: (1) require the GOS to submit quarterly reports that include disclosure of any actions taken by IRAS with regard to taxation of MARIS or AMS; (2) develop questionnaires that require respondents to disclose any changes in their tax liabilities for any prior review period; and (3) include within any benefit analysis for the current POR any increased benefit received by respondents that was unrecognized in a previous POR due to a delay in ascertaining final tax obligations.

Respondent did not comment on this issue.

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioner in part. We do not agree, at this time, that the Department should require the GOS to submit tax information on a quarterly basis, nor should we include within our current benefit analysis any increased benefit received by the respondents in the current POR that relates to a previous review period. However, the Department has asked, and will continue to ask, that respondents provide information relating to tax assessments finalized during a current POR, whether or not the assessment relates to that POR.

Petitioner claims that respondents realize benefits which have accrued after an administrative review has been closed, based on the Singaporean tax system, which allows finalization of tax assessments up to six years after the year of consideration. Because of the mechanics of the Department's administrative review process, it is possible that respondents can accrue benefits greater or less than those considered in calculating the export charge rate for that period of review. Thus, it is possible that respondents may be found to have been in

compliance with the Agreement within the context of the Department's administrative review procedures, even though an offset calculation based on finalized taxes may yield a different figure. However, in the current review, respondents report that no tax assessments had been finalized during the period of review, and therefore, no additional benefits relating to a prior review have been recognized in current POR. Therefore, petitioner's argument that respondents have accrued benefits that were previously unrecognized is moot for this period of review.

Under section 751(a)(1)(C) of the Act, the Department has the authority to review the status of a suspension agreement within the context of the administrative review. Given the possibility that respondents may accrue benefits unrecognized during the period of review to which they pertain, the Department intends to continue to ask respondents for information relating to finalized tax assessments for any prior period of review as a normal part of its administrative review procedure.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the signatories to the Suspension Agreement have complied with the terms of the Agreement, including the payment of the provisional export charge, for the review period. From April 1, 1996 to August 27, 1996, a provisional export charge of 3.00 percent was in effect. From August 28, 1996 to March 31, 1997, a provisional export charge of 2.22 percent was in effect.

We determine the net subsidy to be 0.56 percent of the f.o.b. value of the merchandise for the April 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997 review period. Following the methodology outlined in paragraph B.4 of the Suspension Agreement, the Department determines that, for the period of review, a negative adjustment may be made to the provisional export charge rate in effect. The adjustments will equal the difference between the provisional rate in effect during the review period and the rate determined in this review, plus interest. For this period, the GOS may refund or credit to the companies, in accordance with paragraph B.4.c of the Suspension Agreement, the difference between the two provisional rates noted above and the 0.56 percent, plus interest, calculated in accordance with section 778(b) of the Tariff Act.

Notification of Interested Parties

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 355.306. 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.

This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: December 8, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-33212 Filed 12-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)

Board of Overseers of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Request for nominations of members to serve on the Board of Overseers of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

SUMMARY: NIST invites and requests nomination of individuals for appointment to Board of Overseers of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (Board). The terms of some of the members of the Board will soon expire. NIST will consider nominations received in response to this notice for appointment to the Committee, in addition to nominations already received.

DATES: Please submit nominations on or before January 11, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Please submit nominations to Harry Hertz, Director, National Quality Program, NIST, Building 101, Room A605, Gaithersburg, MD 20899. Nominations may also be submitted via FAX to 301-948-3716. Additional information regarding the Committee, including its charter, current membership list, and executive summary may be found on its electronic home page at: <<http://www.quality.nit.gov/tos.htm>>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harry Hertz, Director, National Quality Program and Designated Federal Official, NIST, Building 101, Room A531, Gaithersburg, MD 20899; telephone 301-975-2163; FAX—301-

948-3716; or via e-mail at harry.hertz@nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Board of Overseers of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Information

The Board was established in accordance with 15 U.S.C. 3711a(d)(2)(B), pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app. 2).

Objectives and Duties

1. The Board shall review the work of the private sector contractor(s), which assists the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in administering the Award. The Board will make such suggestions for the improvement of the Award process as it deems necessary.

2. The Board shall provide a written annual report on the results of Award activities to the Director of NIST, along with its recommendations for the improvement of the Award process.

3. The Board will function solely as an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

4. The Board will report to the Director of NIST.

Membership

1. The Board will consist of approximately eleven members selected on a clear, standardized basis, in accordance with applicable Department of Commerce guidance, and for their preeminence in the field of quality management. There will be a balanced representation from U.S. service and manufacturing industries, education and health care. The Board will include members familiar with the quality improvement operations of manufacturing companies, service companies, small businesses, education, and health care. No employee of the Federal Government shall serve as a member of the Board of Overseers.

2. The Board will be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and will serve at the discretion of the Secretary. The term of office of each Board member shall be three years. All terms will commence on January 1 and end on December 31 of the appropriate year.

Miscellaneous

1. Members of the Board shall serve without compensation, but may, upon request, be reimbursed travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by U.S.C. 5701 et seq.

2. The Board will meet annually, except that additional meetings may be called as deemed necessary by the NIST

Director or by the Chairperson. Meetings are one to two days in duration.

3. Board meetings are open to the public. Board members do not have access to classified or proprietary information in connection with their Board duties.

II. Nomination Information

1. Nominations are sought from the private sector as described above.

2. Nominees should have established records of distinguished service and shall be familiar with the quality improvement operations of manufacturing companies, service companies, small businesses, education, and health care. The category (field of eminence) for which the candidate is qualified should be specified in the nomination letter. Nominations for a particular category should come from organizations or individuals within that category. A summary of the candidate's qualifications should be included with the nomination, including (where applicable) current or former service on federal advisory boards and federal employment. In addition, each nomination letter should state that the person agrees to the nomination, acknowledge the responsibilities of serving on the Board, and will actively participate in good faith in the tasks of the Board. Besides participation at meetings, it is desired that members be able to devote the equivalent of seven days between meetings to either developing or researching topics of potential interest, and so forth, in furtherance of their Board duties.

3. The Department of Commerce is committed to equal opportunity in the workplace and seeks a broad-based and diverse Board membership.

Dated: December 9, 1998.

Robert E. Hebner,

Acting Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 98-33166 Filed 12-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 981028268-8268-01]

Announcing Approval of Federal Information Processing Standard 186-1, Digital Signature Standard, and Request for Comments

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

ACTION: Notice; Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce approved an interim final standard,