the 1996 review (*id.*). As a result, the Department preliminarily determines that the net countervailable subsidies that would be likely to prevail in the event of revocation of the order are 10.93 percent for Haifa and 5.97 percent for all others, including Rotem (*see* September 21, 1999, Memorandum to File Regarding Calculation of the Net Countervailable Subsidy).

Nature of the Subsidy

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department states that, consistent with section 752(a)(6) of the Act, the Department will provide to the Commission information concerning the nature of the subsidy, and whether the subsidy is a subsidy described in Article 3 or Article 6.1 of the Subsidies Agreement. The domestic and respondent interested parties did not address this issue in their substantive responses of March 31, 1999.

Because the receipt of benefit under the Bank of Israel Export Loans program is contingent on exports, this program falls within the definition of an export subsidy under Article 3.1(a) of the Subsidies Agreement. The remaining programs, although not falling within the definition of an export subsidy under Article 3.1(a) of the Subsidies Agreement, could be found to be inconsistent with Article 6 if the net countervailable subsidy exceeds five percent, as measured in accordance with Annex IV of the Subsidies Agreement. The Department, however, has no information with which to make such a calculation, nor do we believe it appropriate to attempt such a calculation in the course of a sunset review. Rather, we are providing the Commission with the following program descriptions.

The Encouragement of Capital Investments Law (ECIL) Grants. In the 1987 original investigation, the Department found that Negev Phosphates, Ltd. (''Negev'') and Haifa Chemicals, Ltd. received countervailable subsidies from this program, the benefits of which depend on the geographic location of the eligible enterprises. ECIL Grants were found to confer subsidies in each subsequent administrative review.

Long-Term Industrial Development (''LTID'') Loans. Funded by the GOI, this program enabled approved enterprises in a number of diverse industries to obtain LTID Loans. Like ECIL grants, these loans are project-specific and the interest rates charged on these loans depend on the Development Zone location of the borrower. The Department found LTID Loans to confer subsidies in the administrative reviews for the periods 1988 through 1993.

Exchange Rate Risk Insurance Scheme (''ERIS''). Operated by the Israeli Foreign Trade Risk Insurance Corporation (''IFTRIC''), ERIS insures exporters against losses which result when the rate of inflation exceeds the rate of devaluation and the new Israeli shekel value of an exporter's foreign currency receivable does not rise enough to cover increases in local costs. The ERIS is optional and open to any exporter willing to pay a premium to IFTRIC. The Department determined that subsidies from this program were terminated in 1993.[17]

Encouragement of Research and Development Law (''EIRD'') Grants. Israeli manufacturers, producers or exporters of IPA may benefit from research and development grants under this program. With the exception of the 1988, 1989 and 1991 administrative reviews, the Department found the EIRD Law Grants to be countervailable in each yearly review since the issuance of the order.

Infrastructure Grant Program. In the administrative review of the 1996 period, the Department found that this program enables the GOI to establish new industrial areas by partially reimbursing companies for their costs of developing the infrastructure in certain geographical zones.

Environmental Grant Program. Additionally, in the 1996 administrative review, the Department found that the GOI administers this countervailable subsidy program to provide for companies financial assistance for the adaptation of existing industrial facilities to new environmental requirements.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the rates listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Haifa, Ltd	10.93
All Others	5.97

This five-year (''sunset'') review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

[17] *See Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 28841, (June 6, 1996).

Dated: September 21, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–25073 Filed 9–24–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[Certificate of Review No. 89–00015]

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Process to Revoke Export Trade.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to Airborne Business Cargo, Inc. (''ABCI''). Because this certificate holder has failed to file an annual report as required by law, the Department is initiating proceedings to revoke the certificate. This notice summarizes the notification letter sent to ABCI.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Exports Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (''the Act'') (15 U.S.C. 4011–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue export trade certificates of review. The regulations implementing Title III (''the Regulations'') are found at 15 CFR part 325. Pursuant to this authority, a certificate of review was issued on December 12, 1989 to ABCI.

A certificate holder is required by law (Section 308 of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 4018) to submit to the Department of Commerce annual reports that update financial and other information relating to business activities covered by its certificate. The annual report is due within 45 days after the anniversary date of the issuance of the certificate of review (Sections 325.14 (a) and (b) of the Regulations). Failure to submit a complete annual report may be the basis for revocation. (Sections 325.10(a) and 325.14(c) of the Regulations).

The Department of Commerce sent to ABCI on December 2, 1998, a letter containing annual report questions with a reminder that its annual report was due on January 26, 1999. Additional reminders were sent on February 10, 1999, and on March 17, 1999. The Department has received no written response to any of these letters.

On September 21, 1999, and in accordance with section 325.10(c)(1) of the Regulations, a letter was sent by certified mail to notify ABCI that the Department was formally initiating the process to revoke its certificate. The letter stated that this action is being taken because of the certificate holder's failure to file an annual report.

In accordance with Section 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations, each certificate holder has thirty days from the day after its receipt of the notification letter in which to respond. The certificate holder is deemed to have received this letter as of the date on which this notice is published in the **Federal Register.** For good cause shown, the Department of Commerce can, at its discretion, grant a thirty-day extension for a response.

If the certificate holder decides to respond, it must specifically address the Department's statement in the notification letter that it has failed to file an annual report. It should state in detail why the facts, conduct, or circumstances described in the notification letter are not true, or if they are, why they do not warrant revoking the certificate. If the certificate holder does not respond within the specified period, it will be considered an admission of the statements contained in the notification letter (Section 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations).

If the answer demonstrates that the material facts are in dispute, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice shall, upon request, meet informally with the certificate holder. Either Department may require the certificate holder to provide the documents or information that are necessary to support its contentions (Section 325.10(c)(3) of the Regulations).

The Department shall publish a notice in the **Federal Register** of the revocation or modification or a decision not to revoke or modify (Section 325.10(c)(4) of the Regulations). If there is a determination to revoke a certificate, any person aggrieved by such final decision may appeal to an appropriate U.S. district court within 30 days from the date on which the Department's final determination is published in the **Federal Register** (Sections 325.10(c)(4) and 325.11 of the Regulations).

Dated: September 21, 1999.

Morton Schnabel,

Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99–25009 Filed 9–24–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 092199B]

Endangered Species; Permits

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

ACTION: Receipt of an application to modify scientific research permit 1134.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that NMFS has received an application to modify scientific research permit 1134 from the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission at Portland, OR (CRITFC).

DATES: Written comments or requests for a public hearing on this modification request must be received on or before October 27, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The application and related documents are available for review in the following office, by appointment:

Protected Resources Division, F/NWO3, 525 NE Oregon Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97232–4169 (503–230–5400).

Documents may also be reviewed by appointment in the Office of Protected Resources, F/PR3, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910–3226 (301–713–1401).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie Schaeffer, Portland, OR (503–230–5433).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

Issuance of permit modifications, as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543) (ESA), is based on a finding that such modifications: (1) Are applied for in good faith; (2) would not operate to the disadvantage of the listed species which are the subject of the permits; and (3) are consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA. Authority to take listed species is subject to conditions set forth in the permits. Modifications are issued in accordance with and are subject to the ESA and NMFS regulations governing listed fish and wildlife permits (50 CFR parts 222–226).

Those individuals requesting a hearing on the application listed in this notice should set out the specific reasons why a hearing on the application would be appropriate (see **ADDRESSES**). The holding of such hearings is at the discretion of the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA. All statements and opinions contained in the permit action summary are those of the applicant and do not necessarily reflect the views of NMFS.

Species Covered in This Notice

The following species and evolutionarily significant units (ESU's) are covered in this notice:

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*): Lower Columbia River (LCR), Snake River (SnR) spring/summer, SnR fall, Upper Columbia River (UCR) spring.

Sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*): SnR

Steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): LCR, SnR, UCR.

To date, protective regulations for threatened LCR steelhead under section 4(d) of the ESA have been not promulgated by NMFS. This notice of receipt of an application for a permit modification requesting take of LCR steelhead is issued as a precaution in the event that NMFS issues LCR steelhead protective regulations. The initiation of a 30-day public comment period on the application, including the proposed take of LCR steelhead, does not presuppose the contents of the eventual protective regulations.

Modification Request Received

CRITFC requests modifications to scientific research permit 1134. Permit 1134 authorizes CRITFC annual takes of juvenile, endangered, SnR sockeye salmon; adult and juvenile, threatened, SnR fall chinook salmon; adult and juvenile, threatened, naturally produced and artificially propagated, SnR spring/summer chinook salmon; and adult and juvenile, endangered, naturally produced and artificially propagated, UCR steelhead associated with 8 research projects in the Snake and Columbia River Basins in the Pacific Northwest. For the modifications, CRITFC proposes an increase in the annual take of ESA-listed adult and juvenile fish associated with the projects and with 3 new projects: (1) biological and chemical monitoring, and physical habitat assessment in steelhead waters; (2) tagging juvenile Hanford Reach upriver bright fall chinook salmon; and (3) SnR steelhead kelt identification study. CRITFC proposes to employ seines and electrofishing to capture ESA-listed juvenile fish, tag ESA-listed juvenile fish, and capture and handle post-spawned ESA-listed adult fish. An increase in take of ESA-listed juvenile fish indirect mortalities is also requested, as well as annual takes of adult and juvenile, endangered, naturally produced and artificially propagated UCR spring chinook salmon