to serve beginning immediately and until October 1, 1999. Private sector members will serve at the discretion of the Secretary. They are expected to participate fully in defining and implementing CBC work programs, reporting on the results, and presenting written recommendations to the two governments. It is expected that private sector individuals chosen for the CBC will attend at least 75% of CBC meetings, which are held alternately in the U.S. and Korea. Private sector members are fully responsible for travel, living and personal expenses associated with their participation in the CBC. The private sector members will serve in a representative capacity presenting the views and interests of the particular business sector in which they operate, not those of their individual firms. Private sector members are not special government employees.

Objectives

The goals of the CBC are as follows:

- Identifying commercial opportunities, impediments, and issues of concern to the respective business communities;
- Improving the dissemination of appropriate commercial information on both markets;
- Adopting sectoral or project-oriented approaches to expand business opportunities, addressing specific problems, and making recommendations to decision-makers where appropriate;
- Promoting trade/business development and promotion programs to assist the respective business communities in accessing each market, including trade missions, exhibits, seminars, and other events;
- Facilitating appropriate technical cooperation; and
- Considering other steps that may be taken to foster growth and enhance commercial relations.

Membership Criteria

Eligibility criteria. An applicant must be:

- a U.S. citizen residing in the United States; and
- not a registered foreign agent under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (FARA).

In reviewing eligible applicants, the Commerce Department will consider:

- Expertise in one of the business sectors noted above in which the CBC will be active;
- Readiness to initiate and be responsible for activities in one or more of the business sectors in which the CBC will be active; and
- Prospective member contributes to membership diversity of company size, type, location, demographics and/or traditional under-representation in business.

To be considered for membership, please provide the following: name and title of the individual requesting consideration; name and address of the company or organization sponsoring each individual; company's product or service line; size of the company; export experience and major markets; a brief statement of why each candidate should be considered for membership on the CBC; the particular segment of the business community each candidate would represent; a personal resume; and a statement signed by the applicant that he or she is a U.S. citizen residing in the United States and not a registered foreign agent under FARA. Up to two applicants from the same organization can be considered.

DEADLINE: In order to receive full consideration, requests must be received no later than May 25, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Please send your requests for consideration to Philip R. Agress, Director, Office of Korea and Southeast Asia, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2320, 14th St. and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20230, fax (202) 482–0469.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Droker, Director, Korea and Taiwan Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2036, 14th St. and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–3876, fax (202) 482–3316.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 1512.

Dated: May 4, 1999.

Philip Agress,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Asia and the Pacific.

[FR Doc. 99–11517 Filed 05–06–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DA–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

United States-Egypt Presidents' Council: Membership

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Amendment to notice of membership opportunity: Extension to deadline for applications.

SUMMARY: The International Trade Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce established and monitors the activities of the U.S.-Egypt Presidents' Council, the private sector component of the Gore-Mubarak Partnership. The **Federal Register** published a notice of membership opportunities for American business representatives on the U.S. side of the Council on April 12, 1999. The deadline was May 7, 1999. This notice hereby extends the deadline by which applications must be received.

DATES: In order to receive full consideration, requests must be received no later than: Friday, May 21, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Please send your requests for consideration to Thomas Sams, Egypt Desk Officer, Office of the Near East, U.S. Department of Commerce either by fax on 202–482–0878 or by mail to Room H–2029B, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Sams, Office of the Near East, Room H–2029B, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, phone: 202–482–4441.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amends the notice of membership opportunities on the U.S.-Egypt Presidents' Council published in the **Federal Register** on April 12, 1999 (64 FR 17617–17618).

Dated: May 4 1999.

Thomas R. Parker,

Director, Office of the Near East.

[FR Doc. 99–11632 Filed 5–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DA–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–508–605]

Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Israel for the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997. For information on the net subsidy for each reviewed company, as well as for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results, we will instruct the U.S. Customs

Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Preliminary Results of Review*. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. *See Public Comment* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dana Mermelstein or Sean Carey, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0984 or (202) 482–3691, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (52 FR 31057) the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Israel. On August 11, 1998, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (63 FR 42821) of this countervailing duty order. We received a timely request for review, and we initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997, on September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51893). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers Rotem-Amfert Negev Ltd. (Rotem) and Haifa Chemicals Ltd. (Haifa). Haifa did not export the subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). Therefore, we are rescinding the review with respect to Haifa. This review covers 11 programs.

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). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. All citations to the Department's regulations reference 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of industrial phosphoric acid (IPA) from Israel. Such merchandise is classifiable under item number 2809.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item number is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs Service purposes. The written description of the scope remains dispositive.

Subsidies Valuation Information

Period of Review

The period for which we are measuring subsidies is calendar year 1997.

Allocation Period

In *British Steel plc.* v. *United States*, 879 F.Supp. 1254 (February 9, 1995) (*British Steel*), the U.S. Court of International Trade (the Court) ruled against the allocation period methodology for non-recurring subsidies that the Department had employed for the past decade, as it was articulated in the *General Issues Appendix* appended to the *Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from Austria*, 58 FR 37225 (July 9, 1993) (GIA). In accordance with the Court's decision on remand, the Department determined that the most reasonable method of deriving the allocation period for nonrecurring subsides is a company-specific average useful life (AUL). This remand determination was affirmed by the Court on June 4, 1996. *British Steel*, 929 F.Supp 426, 439 (CIT 1996). Accordingly, the Department has applied this method to those non-recurring subsidies that have not yet been countervailed. Rotem submitted an AUL calculation based on depreciation expenses and asset values of productive assets reported in its financial statements. Rotem's AUL was derived by adding the sum of average gross book value of depreciable fixed assets for ten years and dividing these assets by the total depreciation charges for the related periods. We found this calculation to be reasonable and consistent with our company-specific AUL objective. Rotem's calculation resulted in an average useful life of 23 years, which we have used as the allocation period for non-recurring subsidies received during the POR. For non-recurring subsidies received prior to the POR and already countervailed based on an allocation period established in an earlier segment of the proceeding, it is not reasonable or practicable to reallocate those subsidies over a different period of time. Since the countervailing duty rate in earlier segments of the proceeding was calculated based on a certain allocation period and resulted in a certain benefit stream, redefining the allocation period in later segments of the proceeding would entail taking the original grant amount and creating an entirely new benefit stream for that grant. Such a practice may lead to an increase or decrease in the total amount countervailed and, thus, would result in the possibility of over- or under-countervailing the actual benefit. Therefore, for purposes of these preliminary results, the Department is using the original allocation period assigned to each non-recurring subsidy received prior to the POR. *See Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 16549 (April 7, 1997).

Privatization

Israel Chemicals Limited (ICL), the parent company which owns 100 percent of Rotem's shares, was partially privatized in 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995. In this administrative review, the Government of Israel (GOI) and Rotem reported that additional shares of ICL were sold in 1997. We have previously determined that the partial privatization of ICL represents a partial privatization of each of the companies in which ICL holds an ownership interest. *See Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel*, 61 FR 53351, 53352 (October 11, 1996) (*1994 Final Results*). In this review and prior reviews of this order, the Department found that Rotem and/or its predecessor, Negev Phosphates Ltd., received non-recurring countervailable subsidies prior to these partial privatizations. Further, the Department found that a portion of the price paid by a private party for all or part of a government-owned company represents partial repayment of prior subsidies. *See GIA*, 58 FR at 37262. Therefore, in 1992, 1993, and 1995 reviews, we calculated the portion of the purchase price paid for ICL's shares that is attributable to repayment of prior subsidies. In the 1994 privatization, less than 0.5 percent of ICL shares were privatized. We determined that the percentage of subsidies potentially repaid through this privatization could have no measurable impact on Rotem's overall net subsidy rate. Thus, we did not apply our repayment methodology to the 1994 partial privatization. *See 1994 Final Results*, 61 FR at 53352. However, we are applying this methodology to the 1997 partial privatization because 17 percent of ICL's shares were sold. This approach is consistent with our findings in the *GIA* and Department precedent under the URAA. *See e.g., GIA*, 58 FR at 37259; *Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 58377 (November 14, 1996); *Final Affirmative Countervailing*

Duty Determination: Certain Pasta from Italy, 61 FR 30288 (June 14, 1996).

Grant Benefit Calculations

To calculate the benefit for the POR, we followed the same methodology used in the final results of the 1996 administrative review. We converted Rotem's shekel-denominated grants into U.S. dollars, using the exchange rate in effect on the date the grant was received. We then applied the grant methodology to determine the benefit for the POR. *See Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 13626, 13633 (March 20, 1998) (*1995 Final Results*).

Discount Rates

We considered Rotem's cost of long-term borrowing in U.S. dollars as reported in the company's financial statements for use as the discount rate used to allocate the countervailable benefit over time. However, this information includes Rotem's borrowing from its parent company, ICL, and thus does not provide an appropriate discount rate. Therefore, we have turned to ICL's cost of long-term borrowing in U.S. dollars in each year from 1984 through 1997 as the most appropriate discount rate. ICL's interest rates are shown in the notes to the company's financial statements, public documents which are in the record of this review. *See Comment 9* in the *1995 Final Results* (63 FR at 13633–4).

Analysis of Programs

I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

A. Encouragement of Capital Investments Law (ECIL)

The ECIL program is designed to encourage the distribution of the population throughout Israel, to create new sources of employment, to aid the absorption of immigrants, and to develop the economy's production capacity. To be eligible for benefits under the ECIL, including investment grants, capital grants, accelerated depreciation, reduced tax rates, and certain loans, applicants must obtain approved enterprise status. Investment grants cover a percentage of the cost of the approved investment, and the amount of the grant depends on the geographic location of eligible enterprises. For purposes of the ECIL program, Israel is divided into three zones—Development Zones A and B, and the Central Zone. Under the ECIL program the Central Zone was not eligible for benefits. In *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel*, 52 FR 25447 (July 7, 1987) (*IPA Investigation*), the Department found the ECIL grant program to be *de jure* specific because the program limits the availability of grants to enterprises located in specific regions. In this review, no new information or evidence of changed circumstances has been submitted to warrant reconsideration of this determination.

Rotem is located in Development Zone A, and received ECIL investment, drawback, and capital grants in disbursements over a period of years for several projects. As explained in the ''Allocation Period'' section above, for grants that have been allocated in prior administrative reviews, we are continuing to use the allocation period assigned to these grants. For grants received during the POR, we have used the AUL calculated by Rotem in this review, which is 23 years. To calculate the benefit for the POR, we followed the same methodology used in the final results of the 1995 administrative review, as indicated in the ''Grant Benefit Calculations'' section above.

To calculate the total subsidy in the POR, we first summed the grant amounts allocated to and received in 1997, after taking into account the partial privatizations in 1992, 1993, 1995, and 1997. To derive the subsidy rates, as discussed in the *1995 Final Results*, we attributed ECIL grants to a particular facility over the sales of the product produced by that facility plus sales of all products into which that product may be incorporated. Accordingly, we attributed ECIL grants to Rotem's phosphate rock mines to total sales; we attributed grants to Rotem's green acid facility to total sales minus direct sales of phosphate rock; and, finally, we attributed grants to Rotem's IPA facilities to sales of IPA, MKP, fertilizers, and ''IPA-Akonomika'' and MKP–HCL (by-products of IPA production which contribute to Rotem's sales revenue). We summed the rates obtained on this basis, and preliminarily determine the net countervailable subsidy from this program to be 5.43 percent *ad valorem* for the POR.

B. Infrastructure Grant Program

Under the Infrastructure Grant Program, the GOI establishes new industrial areas by partially reimbursing companies for their costs of developing the infrastructure in certain geographical zones. Rotem received assistance under this program during the POR. Therefore, within the meaning of section 771(5)(B)(i), a subsidy is bestowed because the GOI provided a financial contribution, which conferred a benefit. We analyzed whether this program is specific within the meaning of section 751(5A)(D) of the Act. Because the infrastructure grants are limited to an enterprise or industry located in certain zones within the jurisdiction of the authority providing the subsidy, we find this program to be regionally specific in accordance with section 771(5A)(D)(iv). We view these grants as non-recurring based on the analysis set forth in the ''Allocation'' section of the *GIA* (58 FR at 37226) because these benefits are exceptional, and the company cannot expect to receive benefits on an ongoing basis from review period to review period. Therefore, we calculated the benefit under this program using the methodology for non-recurring grants noted above in the ''Grant Benefit Calculations'' section. We then divided the grant amount by Rotem's total sales because the grant benefitted Rotem's total production. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net countervailable subsidy from this program to be 0.22 percent *ad valorem*.

II. Programs Preliminarily Determined To Be Not Used

We examined the following programs and preliminarily determined that the producer and/or exporter of the subject merchandise did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs during the POR:

A. Encouragement of Industrial Research and Development Grants (EIRD)
B. Environmental Grant Program
C. Reduced Tax Rates under ECIL
D. ECIL Section 24 loans
E. Dividends and Interest Tax Benefits under Section 46 of the ECIL
F. ECIL Preferential Accelerated Depreciation
G. Exchange Rate Risk Insurance Scheme
H. Labor Training Grants
I. Long-term Industrial Development Loans

Preliminary Results of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), we calculated an individual subsidy rate for each producer/exporter subject to this administrative review. For the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for Rotem to be 5.65 percent *ad valorem*. If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess countervailing duties as indicated above. The Department also intends to instruct Customs to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties as indicated above of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from reviewed companies, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after

the date of publication of the final results of this 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 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 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 under the URAA. If such a review has not been conducted, the rate established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding conducted pursuant to the statutory provisions that were in effect prior to the URAA amendments, is applicable. *See 1992/93 Final Results*, 61 FR 28842. 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, 1997 through December 31, 1997, 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.

Public Comment

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(b), the Department will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within five days after the date of publication of this notice. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309, interested parties may submit written comments in response to these preliminary results. Case briefs must be submitted within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, and rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, must be submitted no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Case and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f). Also, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, interested parties may request a public hearing on arguments to be raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Unless the Secretary specifies otherwise, the hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the date for submission of rebuttal briefs, that is, thirty-seven days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date case briefs, under 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii), are due. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

These preliminary results are issued and published 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)(1)).

Dated: May 3, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–11575 Filed 5–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–815]

Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium From Canada: Preliminary Results of the Sixth Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting administrative reviews of the countervailing duty orders on pure magnesium and alloy magnesium from Canada for the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997. We have preliminarily determined that certain producers/exporters have received countervailable subsidies during the period of review. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Preliminary Results of Reviews* section of this notice. Interested Parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Annika O'Hara or Blanche Ziv, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group 1, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3798 or (202) 482–4207, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA), effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On August 31, 1992, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the countervailing duty orders on pure magnesium and alloy magnesium from Canada (57 FR 39392). On August 11, 1998, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of these orders (63 FR 42821). We received a timely request for review from Norsk Hydro Canada Inc. (NHCI) on August 25, 1998, and we initiated these reviews, covering the period January 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997, on September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51893).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), these reviews cover NHCI, the only producer or exporter of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. These reviews cover 17 subsidy programs.