

exempts all of a firm's export profits from the income tax, is not tied to a particular product.

In determining whether a benefit is or is not tied, we examine whether the company's application, the government's approval notice, and the benefits disbursement documents specify the product or products that qualify to receive the benefit. If the production and sale of a particular product is specified on these documents, we generally regard the benefit as tied to that product. In the case of this scheme, we saw no evidence at verification of the application or approval forms for receipt of the benefit because the benefit was claimed directly on the income tax return.

As discussed elsewhere in this notice, because there were transactions between GEL and its affiliate, which we find were not on market terms, we find both companies have benefitted from this subsidy. Respondents do not dispute that it is the Department's practice to allocate subsidies in between related parties where the subsidies are untied nor the Department's authority in this regard. See e.g., Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From the United Kingdom; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 53306, 3313-16 (Oct. 1998); Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Laminated Hardwood Trailer Flooring From Canada, 62 FR 5201, 02 (Feb. 1997); Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Steel Wire Rod From Canada, 62 FR 54972 (Oct. 1997). Rather, respondents agree that our practice of allocating only untied subsidies between two companies is consistent with the Department's basic principle of tying.

Respondents rely upon the Department's new regulations for the proposition that export subsidies are tied subsidies which may be attributed only to products exported by the company directly receiving the subsidy. While we note that these regulations are not in effect for this investigation, there is nothing in our view, as discussed above, of how to treat export subsidies that is contradicted by our new regulations. See 19 CFR 351.525(b)(2). In addition, respondents themselves acknowledge that under our new regulations we have codified our practice of allocating untied subsidies between related companies (i.e., companies with cross-ownership) in a circumstance where one company is not producing subject merchandise. See 19 CFR 351.525(b)(6)(v).

Verification

In accordance with section 782(i) of the Act, we verified the information used in making our final determination. We followed our standard verification procedures, including meeting with government officials and examination of relevant government records and original source documents. Our verification results are outlined in detail in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the Central Records Unit (Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Summary

In accordance with section 705(a)(3) of the Act, we determine that the total estimated net countervailable subsidy rate is 1.71 percent ad valorem which is *de minimis*. Therefore, we determine that no countervailable subsidies are being provided to the production or exportation of elastic rubber tape from India. Pursuant to section 705(c)(2) of the Act, this investigation will be terminated upon publication of the final negative determination in the **Federal Register**.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination.

Return or Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to Administrative Protective Order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 355.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to section 705(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 12, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-9761 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 041499A]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce (DOC) has submitted to the Office of

Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). This request is being submitted under the emergency processing procedures of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Title: Large Pelagic Fishing Survey.

Agency Form Number(s): None.

OMB Approval Number: None.

Type of Request: New collection—emergency clearance requested.

Burden: 4,752 hours.

Number of Respondents: 21,500 (multiple responses).

Avg. Hours Per Response: Ranges between 2 and 15 minutes depending on the requirement.

Needs and Uses: The Large Fishing Survey consists of dockside and telephone surveys of recreational anglers and headboats fishing for large pelagic species (tunas, sharks, and billfish) in the Atlantic Ocean. The summer fisheries for bluefin tuna and marlin begin in June. Catch monitoring in these two fisheries and collection of catch and effort statistics for all large pelagic fish is required under the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Information collected through the survey is essential for the U.S. to meet its reporting obligation to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas.

Affected Public: Individuals, businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5033, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via Internet at LEngelme@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent no later than April 30, 1999 to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: April 12, 1999.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-9727 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-F