

submits that the Department should reduce COP by the amount of said taxes. CBCC ignores the second part of the same paragraph where the Department clearly stated that “. . . we did not use CBCC’s ICMS tax credit used to pay electricity cost to reduce CV because those credits were not used during the POR.” *Id.* (emphasis added). In other words, the Department did not address in the 1996–1997 Final Review Results the treatment of ICMS taxes in calculating COP. Rather, the Department there referred to the treatment of ICMS tax credits in calculating CV. In the current review, no normal values for CBCC were based on CV. Consequently, the issue of ICMS taxes with regard to CV is moot.

With respect to the calculation of COP, consistent with the past practice, when conducting the sales-below-cost analysis, the Department compared both COP and the home market price on an ICMS tax-exclusive basis. Accordingly, the Department did not reduce COP by the amount of the ICMS tax credits.

Comment 7: Interest Revenue and Net U.S. Price

CBCC claims that the Department should add interest revenue to U.S. price when calculating net price (NETPRIU). CBCC claims that the Department verified that CBCC received interest revenue on U.S. sales, as reported in its submissions. The petitioners did not comment on this issue.

DOC Position: We agree with CBCC. In this review, CBCC received interest revenue on both home market and U.S. transactions. For the preliminary results, we included interest revenue derived from the home market transactions in NV. However, we failed to include similar revenue pertaining to the U.S. transactions in the net U.S. price. For these final results, we have corrected that error.

Comment 8: Double-Counting of U.S. Direct Selling Expenses

CBCC claims that when the Department compared the net U.S. price to the foreign unit price in dollars (FUPDOL), we double-counted U.S. direct selling expenses in the SAS computer program. The petitioners did not comment on this issue.

DOC Position: We agree with CBCC and have corrected that error for these final results.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that the following margins exist for the period April 1, 1997 through March 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Eletrosilex	18.87
CBCC05
LIASA	0
RIMA	0

Cash Deposit Requirements

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

For duty assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates for silicon metal from Brazil. For CEP sales, we calculated importer-specific assessment rates by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the estimated entered value of the same sales to that importer. We calculated the estimated entered value by subtracting international movement expenses and expenses incurred in the United States from the gross sales value. For assessment of EP sales, for each importer, we calculated a per unit importer-specific assessment amount by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of the sales examined.

The following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Brazil that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates listed above, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, de minimis, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent final results of review in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter or the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of

this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 91.06 percent, the “all others” rate established in the LTFV investigation. These requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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.

This notice serves as the only 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 351.105(a). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulation and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: February 7, 2000.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–3557 Filed 2–14–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 981028268–9247–02]

RIN No. 0693–ZA–23

Announcing Approval of Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 186–2, Digital Signature Standard (DSS)

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce approved Federal Information Processing Standard 186–2, Digital Signature Standard (DSS), which supersedes Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 186–1, Digital Signature Standard (DSS), FIPSS 186–2 expands FIPS 186–1 by

specifying an additional voluntary industry standard for generating and verifying digital signatures. This action will enable Federal agencies to use the Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA), which was originally the single approved technique for digital signatures, as well as two new ANSI standards that were developed for the financial community. These new standards are ANSI X9.31, Digital Signature Using Reversible Public Key Cryptography, and ANSI X9.62, Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA).

EFFECTIVE DATE: This standard is effective June 27, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Elaine Barker (301) 975-2911, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, STOP 8930, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930.

Specifications for FIPS 186-2 are available on NIST Web page: <<http://csrc.nist.gov/encryption>>.

Copies of ANSI X9.31, Digital Signatures Using Reversible Public Key Cryptography, and ANSI X9.62, Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA) are available from the American Bankers Assoc./DC, X9 Customer Service Dept. P.O. Box 79064, Baltimore, MD 21279-0064; telephone 1-800-338-0626.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under Section 5131 of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 and the Computer Security Act of 1987, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve standards and guidelines for the cost effective security and privacy of sensitive information processed by federal computer systems. In May 1994, the Secretary of Commerce approved FIPS 186, Digital Signature Standard (DSS), which specified the Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA) as the single technique for the generation and verification of digital signatures. In 1997 NIST solicited comments on augmenting FIPS 186 with other digital signature techniques including the Rivest-Shamir-Adleman (RSA) and the elliptic curve technique. The comments received by NIST supported adding both techniques to FIPS 186. Both techniques were being considered by the financial services industry as voluntary industry standards.

On December 15, 1998, (FR Vol. 63, No. 240, pp 69049-51) NIST announced that the Secretary of Commerce had approved FIPS 186-1, Digital Signature Standard (DSS) as an interim final standard. FIPS 186-1 added the RSA digital signature technique, which had been approved as an industry standard (X9.31-1998, Digital Signatures Using

Reversible Public Key Cryptography for the Financial Services Industry). The elliptic curve technique was not included in the interim final standard since it had not yet been approved by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) as a voluntary industry standard.

The December 1998 Notice from NIST invited comments from public, academic and research communities, manufacturers, voluntary standards organizations, and Federal, state, and local government organizations concerning the specification of two techniques (DSA and ANSI X9.31-1998) for the generation and verification of digital signatures. That Notice also referred to the elliptic curve technique, which NIST had expected to be approved by ANSI as a voluntary industry standard. In addition to being published in the **Federal Register**, the Notice was posted on the NIST Web pages; information was provided for submission of electronic comments. NIST received comments from 15 private sector organizations and individuals, and from two federal government organizations. The comments supported the addition of the ANSI X9.31 standard, as well as the addition of the elliptic curve technique to the Digital Signature Standard (DSS). NIST recommended that the Secretary of Commerce approve FIPS 186-2, which includes the DSA, ANSI X9.31, and the elliptic curve technique, which has now been approved as ECDSA, under ANSI X9.62, Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm. Other comments supported the continued use of another RSA signature algorithm that is specified by PKCS#1. The algorithm specified in PKCS#1 does not interoperate with the algorithm specified in ANSI X9.31. FIPS 186-2 allows for the continued acquisition of implementations of PKCS#1 for a transition period of eighteen months from the date of approval of this standard, which will enable federal agencies to plan for the acquisition of implementations of the algorithms promulgated by FIPS 186-2.

Dated: February 8, 2000.

Karen H. Brown,

Deputy Director, NIST.

[FR Doc. 00-3450 Filed 2-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-CN-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 000204026-0026-01; I.D. 121799A]

RIN 0648-AN48

Tautog; Interstate Fishery Management Plans

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

ACTION: Notice of determination of noncompliance; notice of declaration of a moratorium.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act of 1993 (Act), 16 U.S.C. 5101 *et seq.*, the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) has determined that the State of Rhode Island is not in compliance with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's (Commission) Interstate Fishery Management Plan (ISFMP) for tautog and has failed to implement measures necessary for the conservation of the fishery in question. Pursuant to the Act, a Federal moratorium on fishing for tautog within Rhode Island state waters to be effective on June 15, 2000, if Rhode Island does not come into compliance with the ISFMP for tautog by June 1, 2000, is hereby declared. The purpose of this action is to support and encourage the development, implementation, and enforcement of the Commission's ISFMPs to conserve and manage Atlantic coastal fishery resources.

DATES: The moratorium will become effective on June 15, 2000, through a separate rule unless, by June 1, 2000, the State of Rhode Island adopts and implements measures to return to compliance with the Commission's ISFMP for tautog. If the State of Rhode Island adopts and implements the measures required by the ISFMP for tautog, the Secretary will publish an appropriate announcement in the **Federal Register** rescinding the moratorium with respect to the State.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard H. Schaefer, Chief, Staff Office for Intergovernmental and Recreational Fisheries, NMFS, 301-427-2014.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Act was enacted to support and encourage the development, implementation, and enforcement of the Commission's ISFMPs to conserve and