

Weapons Conventions. Members will exchange information and concepts with key ACDA and Livermore Laboratory personnel. All meetings will be held in Executive Session.

**Reasons for Closing:** The DirAC members will be reviewing and discussing matters specifically authorized by Executive Order 12,958 to be kept secret in the interest of national defense and foreign policy.

**Authority to Close Meetings:** The closing of the meetings is in accordance with a determination by the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency dated February 5, 1999, made pursuant to the provisions of Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(d) (1996).

Notice: This notice is being published less than 15 days before the first meeting because of recent changes in the location of the meetings.

**Cathleen Lawrence,**

*Director of Administration.*

#### **Determination to Close Meetings of the Director's Advisory Committee**

The Director's Advisory Commission (DirAC) will hold meetings in Washington, D.C., on February 22–23 and March 11–12, and Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri on February 24, 1999.

The entire agenda of these meetings will be devoted to specific national security policy and arms control issues. Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(d)(1996), I have determined that the meetings may be closed to the public in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(1). Materials to be discussed at the meetings have been properly classified and are specifically authorized under criteria established by Executive Order 12,958, 60 FR 19,825 (1995), to be kept secret in the interests of national defense and foreign policy.

This notice is being published less than 15 days before the first meeting day, because of recent changes in the location of the meetings.

John D. Holum,

*Director.*

[FR Doc. 99–4084 Filed 2–16–99; 11:06 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–32–M

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

### **International Trade Administration**

[A–301–602]

#### **Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia for the period March 1, 1997 through February 28, 1998.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value by various companies subject to this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price or constructed export price and the normal value. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 18, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rosa Jeong or Marian Wells, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3853 or (202) 482–6309, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **The Applicable Statute and Regulations**

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 of Commerce’s (“the Department’s”) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (April 1998).

#### **Background**

On March 11, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of “Opportunity to Request Administrative Review” with respect to the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (see 63 FR 11868). We published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of this order on April 21, 1998, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b) (see 63 FR 19709). On September 17, 1998, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we rescinded the administrative review with respect to ten groups of producers

and exporters of the subject merchandise based on withdrawals of the requests for review by the interested parties (see 63 FR 49686). The cash deposit rates for these companies will continue to be the rates established for them in the most recently completed final results. On December 7, 1998, we extended the deadline for these preliminary results until February 10, 1999, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (see 63 FR 67454). From December 8–18, 1998, we verified the responses of four respondents: Falcon Farms de Colombia S.A. (“Falcon Farms”), Flores de la Vega Ltda. (“Vegaflor”), Flores de Serrezuela S.A. (“Serrezuela”), and Flores Silvestres S.A. (“Silvestres”). The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

#### **Scope of Review**

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (standard carnations, miniature (spray) carnations, standard chrysanthemums, and pompon chrysanthemums). These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 0603.10.30.00, 0603.10.70.10, 0603.10.70.20, and 0603.10.70.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the Department’s written description of the scope remains dispositive.

#### **Period of Review**

The period of review (“POR”) is March 1, 1997 through February 28, 1998.

#### **Respondent Selection**

Section 777A(c)(2) of the Act provides the Department with the authority to determine margins by limiting its examination to a statistically valid sample of exporters, or exporters accounting for the largest volume of the subject merchandise that can reasonably be examined. This subparagraph is formulated as an exception to the general requirement of the Act that each company for which a review is requested will be individually examined and receive a calculated margin. In this

administrative review, over 400 companies were either named in the initiation notice or have been identified as being affiliated with a company named in the initiation notice.

Because of the large number of companies involved in the review and the limited resources available to the Department, we determined that it was administratively necessary to restrict the number of respondents selected for examination. This enabled the Department to conduct thorough and accurate analyses of the responses to our questionnaires and other relevant issues within the statutory deadlines. Restricting the number of respondents for examination is consistent with the two most recent administrative reviews of this order and other past cases involving large numbers of potential respondents, statutory deadlines, and limited resources. See, e.g., *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Preliminary Results and Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 5354 (February 2, 1998) ("*Flowers Tenth Review (Preliminary)*"); *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 16772 (April 8, 1997) ("*Flowers Ninth Review (Preliminary)*"); *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brake Drums and Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China*, 61 FR 53190 (October 10, 1996); and *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pasta from Italy*, 61 FR 1344 (January 19, 1996).

The Department limited its examination in the present review to seven exporters and producers as permitted under section 777A(c)(2)(B) of the Act. Of the exporters and producers subject to requests for review, these seven accounted for the largest volume of exports to the United States during the POR. The respondents in this review are: the Caicedo Group ("Caicedo"), Falcon Farms, Flores Colon Ltda. ("Flores Colon"), the Maxima Farms Group ("Maxima"), Serrezuela, Silvestres, and Vegaflor.

#### Non-Selected Respondents

Consistent with our practice in *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 31724 (June 10, 1998) (*Flowers Tenth Review*), we have assigned the non-selected respondents a weighted-average margin based on the calculated margins of selected respondents, excluding any *de minimis* margins and margins based on facts available. The firms in question

are listed under "Non-Selected Respondents" in the *Preliminary Results of Review* section below.

#### Verification

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.307(b)(v), we verified information provided by those respondents that had not been verified in the last two administrative reviews and for whom the petitioner requested verification (see *Background* section above for a list of verified companies). We verified information using standard verification procedures, including on-site examination of relevant sales and financial records, and inspection of original documentation containing relevant information.

#### Duty Absorption

On March 31, 1998, the petitioner requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties had been absorbed by respondents during the POR. Section 751(a)(4) of the Act provides for the Department, if requested, to determine, during an administrative review initiated two or four years after publication of the order, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by a foreign producer or exporter subject to the order, if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer who is affiliated with such foreign producer or exporter. Section 751(a)(4) was added to the Act by the URAA. 19 CFR 351.213(j) addresses duty absorption.

For transition orders as defined in section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act, i.e., orders in effect as of January 1, 1995, 19 CFR 351.213(j)(2) provides that the Department will make a duty absorption determination, if requested, for any administrative review initiated in 1996 or 1998. The preamble to the proposed regulations explains that reviews initiated in 1996 will be considered initiated in the second year and reviews initiated in 1998 will be considered initiated in the fourth year. See 61 FR 7308, 7317 (February 27, 1996). See also 62 FR at 27318 (May 19, 1997). This approach assures that interested parties will have the opportunity to request a duty absorption determination on entries for which the second and fourth years following an order have already passed, prior to the time for sunset review of the order under section 751(c) of the Act. Because the order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia has been in effect since 1986, this is a transition order. Consequently, based on the policy stated above, it is appropriate for the Department to examine duty absorption in this eleventh review, which was initiated in 1998.

Section 751(a)(4) of the Act provides that duty absorption may occur if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an affiliated importer. Of the selected respondents, the following have affiliated importers: Caicedo, Falcon Farms, Maxima, and Vegaflor. Furthermore, we have preliminarily determined that there are dumping margins for the following companies with respect to the percentages of their U.S. sales by quantity indicated below:

Name of company	Percentage of U.S. affiliated importer sales with margin
Caicedo .....	2.66
Falcon Farms .....	32.47

We presume that the duties will be absorbed for those sales which were dumped, unless there is evidence (e.g., an agreement between the affiliated importer and the unaffiliated purchaser) that the unaffiliated purchaser in the United States will pay the full duty ultimately assessed on the subject merchandise. In the present review, none of the selected respondents has provided evidence of agreements with unaffiliated purchasers to pay ultimately assessed antidumping duties. Therefore, we preliminarily find that the antidumping duties have been absorbed by the above-listed firms on the percentage of U.S. sales indicated.

#### Fair Value Comparisons

##### United States Price

As permitted by section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we have preliminarily determined that it is appropriate to average U.S. prices on a monthly basis in order to (1) use actual price information (which is often available only on a monthly basis), and (2) account for perishable product pricing practices. The Department used this same averaging technique in *Flowers Tenth Review*, and prior reviews of this order.

For the price to the United States, we used export price ("EP") or constructed export price ("CEP") as defined in sections 772(a) and 772(b) of the Act, as appropriate. CEP was used for consignment sales through unaffiliated U.S. consignees and sales (consignment or otherwise) made through affiliated importers.

We calculated EP based on the packed price, consisting of invoice price plus certain additional charges (e.g., box charges, fuel surcharges, and antidumping duty surcharge), to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United

States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts and rebates, foreign inland freight, international (air) freight, brokerage and handling, U.S. customs fees, and return credits.

For sales made on consignment, CEP was calculated based on the packed price consisting of invoice price plus certain additional charges by the consignee (e.g., box charges, fuel surcharges, and antidumping duty surcharge) to the unaffiliated purchaser. For sales made through affiliated parties, CEP was based on the packed price, consisting of invoice price plus certain additional charges (e.g., box charges, fuel surcharges, and antidumping duty surcharge), to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made adjustments to these prices, where appropriate, for discounts and rebates, foreign inland freight, international (air) freight, freight charges incurred in the United States, brokerage and handling, U.S. customs fees, direct selling expenses relating to commercial activity in the United States (i.e., credit expenses and contributions to the Colombian Flower Council), return credits, royalties, and indirect selling expenses incurred in the home market that related to commercial activity in the United States. Finally, consistent with our practice in the *Flowers Tenth Review*, we made adjustments for either commissions paid to unrelated U.S. consignees or the direct and indirect U.S. selling expenses of related consignees.

Pursuant to sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act, the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP for sales made through affiliated parties. The CEP profit was calculated in accordance with section 772(f) of the Act.

#### Normal Value

Section 773 of the Act provides that the normal value ("NV") of the subject merchandise shall be (1) the price at which the foreign like product is first sold (or, in the absence of a sale, offered for sale) for consumption in the exporting country (home market sales), in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the export price or constructed export price, (2) the price at which the foreign like product is sold (or offered for sale) for consumption in a country other than the exporting country or the United States (third country sales), or (3) the constructed value of that merchandise.

During the POR, none of the companies selected to respond in this review had sales in the home market

exceeding five percent of the sales to the U.S. market, i.e., none had a viable home market. Section 773(a)(4) of the Act states that if the administering authority determines that the NV of the subject merchandise cannot be determined using home market prices, then, notwithstanding the possible use of third country prices, the NV of the subject merchandise may be the constructed value ("CV") of that merchandise.

During this POR, certain companies selected to respond had viable third country markets in Europe and Canada. In prior reviews, we have rejected using prices to Europe because the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison. See *Flowers Tenth Review* at 31725. Information submitted by respondents shows that this market situation has continued. Therefore, we are not basing NV on sales to European markets.

With respect to Canada, only one selected respondent had a viable third country market. Because this is not a significant export market for Colombia, we have determined that, under the facts of this case, prices to Canada are not representative within the meaning of section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(I) of the Act. As discussed in the *Respondent Selection* section above, we have limited our analysis to a subset of the Colombian companies exporting the subject merchandise to the United States and we are basing the antidumping duty assessments for the non-selected companies on the margins calculated for the selected companies. Given this, we want to make our analysis as representative as possible of the companies that were not selected to respond to our questionnaire.

It is clear that Canada is not an important export market for Colombian flower growers. Evidence on the record indicates that Canada represents less than three percent of flower exports from Colombia. Thus, to use sales to Canada as the basis of our margin calculations for the single exporter that has a viable market in Canada and then include those results in calculating the rate used for assessing duties on the non-selected respondents' imports would be inappropriate for the vast majority of growers. Furthermore, all interested parties in this review agree that sales to Canada should not be used as a basis for NV. See Memorandum from Team to Richard W. Moreland, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration "Canadian Sales," dated February 10, 1999, on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce. Therefore, in accordance

with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we are basing NV on CV.

We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, and the selling, general and administrative expenses reported by respondents. Consistent with the methodology used in the *Flowers Tenth Review*, we first converted costs incurred in each month from pesos to dollars using the corresponding month's exchange rate. See *Flowers Tenth Review (Preliminary)* at 5357 (explaining the Department's methodology). We totaled the monthly cost expressed in dollars over the POR and divided by the quantity of export quality flowers sold by the producer to arrive at the per-stem CV in U.S. dollars. The dollar per-stem CV was then converted to pesos using the period-end exchange rate and then deflated each month to account for fluctuations in the value of the Colombian peso during the POR. Next, we converted the peso per-stem CV based on the date of the U.S. sale, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act.

We consider non-export quality flowers (culls) that are produced in conjunction with export quality flowers to be by-products. Therefore, revenue from the sales of culls was offset against the cost of producing the export quality flowers.

We based selling, general and administrative expenses on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondents in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product for consumption in the home market. Where the respondents had no home market sales, we used as general and administrative expenses the expenses associated with the respondents' sales to all other markets. With respect to selling expenses, all respondents reporting sales of export quality flowers in the home market reported no selling expenses. Therefore, we included zero as the actual amount of selling expenses incurred and realized by the exporters and producers being examined in this review.

With respect to profit, we preliminarily determine that the conditions that led to the use of facts available for the profit rate in the *Flowers Ninth Review* and the *Flowers Tenth Review* continue to exist in the current POR. We find that home market sales of culls and export quality flowers were outside the ordinary course of trade. Consequently, we are unable to apply the methods specified in section 773(e)(2)(A) or 773(e)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act for calculating profit. Also, none of the respondents realized a profit on

merchandise in the same general category as flowers produced for sale in Colombia. Therefore, we are also not able to apply the profit methodology described in section 773(e)(2)(B)(i) of the Act.

Section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) permits the Department to use "any other reasonable method" to compute an amount for profit, provided that the amount "may not exceed the amount normally realized by exporters or producers \* \* \* in connection with the sale, for consumption in the foreign country, of merchandise that is in the same general category of products as the subject merchandise." Despite our efforts, we have not been able to find any information on the profits earned in Colombia by producers of merchandise that is in the same general category of products as flowers. Therefore, we cannot determine a "profit cap" as described in section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act. Consistent with our practice in *Flowers Ninth Review* and *Flowers Tenth Review*, we have applied section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act on the basis of facts available and have developed a profit figure from the financial statements of a Colombian producer of agricultural and processed agricultural goods. See Statement of Administrative Action ("SAA") at 841. We preliminarily determine that it is appropriate to use the profit rate for that company, 2.87 percent of cost of production, for all respondents. See Memorandum from Team to Richard W. Moreland, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration "Calculation of Constructed Value Profit," dated February 10, 1999, on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce.

We added U.S. packing to CV. In addition, for EP sales, we made circumstance of sale adjustments for direct expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act.

#### Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. See *Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions*, 61 FR 9434 (March 8, 1996). Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a "fluctuation." In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined as a general matter that a fluctuation exists when the daily

exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. See *Notice of Final Determination of Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61971 (November 19, 1997). The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine that a fluctuation exists, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of EP and CEP with NV, we preliminarily determine that there are margins in the amounts listed below for the period March 1, 1997 through February 28, 1998.

#### Selected Respondents

The following seven firms and groups of firms (composed of 19 companies) were selected as respondents and received individual rates, as indicated below:

	Percent
Caicedo Group .....	1.06
Agrobosques S.A.	
Andalucia S.A.	
Aranjuez S.A.	
Exportaciones Bochica S.A.	
Floral Ltda.	
Flores del Cauca S.A.	
Productos el Rosal S.A.	
Productos el Zorro S.A.	
Falcon Farms de Colombia S.A. ..	3.31
Flores Colon Ltda .....	1.87
Flores de la Vega (Vegaflor) .....	0.07
Flores de Serrezuela S.A. ....	1.82
Flores Silvestres S.A. ....	2.36
Maxima Farms Group .....	0.34
Agricola Los Arboles S.A.	
C.I. Maxima Floral Traders S.A.	
Colombian D.C. Flowers	
Maxima Farms Inc.	
Polo Flowers S.A.	
Rainbow Flowers S.A.	

#### Non-Selected Respondents

The following companies were not selected as respondents and will receive a rate of 1.83 percent:

Abaco Tulipanex de Colombia  
Achalay  
Aga Group  
Agricola la Celestina  
Agricola la Maria  
Agrex de Oriente  
Agricola Acevedo  
Agricola Altiplano  
Agricola Arenales Ltda.  
Agricola Benilda Ltda.  
Agricola Bonanza Ltda.  
Agricola Circasia Ltda.  
Agricola de Occident  
Agricola del Monte  
Agricola el Cactus S.A.  
Agricola el Redil

Agricola Guali S.A.  
Agricola la Corsaria C.I. Ltda.  
Agricola la Siberia  
Agricola Las Cuadras Group  
Agricola Las Cuadras Ltda.  
Flores de Hacaritama  
Agricola los Gaques Ltda.  
Agricola Megaflor Ltda.  
Agricola Yuldama  
Agrocaribu Ltda.  
Agro de Narino  
Agroindustrial Don Eusebio Ltda. Group  
Agroindustrial Don Eusebio Ltda.  
Celia Flowers  
Passion Flowers  
Primo Flowers  
Temptation Flowers  
Agroindustrial Madonna S.A.  
Agroindustrias de Narino Ltda.  
Agromonte Ltda.  
Agropecuaria Cuernavaca Ltda.  
Agropecuaria la Marcela  
Agropecuaria Mauricio  
Agorrosas  
Agrotabio Kent  
Aguacarga  
Alcala  
Alstroflores Ltda.  
Amoret  
Ancas Ltda.  
Andes Group  
Cultivos Buenavista Ltda.  
Flores de los Andes Ltda.  
Flores Horizonte Ltda.  
Inversiones Peñas Blancas Ltda  
A.Q.  
Arboles Azules Ltda.  
Aspen Gardens Ltda.  
Astro Ltda.  
Becerra Castellanos y Cia.  
Bojaca Group  
Agricola Bojaca  
Flores del Neusa Nove Ltda.  
Flores y Plantas Tropicales  
Tropiflora  
Universal Flowers  
Cantarrana Group  
Agricola los Venados Ltda.  
Cantarrana Ltda.  
Carcol Ltda.  
Cigarral Group  
Flores Cigarral  
Flores Tayrona  
Classic  
Claveles de los Alpes Ltda.  
Clavelez  
Coexflor  
Colibri Flowers Ltda.  
Color Explosion  
Combiflor  
Cota  
Crest D'or  
Crop S.A.  
Cultiflores Ltda.  
Cultivos Guameru  
Cultivos Medellin Ltda.  
Cultivos Tahami Ltda.  
Cypress Valley  
Daflor Ltda.

Degaflor	Flores de la Hacienda	Flores Tomine Ltda.
De La Pava Guevara e Hijos Ltda.	Flores de la Maria	Flores Tropicales Group
Del Monte	Flores de la Montana	Flores Tropicales Ltda.
Del Rio Group	Flores de la Parcelita	Mercedes S.A.
Agricola Cardenal S.A.	Flores de la Sabana Group	Rosas Colombianas Ltda.
Flores del Rio S.A.	Flores de la Sabana S.A.	Flores Urimaco
Indigo S.A.	Roselandia S.A.	Flores Violette
Del Tropico Ltda.	Flores de la Vereda	Florexpo
Dianticola Colombiana Ltda.	Flores del Campo Ltda.	Floricola
Disagro	Flores del Cielo Ltda.	Floricola la Gaitana S.A.
Diveragricola	Flores del Cortijo	Floricola la Ramada Ltda.
Dynasty Roses Ltda.	Flores del Lago Ltda.	Florimex Colombia Ltda.
El Antelio S.A.	Flores del Tambo	Florisol
El Dorado	Flores de Oriente	Florpacifico
Elite Flowers (The Elite Flower/Rosen	Flores de Suba	Flor y Color
Tantau)	Flores de Suesca Group	Floval
El Jardin Group	Flores de Suesca S.A.	Flower Factory
Agricola el Jardin Ltda.	Toto Flowers	Flowers of the World/Rosa
La Marotte S.A.	Flores de Tenjo Ltda.	Four Seasons
Orquideas Acatayma Ltda.	Flores Depina Ltda.	Fracolsa
El Milaro	Flores el Lobo	Fresh Flowers
El Tambo	Flores el Molino S.A.	F. Salazar
El Timbul Ltda.	Flores el Puente Ltda.	Garden and Flowers Ltda.
Envy Farms Group	Flores el Rosal Ltda.	German Ocampo
Envy Farms	Flores el Talle Ltda.	Granja
Flores Marandua Ltda.	Flores el Zorro Ltda.	Green Flowers
Euroflora	Flores Flamingo Ltda.	Gypso Flowers
Exoticas	Flores Fusu	Hacienda la Embarrada
Exotic Flowers	Flores Galia Ltda.	Hacienda Matute
Exotico	Flores Gicor Group	Hana/Hisa Group
Expoflora Ltda.	Flores Cicor Ltda.	Flores Hana Ichi de Colombia Ltda.
Exporosas	Flores de Colombia	Flores Tokai Hisa
Exportadora	Flores Gloria	Hernando Monroy
Farm Fresh Flowers Group	Flores Hacienda Bejucol	Hill Crest Gardens
Agricola de la Fontana	Flores Juanambu Ltda.	Horticultura de la Sasan
Flores de Hunza	Flores Juncalito Ltda.	Horticultura el Molino
Flores Tibati	Flores la Cabanuela	Horticultura Montecarlo
Inversiones Cubivan	Flores la Fragancia S.A.	Illusion Flowers
Ferson Trading	Flores la Gioconda	Industria Santa Clara
Flamingo Flowers	Flores la Lucerna	Industrial Agricola
Flor Colombiana S.A.	Flores la Macarena	Industrial Terwengel Ltda.
Flora Bellisima	Flores la Pampa	Ingro Ltda.
Flora Intercontinental	Flores la Union/Gomez Arango & Cia.	Inverpalmas
Floralex Ltda..	Group	Inversiones Almer Ltda.
Florandia Herrera Camacho y Cia.	Flores la Union/Santana	Inversiones Bucarelia
Floreales Group	Flores las Caicas	Inversiones Cota
Floreales Ltda.	Flores las Mesitas	Inversiones el Bambu Ltda.
Kimbaya	Flores los Sauces	Inversiones Flores del Alto
Floral (Flores el Arenal) Ltda.	Flores Montecarlo	Inversiones Maya
Flores Abaco S.A.	Flores Monteverde	Inversiones Morcote
Flores Acuarela S.A.	Flores Palimana	Inversiones Morrosquillo
Flores Agromonte	Flores Ramo Ltda.	Inversiones Playa
Flores Aguila	Flores S.A.	Inversiones & Producciones Tecnica
Flores Ainsuca Ltda.	Flores Sagaro	Inversiones Santa Rita Ltda.
Flores Ainsus	Flores Saint Valentine	Inversiones Santa Rosa ARW Ltda.
Flores Alcala Ltda.	Flores Sairam Ltda.	Inversiones Silma
Flores Andinas	Flores San Andres	Inversiones Sima
Flores Aurora	Flores San Carlos	Inversiones Supala S.A.
Flores Bachue Ltda.	Flores San Juan S.A.	Inversiones Valley Flowers Ltda.
Flores Calichana	Flores Santa Fe Ltda.	Iturrama S.A.
Flores Carmel S.A.	Flores Santana	Jardin de Carolina
Flores Cerezangos	Flores Sausalito	Jardines Choconta
Flores Comercial Bellavista Ltda.	Flores Selectas	Jardines Darpu
Flores Corola	Flores Sindamanoi	Jardines de America
Flores de Aposentos Ltda.	Flores Suasque	Jardines de Timana
Flores de Guasca	Flores Tenerife Ltda.	Jardines Natalia Ltda.
Flores de Iztari	Flores Tiba S.A.	Jardines Tocarema
Flores de Memecon/Corinto	Flores Tocarinda	J.M. Torres
Flores de la Cuesta		Karla Flowers

Kingdom S.A.  
 La Colina  
 La Conchita Group  
   Agropecuaria La Monja  
   Cienfuegos  
   C.I. Flores Santillana Ltda.  
   Flores la Conchita  
 La Embairada  
 La Flores Ltda.  
 La Floresta  
 La Plazoleta Ltda.  
 Las Amalias Group  
   La Fleurette de Colombia Ltda.  
   Las Amalias S.A.  
   Pompones Ltda.  
   Ramiflora Ltda.  
 Las Flores  
 Laura Flowers  
 L.H.  
 Linda Colombiana Ltda.  
 Loma Linda  
 Loreana Flowers  
 Los Geranios Ltda.  
 Luisa Flowers  
 M. Alejandra  
 Manjui Ltda.  
 Mauricio Uribe  
 Merastec  
 Monteverde Ltda.  
 Morcoto  
 Nasino  
 Natuflora/San Martin Bloque B Ltda.  
 Olga Rincon  
 Oro Verde Group  
   Inversiones Miraflores S.A.  
   Inversiones Oro Verde S.A.  
 Otono  
 Petalos de Colombia Ltda.  
 Pinar Guameru  
 Piracania  
 Pisochago Ltda.  
 Plantaciones Delta Ltda.  
 Plantas S.A.  
 Prismaflor  
 Propagar Plantas S.A.  
 Reme Salamanca  
 Rosa Bella  
 Rosaflor  
 Rosales de Colombia Ltda.  
 Rosales de Suba Ltda.  
 Rosas Sabanilla Group  
   Agricola la Capilla  
   Flores la Colmena Ltda.  
   Inversiones la Serena  
   Rosas Sabanilla Ltda.  
 Rosas y Jardines  
 Rose  
 Rosex Ltda.  
 San Ernesto  
 San Valentine  
 Sansa Flowers  
 Santana Flowers Group  
   Hacienda Curibital Ltda.  
   Inversiones Istra Ltda.  
   Santana Flowers Ltda.  
 Santa Rosa Group  
   Flores Santa Rosa Ltda.  
   Floricola la Ramada Ltda.  
 Sarena

Select Pro  
 Senda Brava Ltda.  
 Shasta Flowers y Compania Ltda.  
 Shila  
 Siempreviva  
 Soagro Group  
   Agricola el Mortino Ltda.  
   Flores Aguacilara Ltda.  
   Flores del Monte Ltda.  
   Flores la Estancia  
   Jaramillo y Daza  
 Solor Flores Ltda.  
 Starlight  
 Sunbelt Florals  
 Superflora Ltda.  
 Susca  
 Sweet Farms  
 Tag Ltda.  
 The Beall Company  
 The Rose  
 Tikiya Flowers  
 Tinzuque Group  
   Catu S.A.  
   Tinzuque Ltda  
 Tomino  
 Tropical Garden  
 Tuchany Group  
   Flores Munya  
   Flores Sibate  
   Flores Tikaya  
   Tuchany S.A.  
 Uniflor Ltda.  
 Velez de Monchaux Group  
   Agroteusa  
   Velez De Monchaux e Hijos y Cia S.  
     en C.  
 Victoria Flowers  
 Villa Cultivos Ltda.  
 Villa Diana  
 Vuelven Ltda.  
 Zipa Flowers

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice. Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 30 days after publication of this notice. Interested parties may also submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument: (1) a statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. All memoranda referred to in this notice can be found in the public reading room, located in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs.

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including a discussion of its analysis of

issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated an importer-specific per-stem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the quantity of subject merchandise entered during the POR. We have used the number of stems entered during the POR, rather than entered values, because respondents reported average monthly prices and, moreover, the entered values were not associated with particular importers. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisal instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established in the final results of this review, except that no cash deposit will be required if the rate is *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 3.10 percent, the adjusted "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.401(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 administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: February 10, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-4012 Filed 2-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-559-001]

#### **Certain Refrigeration Compressors From the Republic of Singapore; Notice of Rescission of Countervailing Duty Suspension Agreement Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of rescission of suspension agreement administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On December 23, 1998 the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated the fifteenth administrative review of the countervailing duty suspension agreement on certain refrigeration compressors from the Republic of Singapore. The period of review was April 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998. The initiation was in response to a request made on November 30, 1998, by the Government of the Republic of Singapore (the GOS), Asia Matsushita Electric (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. (AMS), an exporter of subject merchandise, and Matsushita Refrigeration Industries (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. (MARIS), a producer of subject merchandise. This review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the GOS, AMS and MARIS, as no other interested party has requested a review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 18, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Bailey or Rick Johnson, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0413 and (202) 482-3818, respectively.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Background

On November 7, 1983, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice announcing the suspension of the countervailing duty investigation on refrigeration compressors from the Republic of Singapore (48 FR 51167).

On November 30, 1998, the GOS, AMS, and MARIS, requested an administrative review of the suspension agreement on certain refrigeration compressors from Singapore. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b), we initiated the review on December 23, 1998 (63 FR 71091) covering the period of April 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998. On January 5, 1999, the GOS, AMS, and MARIS withdrew their request for an administrative review of the suspension agreement.

### Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

### Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, the Department will allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. Therefore, because the GOS, AMS, and MARIS have timely withdrawn their requests for review, the Department is rescinding this review. This rescission of administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d).

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: February 5, 1999.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.*

[FR Doc. 99-4011 Filed 2-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 020999D]

#### **Caribbean Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Caribbean Fishery Management Council (Council) and its Administrative Committee will hold meetings.

**DATES:** The meetings will be held on March 29-31, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** All meetings will be held at the Villa Parguera Hotel, 304 St., Km. 3.3, La Parguera, Lajas, PR.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 268 Munoz Rivera Avenue, Suite 1108, San Juan, PR 00918-2577, telephone: (787) 766-5926.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Council will hold its 97th regular public meeting to discuss the items contained in the following agenda:

- Conflict of Interest Presentation
  - Essential Fish Habitat
  - Council Comments on Projects that might affect Essential Fish Habitat
  - Coral Fishery Management Plan (FMP)
  - Update on Marine Conservation District
  - Report of Scientific and Statistical Committee Meeting
  - Reef Fish FMP
  - Update
  - Overfishing Definition based on Maximum Sustainable Yield
  - Banning SCUBA-Gillnets-Traps
  - Trap Reduction Program - Fact Finding Meetings Schedule
  - Queen Conch FMP
  - Update
  - Report on Belize Meeting
  - Coastal Pelagics FMP
  - Dolphin Fish and Other Pelagic Species - Update
  - Enforcement
  - Federal Government
  - Puerto Rico
  - U.S. Virgin Islands
  - Administrative Committee Recommendations
  - Meetings Attended by Council Members and Staff
  - Other Business
  - Next Council Meeting
- The Council will convene on Tuesday March 30, 1999, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00