

of taxes on export sales. During fiscal year 1984, the Indian government modified the program to allow exporters to deduct one percent of taxes paid on export sales during the fiscal year and five percent of taxes paid on the increment of export sales over the previous fiscal year. Because this tax deduction is contingent upon export performance and available only to exporters, we preliminarily determine that it is countervailable.

After reviewing the tax claims of the castings exporters during the period of review, we multiplied the income tax deductions claimed by each company by the corporate income tax rate and allocated the resulting benefit over the total value of that firm's exports to all markets during the period of review. We then weight-averaged the resulting *ad valorem* benefits by each company's proportion of the value of Indian castings exports to the United States. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 0.02 percent *ad valorem*.

Under Article 35B of the Finance Act, the Government of India allowed exporters to deduct 133 percent of certain expenses related to market development. Effective April 1, 1983, no income tax benefits were available for expenditures incurred after March 1, 1983. One company claimed an Article 33B income tax deduction in its tax return covering fiscal year 1983 filed during 1984.

Because the Indian government allowed deductions for 100 percent for expenses relating to domestic sales, we focused on the remaining 33 percent. We allocated one-third of the deduction over total exports and weight-averaged the resulting *ad valorem* benefit by the company's share of total Indian exports of the merchandise to the United States. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 0.005 percent *ad valorem*.

#### (5) Other Programs

We also examined the following programs, which we preliminarily find exporters of certain iron-metal castings did not use during the review period;

- A. Market Development Assistance grants;
- B. Sale of Import Replenishment Licenses;
- C. Extension of the Free Trade Zones;
- D. Supply of raw materials at preferential prices;
- E. Preferential freight rates; and
- F. Import duty exemptions available to 100 percent export-oriented units.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of the review, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 6.99 percent *ad valorem* for the period January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984. The Department intends to instruct the Customs Service to assess countervailing duties of 6.99 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on any shipments of this merchandise exported on or after January 1, 1984, and on or before December 31, 1984.

The Department intends to instruct the Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, of 6.99 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on shipments of this merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review. This deposit requirement shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Interested parties may submit written comments on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice and may request disclosure and/or a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 30 days after the date of publication or the first workday afterward. Any request for an administrative protective order must be made no later than five days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and § 355.10 of the Commerce Regulations (50 FR 32556; August 13, 1985).

Dated: October 2, 1986.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 86-22699 Filed 10-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

#### Electronic Instrumentation Technical Advisory Committee; Partially Closed Meeting

A meeting of the Electronic Instrumentation Technical Advisory Committee will be held October 28 and 29, 1986, in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. On October 28 the meeting will be held in

Room 4830 from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and will be open to the public. The Executive session of the meeting will be held on October 29, 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Room 6029.

The Committee advises the Office of Technology and Policy Analysis with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to electronics and related equipment and technology.

#### Agenda

##### General Session

October 28, 1986—Open EITAC Meeting 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

1. Opening remarks by the Chairperson.
2. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
3. Industry presentation and discussion concerning controls on ECCN 1521A (broadband amplifiers).
4. Industry presentation and discussion concerning controls of ECCN 1548A (oscilloscopes).

5. Public comments are invited on the following entries on the Commodity Control List (CCL):

- CCL 1522A Lasers and Laser Systems
- CCL 1529A Electronic Test Equipment—particularly subitem b(5)
- CCL 1531A Frequency Synthesizers
- CCL 1541A Cathode Ray Tubes
- CCL 1572A Recording and Reproducing Equipment.

Comments should consider the need for revision (strengthening, relaxation or decontrol) of the current regulations based on technological trends, foreign availability and national security. The committee is also interested in proposals for revision to the People's Republic of China guidelines and GCOM regulations relating to these CCL numbers.

##### Executive Session

October 29, 9:30 a.m.—5:00 p.m.  
6. Discussion of matters properly classified under Executive Order 12356, dealing with the U.S. and COCOM control program and strategic criteria related thereto.

The General session of the meeting will be open to the public and a limited number of seats will be available. To the extent time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. Written statements may be submitted at any time before or after the meeting.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the delegate of the General Counsel, formally determined on January 10, 1986, pursuant to section 10(d) of the

Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94-409, that the matters to be discussed in the Executive Session should be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act relating to open meetings and public participation therein, because the Executive Session will be concerned with matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and are properly classified under Executive Order 12356.

A copy of the Notice of Determination to close meetings or portions thereof is available for public inspection and copying in the Central Reference and Records Inspection Facility, Room 6628, U.S. Department of Commerce. Telephone: 202-377-4217. For further information or copies of the minutes contact Betty A. Ferrell, 202/377-2583.

Dated: October 2, 1986.

Betty A. Ferrell,

Acting Director, Technical Support Staff,  
Office of Technology and Policy Analysis.

[FR Doc. 86-22686 Filed 10-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

[C-507-601]

#### Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order; Roasted In-Shell Pistachios From Iran

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We determine that certain benefits which constitute bounties or grants within the meaning of the countervailing duty law are being provided to growers, processor-roasters, or exporters in Iran of roasted in-shell pistachios. The estimated net bounty or grant is 317.89 percent *ad valorem*.

We are directing the U.S. Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of roasted in-shell pistachios from Iran that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice, and to require a cash deposit on entries of these products in the amount equal to the estimated net bounty or grant.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 7, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alain Letort or Gary Taverman, Office of Investigations, or Dick Moreland, Office of Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-0186 (Letort), 377-

0161 (Taverman), or 377-2786 (Moreland).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Final Determination

Based upon our investigation, we determine that there is reason to believe or suspect that certain benefits which constitute bounties or grants within the meaning of section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are being provided to growers, processor-roasters, or exporters in Iran of in-shell pistachios which are roasted and imported into the United States. For purposes of this final determination, the following programs are found to confer bounties or grants:

- Foreign Exchange Benefits for Exporters.
- Price Supports and/or Guaranteed Purchase of All Production.
- Preferential Provision of Fertilizer and Machinery.
- Preferential Credit.
- Tax Exemptions.
- Provision of Water and Irrigation at Preferential Rates.
- Technical Support.

We determine the estimated net bounty or grant for roasted in-shell pistachios to be 317.89 percent *ad valorem*.

##### Case History

On June 24, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the California Pistachio Commission, Keenan Farms Inc., Kern Pistachio Hulling and Drying Co-op, and T.M. Duche Nut Company, Inc. on behalf of growers and processor-roasters in the U.S. industry producing roasted in-shell pistachios. In compliance with the filing requirements of §355.26 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 355.26), the petition alleges that growers, processor-roasters, and exporters in Iran of roasted pistachios receive bounties or grants within the meaning of section 303 of the Act.

We found that the petition contained sufficient grounds upon which to initiate a countervailing duty investigation, and on June 30, 1986, we initiated such an investigation (51 FR 25084—July 10, 1986).

Since Iran is not a "country under the Agreement" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, sections 303 (a)(1) and (b) of the Act apply to this investigation. Accordingly, the petitioners are not required to allege that, and the U.S. International Trade Commission is not required to determine whether, imports of this product materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

On July 2, 1986, we presented a questionnaire to the government of

Algeria in Washington, DC and requested that it forward the questionnaire to the Iranian authorities in its capacity as the protecting power for Iran in the United States. We requested a response to our questionnaire by August 1, 1986. We did not receive a response from either the government of Iran or the growers, processor-roasters, or exporters of the subject merchandise in Iran.

On August 15, 1986, we made our preliminary affirmative determination, based on the best information available, stating that benefits which constitute bounties or grants are being provided to growers, processor-roasters, or exporters in Iran of roasted in-shell pistachios (51 FR 29956—August 21, 1986).

Since no response has been received in this investigation, our final determination is based upon the best information available, as required by § 355.39 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 355.39).

##### Scope of Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is all roasted in-shell pistachio nuts, whether roasted in Iran or elsewhere, from which the hull has been removed, leaving the inner hard shells and the edible meat, currently provided for under item 145.53 of the *Tariff Schedules of the United States* (TSUS).

##### Analysis of Programs

Throughout this notice, we refer to certain general principles applied to the facts of the current investigation. These general principles are described in the *Subsidies Appendix* attached to the notice of the notice of "Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat-Rolled Products from Argentina; Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order" (49 FR 18006—April 26, 1984).

Because we did not receive a response to our questionnaire, we are using the best information available as required under § 355.39 of our regulations (19 U.S.C. 355.39), adversely inferring receipt and countervailability of benefits based on the absence of a response.

For purposes of this final determination, the period for which we are measuring bounties or grants ("the review period") is calendar year 1985. Based upon our analysis of the petition and the best information available, we determine the following:

### Programs Determined to Confer Bounties or Grants

We determine that bounties or grants are being provided to growers, processor-roasters, or exporters in Iran of in-shell pistachios which are roasted and imported into the United States under the following programs:

#### A. Foreign Exchange Benefits for Exporters

Petitioners allege that exporters of pistachios in Iran are entitled to exchange foreign currency earned from export sales at a premium of 11 percent above the official exchange rate and that this preferential rate is limited to exporters. According to information submitted in the petition, exporters of pistachios in Iran may retain this additional 11 percent as foreign exchange and then may benefit from this retained foreign currency in one of two ways.

First, an exporter can use the additional foreign currency to import goods for resale in Iran at whatever price the market will bear. According to the petition, the free market price of imported goods is often five to six times higher than the price set by the government of Iran. Second, a pistachio exporter may sell retained foreign currency at the free-market rate to any person in Iran with a need for foreign currency. During the period of investigation, the average official exchange rate was 89.248 rials/dollar, derived from International Monetary Fund statistics, and, according to petitioners, the average free-market exchange rate was approximately 650 rials/dollar. Petitioners estimate the net bounty or grant from the preferential exchange rate and foreign currency retention schemes to be 56.65 percent *ad valorem*.

Petitioners further allege that when Iranian exporters surrender their foreign exchange to the Iranian Central Bank, they receive a *wariznameh*, or a foreign exchange certificate. This certificate, given in addition to the rial value of the foreign currency surrendered, is an acknowledgement by the Central Bank of receipt of foreign exchange and authorizes the holder to receive foreign currency equal to the amount indicated on the *wariznameh* to use for the payment of imports. The *wariznameh* has a face value equal to the full value of the foreign currency earned from exports. The *wariznameh* is transferable to importers needing foreign currency to pay their bills and, according to petitioners, has a market value of 240-360 rials/dollar. Therefore, the *wariznameh* potentially confers a benefit on the exporters of 240-360 rials for each dollar earned from exports.

We have been unable to ascertain from available information whether the preferential exchange rate/currency retention schemes and the *wariznameh* program coexist in Iran or, as the petitioners suggest, the former program has been superseded by the latter. As best information available, we determine that exporters of Iranian pistachios benefit from the *wariznameh* program. This is the program for which the petition provides the most recent information and, of the two, has the highest rate.

To calculate the benefits, we assumed an average value for the *wariznameh* of 300 rials for each dollar delivered to the Central Bank. Using the official exchange rate for 1985 of 89.248 rials we calculated that the exporter received a benefit of \$3.3614 of each dollar of exports, or 336.14 percent.

The petitioners allege that all roasted pistachios from Iran are exported as raw pistachios and are then roasted in a third country before importation into the United States. Therefore, we have adjusted the benefit from this program to reflect that any benefit earned in Iran is actually earned on the lower value of raw pistachios. We compared the average unit value of raw pistachios imported into the United States to the value of roasted pistachios imported into the United States. This comparison showed the value of raw pistachios imported into the United States to be 82.7 percent of the value of imported roasted pistachios. Therefore, we adjusted the benefit from this program using this 82.7 percent ratio and obtained an estimated net bounty or grant of 277.99 percent *ad valorem*.

#### B. Price Supports and/or Guaranteed Purchase of All Production

Petitioners allege that pistachio growers in Iran may benefit from a government policy of guaranteeing purchase of, and subsidizing prices for, certain major food commodities. Petitioners state that the government of Iran gave the Rafsanjan Cooperative, the country's principal pistachio cooperative, a \$100 million loan on terms consistent with commercial considerations to purchase and stockpile pistachios.

Because we not receive a response to our questionnaire in this investigation, we are assuming, as best information available, that this type of financing is limited to a specific enterprise or industry, or group of enterprises or industries, and that the loan was extended on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

We treated the loan under this program as a long-term, cost-free loan and calculated the benefit consistent with the Department's methodology as

outlined in the *Subsidies Appendix* for long-term loans. We have assumed that the loan was given in 1983, when, according to information supplied by the petitioners, the Iranian banks still operated under a system of charging interest on loans. To determine a benchmark interest rate for loans in Iran, we are relying on information contained in the *Middle East Economic Digest*. This publication indicates that interest rates on bank loans in 1983 ranged from 12 to 18 percent. To quantify the benefit from this loan, we assumed the loan was given interest free and used 18 percent as our commercial benchmark rate. Because information in the record of this investigation indicates that the Rafsanjan Pistachio Producers Cooperative is the only pistachio cooperative in Iran, we divided the benefit received during the review period by the total value of 1985 pistachio production. This benefit of 8.05 percent was then applied to the adjustment factor for roasted pistachios of 82.7 percent. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### C. Preferential Provision of Fertilizer and Machinery

Petitioners allege that agricultural cooperatives, such as the Rafsanjan Cooperative, can obtain fertilizer and machinery from the government at preferential prices. According to the petition, the extent of the benefit varies with the crop produced. Petitioners further allege that these cooperatives, in turn, provide both fertilizer and machinery to their members on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

Because the respondents did not provide a response in this case and the petitioners were unable to provide information as to whether and to what degree the pistachio industry receives countervailable benefits under this program, we are applying, as best information available, the highest benefit rate for a domestic bounty or grant program found in this case. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### D. Preferential Credit

Petitioners allege that agricultural cooperatives in Iran make preferential credit available from funds provided by the government to their members. Petitioners argue that the Rafsanjan Cooperative is the principal cooperative for pistachios in Iran and that this organization may provide loans on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations to its members.

Because the respondents did not provide a response in this case and the petitioners were unable to provide information as to whether and to what degree the pistachio industry receives countervailable benefits under this program, we are applying, as best information available, the highest benefit rate for a domestic bounty or grant program found in this case. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### E. Tax Exemptions

Petitioners allege that pistachio farmers may benefit from legislation exempting farmers and livestock breeders from paying taxes, provided they follow government agricultural guidelines.

Because the respondents did not provide a response in this case and the petitioners were unable to provide information as to whether and to what degree the pistachio industry receives countervailable benefits under this program, we are applying, as best information available, the highest benefit rate for a domestic bounty or grant program found in this case. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### F. Provision of Water and Irrigation

Petitioners allege that pistachio growers in Iran may benefit from the construction of soil dams, flood barriers, canals, and other irrigation projects undertaken by the government to increase agricultural production.

Because the respondents did not provide a response in this case and the petitioners were unable to provide information as to whether and to what degree the pistachio industry receives countervailable benefits under this program, we are applying, as best information available, the highest benefit rate for a domestic bounty or grant program found in this case. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### G. Technical Support

Petitioners allege that pistachio growers in Iran may receive technical support as part of the government's program to support agricultural development. Petitioners argue that technical support has included research projects to improve cultivation

techniques, and assistance in harvesting, marketing, and use of fertilizer.

Because the respondents did not provide a response in this case and the petitioners were unable to provide information as to whether and to what degree the pistachio industry receives countervailable benefits under this program, we are applying, as best information available, the highest benefit rate for a domestic bounty or grant program found in this case. On this basis, we determine an estimated net bounty or grant of 6.65 percent *ad valorem*.

#### Best Information Available

In accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we used the best information available in making our final determination.

#### Suspension of Liquidation

The suspension of liquidation ordered in our preliminary affirmative determination shall remain in effect until further notice. The estimated net bounty or grant is 317.89 percent *ad valorem*. In accordance with section 706(a)(4) of the Act, we are directing the U.S. Customs Service to require a cash deposit in the amount indicated above for each entry of roasted in-shell pistachios from Iran which is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, and to assess countervailing duties in accordance with sections 706(a)(1) and 751 of the Act.

#### Administration Procedures

We afforded interested parties an opportunity to submit written views in accordance with § 355.34 of our regulations (19 CFR 355.34). We also afforded the parties to the proceeding an opportunity to present views orally before the Department at a public hearing in accordance with § 355.35 of our regulations (19 CFR 355.35). No hearing was requested.

This determination is published pursuant to section 705(d) of the Act [19 U.S.C. 1671d(d)].

Paul Freedenberg,

Assistant Secretary for Trade Administration,  
October 1, 1986.

[FR Doc. 86-22700 Filed 10-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

#### National Bureau of Standards

##### Membership of General Performance Review Board

In a notice published in the **Federal Register** on February 7, 1986 (51 FR 4780-4781), the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) announced the membership, terms, and purpose of the General Performance Review Board (GPRB). This notice announces a change in the membership of the GPRB. Helen M. Wood; Chief, Information Systems Engineering Division, replaces Thomas N. Pyke, Jr. Ms. Wood's appointment is effective immediately and expires December 31, 1988.

Persons desiring further information about the GPRB or its membership may contact Mrs. Elizabeth W. Stroud, Personnel Officer, A123 Administration Building, National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, Maryland, 20899, telephone (301) 921-3555.

Dated: October 1, 1986.

Ernest Ambler,

Director.

[FR Doc. 86-22640 Filed 10-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

#### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

##### Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Amended Meeting Notice

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Commerce.

The dates for the joint public meeting as published in the **Federal Register** (September 26, 1986, page 34239), for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's Red Drum Advisory Panel, its Scientific and Statistical and its Special Red Drum Committees, have been changed from September 29-30, 1986 to October 6-7, 1986. All other information remains unchanged. For further information contact Wayne E. Swingle, Executive Director, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 5401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 881, Tampa, FL; telephone: (813) 228-2815.

Dated: October 2, 1986.

Richard B. Roe,

Director, Office of Fisheries Management,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 86-22665 Filed 10-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-M