

What and Where to Submit

A complete, original application may be electronically sent as an e-mail attachment to tia.trout@usda.gov. If applications are submitted electronically, a signature page must be submitted in hard copy or via fax. Alternatively, an original application package plus two paper copies may be submitted in hard copy to: Tia Trout, USDA National Rural Development Partnership, MAIL STOP 3205, Room 4225, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250-3205.

Dated: February 3, 2003.

John Rosso,

Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.

Appendix A

Form of Recognition Agreement

Recognition Agreement Between [SRDC] and The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Parties

SRDC Chair or Co-Chairs _____

SRDC Executive Director _____

USDA

Administrator—Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Purpose

The purpose of this Agreement is to confer recognition upon [SRDC] as the State Rural Development Council for the state of _____ a term ending May 13, 2007 unless earlier terminated for failure to maintain the requirements for ongoing eligibility pursuant to the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (the 2002 Farm Bill).

Background

The National Rural Development Partnership authorized by section 6021 of the 2002 Farm Bill is composed of a National Rural Development Coordinating Committee (the Coordinating Committee) and State Rural Development Councils. The purposes of the Partnership are to empower and build the capacity of States and rural communities to design flexible and innovative responses to their own special rural development needs, with local determinations of progress and selection of projects and activities. Accordingly, the legislation requires that a State Rural Development Council (1) be composed of representatives of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, nonprofit organizations, regional organizations, the private sector, and other entities committed to rural advancement, (2) have a nonpartisan and nondiscriminatory membership that is broad and representative of the economic, social, and political diversity of the State, and (3) that the membership shall be responsible for the governance and operations of the State Rural Development Council.

Agreement

The [SRDC] hereby represents the following:

1. The membership of the SRDC meets and will continue to meet on an ongoing basis the

eligibility requirements for recognition as a member of the NRDP set forth in the 2002 Farm Bill.

2. The entity which shall undertake fiscal responsibilities on behalf of the SRDC for purposes of any USDA funding is [name of Funding Entity/Address]. The officer who is authorized to enter into agreements on behalf of the Funding Entity is [Name, Title].

3. The person who is authorized to represent the SRDC in meetings of the NRDP and enter into contracts and receive notices on behalf of the SRDC is: [Name, Title, Address]

The [SRDC] hereby undertakes to perform the following duties:

1. Facilitate collaboration among Federal, State, local, and tribal governments and the private and nonprofit sectors in the planning and implementation of programs and policies that have an impact on rural areas of the State;

2. Monitor, report, and comment on policies and programs that address, or fail to address, the needs of the rural areas of the State; and

3. As part of the NRDP, in conjunction with the Coordinating Committee, facilitate the development of strategies to identify and reduce or eliminate conflicting or duplicative administrative or regulatory requirements of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments.

Furthermore, the [SRDC] agrees to:

(a) Provide to the Coordinating Committee an annual plan with goals and performance measures; and

(b) Submit to the Coordinating Committee an annual report on the progress of the [SRDC] in meeting the goals and measures.

The [SRDC] hereby agrees to provide matching funds or in-kind goods or services, as required by statute, to support the activities of the undersigned, in an amount that is at least 33 percent of the amount of Federal funds received from a Federal agency, except where the Federal funds in question are (a) to support one or more specific programs or project activities or (b) to reimburse the SRDC for services provided to the funding Federal agency.

The [SRDC] hereby agrees to provide evidence on an on-going basis that the SRDC is in compliance with this Agreement. For example, as and when the Council modifies its bylaws, organizational structure, rules of governance, and/or makes any other modifications that change the SRDC's structure or rules of operations, such changes must be provided to USDA immediately.

Furthermore, the [SRDC] understands that if it applies to USDA—RD for federal funding for its core operations, it must comply with all federal requirements regarding financial management, good standing, criminal convictions, debarment, civil rights and any other applicable laws.

Recognition

The USDA hereby recognizes [name of SRDC] as a State Rural Development Council and member of the National Rural Development Partnership. All correspondence shall be directed to USDA, care of [David Sears, National Partnership Office, email, telephone].

Programming, Budgeting, Funding, and Reimbursement Arrangement

This Recognition Agreement does not commit USDA or the federal government to provide any financial assistance.

Authority

The USDA authority for entering into this Recognition Agreement is Section 6021 of Public Law 107-171 (May 13, 2002). This Recognition Agreement is subject to Section 6021 of the 2002 Farm Bill, the Notice Inviting Applications for Recognition, future SRDC regulations not otherwise inconsistent with this Recognition Agreement and all other applicable laws.

Approvals

The signatories hereby certify that they have the authority to enter into this Recognition Agreement.

Revocation

Upon written notice from USDA of a failure to perform or other default under this Agreement, the SRDC has 90 days from the date of the USDA written notice to cure the failure to perform or the default. USDA may terminate this agreement, thereby revoking recognition, upon written notice to the SRDC for failure of the SRDC to cure a failure to perform or otherwise cure a default under this Recognition Agreement.

The SRDC may terminate this Recognition Agreement upon 90 days written notice to USDA.

Effective Date

This Recognition Agreement will become effective upon the signature of all parties and shall remain in effect until the earlier of May 13, 2007 or termination by either party. Its provisions can be amended or supplemented in writing as may be agreed upon.

Administrator
Rural Business-Cooperative Service
Administrator

[Date]

[] Chair
SRDC

[Date]

[] Executive Director
SRDC

[Date]

[FR Doc. 03-4040 Filed 2-19-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-XY-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[Docket No.: 030213030-3030-01]

Office of the General Counsel; Guidelines for the Proper Consideration of Small Entities in Rulemaking

AGENCY: Office of the General Counsel, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Department) announces the availability of its guidelines for the proper consideration of small entities in agency rulemaking pursuant to Executive Order 13272. The purpose of these guidelines is to establish procedures and policies to promote compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA). These guidelines ensure that the Department properly considers the potential impacts of its rulemakings on small business, small governmental jurisdictions, and small organizations during the rulemaking process.

ADDRESSES: To obtain a copy of the Department's guidelines, please send a written request to Daniel Cohen, Chief Counsel for Regulation, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Ave., Suite 5876, Washington, DC 20230, or visit the following Web site: <http://www.ogc.doc.gov/ogc/legreg/regulati.htm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, please contact Tricia Choe, Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation at (202) 482-4265.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 13, 2002, the President signed Executive Order 13272 entitled Proper Consideration of Small Entities in Agency Rulemaking. Executive Order 13272 requires federal agencies to issue policies and procedures to ensure that the potential impacts of agency rules in small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions are properly considered during the rulemaking process consistent with the statutory mandates of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA). *See* 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The intent of the Order is to ensure that agencies work closely with the Office of Advocacy at the Small Business Administration to address small business issues as early as possible in the regulatory process, particularly as they relate to disproportionate regulatory burden.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Order, the Department of Commerce prepared guidelines that establish procedures and policies ensuring compliance with the RFA. These guidelines ensure that the Department properly considers the potential impacts of rules on small business, small governmental jurisdictions, and small organizations during the rulemaking process. Specifically, the document provides guidance concerning the formulation of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis and final regulatory

flexibility analysis, the certification process, and the SBA review process.

On November 13, 2002, the Department submitted a draft of the guidelines to SBA for review and comment. After reviewing the guidelines, SBA requested that the Department make minor editorial revisions and include the Department's procedure for notifying SBA of proposed rules that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Department addressed all of SBA's comments. The Department now makes available to the public its guidelines. To obtain a copy of the guidelines, please see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

Dated: February 13, 2003.

Theodore W. Kassinger,
General Counsel, Department of Commerce.
[FR Doc. 03-4032 Filed 2-19-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-BW-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-809]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico: Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On November 12, 2002, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the remand determination of the Department of Commerce (the Department) in the 1997-98 administrative review for Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. (AHMSA) arising from the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Mexico. *See Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. v. United States of America, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation*, Consol. Ct. No. 01-00018, Slip Op. 02-136 (CIT November 12, 2002) (the November 12, 2002 Court order). As there is now a final court decision, we are amending the amended final results of the review in this matter. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these amended final results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 20, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas Killiam or Michael Heaney, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street N.W. and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5222 or (202) 482-4475, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on steel plate from Mexico (58 FR 44165). On February 18, 2000, the Department published the final results of the 1997-1998 administrative review. *See Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 8338, February 18, 2000. The Department published three successive sets of amended results, on November 2, 2000 (65 FR 65830), December 12, 2000 (65 FR 77566), and January 24, 2001 (66 FR 7619).

Following the January 24, 2001 amended results, the foreign producer, AHMSA, contested certain aspects of the Department's final and amended final results at the CIT. The Department requested a voluntary remand, and on April 15, 2002, the CIT remanded the amended final results to the Department. On June 28, 2002, the Department issued its remand redetermination. *See Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Order in Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. v. United States, et. al.*, Court No. 01-00018, June 28, 2002. *See also* Memorandum to the File from T. Killiam, Case Analyst, "Analysis of Programming Revisions in the Final Remand Results of Review of Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Mexico A-201-809", June 28, 2002; and Memorandum to Neal Halper, Director, Office of Accounting, from Peter S. Scholl, Senior Accountant, "Final Remand Redetermination - Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Mexico," June 28, 2002. In the remand determination, the Department used historical and inflation-adjusted information previously placed on the record by AHMSA to calculate a revised financial expense rate, and applied this revised rate to AHMSA's historical cost of manufacturing.

On November 12, 2002, the CIT sustained the Department's remand results.