

Therefore, we are not initiating on petitioners' less than adequate remuneration allegation on the grounds that petitioners have not provided sufficient information to warrant initiating an investigation of this program.

## 2. Extraordinary Write Down Taken by BNFL in 1993 Provided a Potential Benefit to Urenco Ltd.

In 1993, BNFL transferred its enrichment production at the Capenhurst facility to Urenco Ltd. in exchange for one-third ownership in Urenco Ltd. Petitioners state that when BNFL exchanged the Capenhurst facility for ownership in Urenco Ltd., BNFL incurred an extraordinary charge of £40 million to cover the restructuring of the enrichment operations. Petitioners claim that because of the non-transparency of Urenco's restructuring, they have been unable to determine how to attribute the entire £40 million written off by BNFL. However, petitioners contend that the one-third interest in Urenco Ltd. that BNFL gained may not have been a fair market exchange and that the £40 million charge taken by BNFL may have somehow provided subsidy benefits to Urenco Ltd. that were not reflected in the terms of the restructuring.

The only evidence that petitioners have provided in support of this allegation is a press article stating that BNFL made a £40 million charge to cover the merger of its Capenhurst uranium enrichment plant. However, petitioners provide no evidence to indicate that this charge should have somehow been attributed to Urenco Ltd. Furthermore, petitioners provide no information demonstrating how the £40 million charge allegedly taken by BNFL resulted in BNFL obtaining its one-third interest in Urenco Ltd. at less than adequate remuneration. As noted above, the adequacy of remuneration shall be determined in relation to the prevailing market conditions which include price, quality, availability, marketability, and other conditions of purchase or sale. Petitioners have not addressed any of these factors. On this basis, we are not initiating an investigation of petitioners' less than adequate remuneration allegation. However, because the 1993 corporate restructuring of the Urenco Group is involved in several allegations on which we are initiating investigations, during the course of this investigation we will request additional information from respondents regarding BNFL's extraordinary charge of £40 million.

## Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitions allege that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the subsidization of individual and cumulated imports of the subject merchandise. Petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is evident in the declining trends in net operating profits, net sales volumes, profit-to-sales ratios, and capacity utilization. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. Customs import data, lost sales, and pricing information. We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation, and have determined that these allegations are properly supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation (*see Initiation Checklist* at Attachment II Re: Material Injury).

## Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations

The Department has examined the countervailing duty petitions on low enriched uranium from France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, and found that they comply with the requirements of section 702(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b) of the Act, we are initiating countervailing duty investigations to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of low enriched uranium from these countries receive subsidies. *See* the December 27, 2000, memoranda to the file (for each country) regarding the initiation of each investigation (public versions on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce, Room B-099).

## Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 702(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of each petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, as well as to the Delegation of the European Community. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of each petition to each exporter named in the petition, as appropriate.

## ITC Notification

Pursuant to section 702(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of these initiations.

## Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by January 22, 2001, whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of imports of low enriched uranium from France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, the investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: December 27, 2000.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-385 Filed 1-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 00092-9279-01]

RIN 0693-ZA41

### Announcing a Draft Federal Information Processing Standard for the Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC), and Request for Comments

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

**ACTION:** Notice; Request for Comments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a draft Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) for the Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC), for public review and comment.

This draft FIPS describes a keyed-hash message authentication code (HMAC), A MECHANISM FOR MESSAGE AUTHENTICATION USING CRYPTOGRAPHIC HASH FUNCTIONS, HMAC can be used with any FIPS-approved cryptographic hash function, in combination with a shared secret key. The cryptographic strength of HMAC depends on the properties of the underlying hash function. The HMAC specification in this draft FIPS is a generalization of HMAC as specified in Internet RFC 2104, HMAC, Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication, and ANSI X9.71, Keyed Hash Message Authentication Code.

Prior to the submission of this proposed standard to the Secretary of Commerce for review and approval, it is essential that consideration is given to

the needs and views of the public, users, the information technology industry, and Federal, State and local government organizations. The purpose of this notice is to solicit such views.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 5, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be sent to: Chief, Computer Security Division, Information Technology Laboratory, Attention: Comments on the draft FIPS for HMAC, 100 Bureau Drive—Stop 8930 National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930.

Electronic comments may also be sent to: "HMAC@nist.gov".

This draft FIPS is available electronically at: <http://www.nist.gov/hmac/> or <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/drafts.html>.

Comments received in response to this notice will be published electronically at <http://www.nist.gov/hmac/>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Elaine Barker, Computer Security Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930, telephone (301) 975-2911, email: [elaine.barker@nist.gov](mailto:elaine.barker@nist.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This draft FIPS for The Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC) specifies an algorithm for applications requiring message authentication. Message authentication is achieved via the construction of a message authentication code (MAC). MACs based on cryptographic hash functions are known as HMACs.

The purpose of a MAC is to authenticate both the source of a message and its integrity without the use of any additional mechanisms. HMACs have two functionally distinct parameters, message input and a secret key known only to the message originator and intended receiver(s). Additional applications of keyed hash functions include their use in challenge-response identification protocols for computing responses, which are a function of both a secret key and a challenge message.

An HMAC function is used by the originator to produce a value (the MAC) that is formed by condensing the secret key and the message input. The MAC is typically sent to the message receiver along with the message. The receiver computes the MAC on the received message using the same key and HMAC function as was used by the originator, and compares the result computed with the received MAC. If the two values match, the message has been correctly received, and the receiver is assured

that the message originator is a member of the community of users that share the key.

**Authority:** Federal Information Processing Standards Publications (FIPS PUBS) are issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology after approval by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 5131 of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 and the Computer Security Act of 1987, Public Law 100-2235.

E.O. 12866: This notice has been determined to be non-significant for the purposes of E. O. 12866.

Dated: January 2, 2001.

**Karen H. Brown,**

*Deputy Director, NIST.*

[FR Doc. 01-381 Filed 1-4-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-CN-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

[I.D. 122800C]

**Availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Tacoma Water Department Habitat Conservation Plan, King County, WA**

**AGENCIES:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce; Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for public review. The FEIS addresses the proposed issuance of Incidental Take Permits (permits) to the City of Tacoma, WA, Department of Public Utilities, Water Division (Tacoma Water). The proposed permits relate to water withdrawal, forest management, and timber harvest on City of Tacoma lands in King County, WA. Tacoma Water submitted applications on December 23, 1999, to the FWS and the NMFS (together, the Services) for permits pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (the Act). The proposed permits would authorize take of the following endangered or threatened species incidental to otherwise lawful management activities: gray wolf (*Canis lupis*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus marmoratus*), northern spotted owl

(*Strix occidentalis caurina*), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*), Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*), Puget Sound chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). Tacoma Water is also seeking coverage for 24 currently unlisted species under specific provisions of the permits, should these species be listed in the future. The duration of the proposed permits is 50 years. This notice is provided pursuant to the ESA, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations.

**DATES:** We will issue a Record of Decision and make a final permit decision no sooner than 30 days after publication of this notice.

**ADDRESSES:** See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for addresses of locations where you may review copies of the documents.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Tim Romanski, Project Biologist, FWS, 510 Desmond Drive. S.E., Suite 102, Lacey, Washington, 98503-1273, (360) 753-5823; or Mike Grady, Project Biologist, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Bldg. 1, Seattle, Washington, 98115-0070, (206) 526-4645.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Availability of Documents**

Copies of the Statement, and all associated documents are available for review at the following libraries:

The Olympia Timberland Library, Reference Desk, 313 8th Avenue SE, Olympia, WA, (360)352-0595

Tacoma Main Public Library, 1102 Tacoma Avenue South, Tacoma, WA, (253)591-5666

Enumclaw City Library, 1700 1st Street, Enumclaw, WA, (360)825-2938; Auburn Public Library, 808 9th Street SE, Auburn, WA, (253)931-3918

The Seattle Public Library, Government Publications Desk, 1000 4th Avenue, Seattle, WA, (206)386-4636.

The documents are also available electronically on the World Wide Web at <http://www.r1.fws.gov/>. Requests for documents or CD ROMs should be made by calling the FWS at (360)534-9330.

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulations prohibit the "taking" of a species listed as endangered or threatened. The term take is defined under the Act to mean harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is defined by the FWS to include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns,