

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On April 30, 1984, the Department published in the Federal Register (49 FR 18336) the antidumping duty order on CTVs from the Republic of Korea (the order). On April 4, 1995, the Department published (60 FR 17052) a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the order for the period April 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995 (twelfth review). We received a timely request for review and partial revocation of the order from Samsung.

Applicable Statute

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review include CTVs, complete and incomplete, from the Republic of Korea. This merchandise is currently classified under item numbers 8528.10.08, 8528.10.11, 8528.10.13, 8528.10.17, 8528.10.19, 8528.10.24, 8528.10.28, 8528.10.34, 8528.10.38, 8528.10.44, 8528.10.48, 8528.10.54, 8528.10.58, 8528.10.61, 8528.10.63, 8528.10.67, 8528.10.69, 8528.10.71, 8528.10.73, 8528.10.77, 8528.10.79, 8529.90.03, 8529.90.06, and 8540.11.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Since the order covers all CTVs regardless of HTS classification, the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and for the U.S. Customs Service purposes. Our written description of the scope of the order remains dispositive. The period of review is April 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995.

Request for Revocation

On April 28, 1995, Samsung submitted, along with its request for an administrative review, a request that the order be revoked as it applies to Samsung. In its letter, Samsung certified that it did not sell subject merchandise during the twelfth review at less than normal value, and that it will not in the future sell such merchandise at less than normal value. Additionally, Samsung attached to its letter a certificate agreeing to the immediate reinstatement of the order if Samsung is

subsequently found to have sold CTVs at less than normal value.

We have preliminarily determined that, because Samsung made no sales of subject merchandise during the period of review, the criteria necessary to revoke an order based on an absence of dumping have not been met. Pursuant to section 353.25(a) of the Department's regulations, we may revoke an order in part if the subject merchandise has been sold at not less than normal value for a period of at least three consecutive years and it is not likely that future sales of the subject merchandise will be made at less than normal value.

Because Samsung did not sell the subject merchandise during the period of review, we have determined that the regulatory requirements listed in sections 353.25 (a) and (b) have not been met. Accordingly, we have preliminarily determined to deny Samsung's request for partial revocation.

Preliminary Results of Review

Samsung reported, and the Department verified through the U.S. Customs Service, that it made no sales or shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. Therefore, we preliminarily determine to maintain Samsung's current cash deposit rate. This rate is zero percent because the margin assigned to Samsung in the most recent final results of review in which it made shipments was a *de minimis* rate (0.47 percent).

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of CTVs entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Samsung will remain zero percent, the rate established in the last review in which it made shipments; (2) For previously reviewed or investigated companies not covered in this review, 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 less-than-fair-value (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) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rates will be 13.90 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (49 FR 18336). These

deposit requirements will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice, and may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held as early as convenient for the parties but not later than 44 days after the date of publication or the first work day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written arguments.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 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 section 751(a)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-13172 Filed 5-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-428-814, A-428-816]

Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Germany: Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On March 28, 1996, the Department of Commerce published the final results of its administrative review

of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany. The review covered one manufacturer/exporter and the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994. Based on the correction of a ministerial error, we are amending the final results. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 24, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nancy Decker or Linda Ludwig, Office of Agreements Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 28, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany (61 FR 13834). The review covered one manufacturer/exporter, AG der Dillinger Huttenwerke (Dillinger), and the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994.

After publication of our final results, we received a timely allegation from petitioners (Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Company, a Unit of USX Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., Geneva Steel, Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, and Lukens Steel Company) that the Department had made a ministerial error in calculating the final results for plate from Germany sold by Dillinger. The respondent filed a timely rebuttal to petitioners' ministerial error allegation.

Petitioners allege that the Department incorrectly applied Dillinger's actual-to-theoretical weight conversion factor in the conversion of gross unit price. The petitioners state that the gross unit price should have been divided, rather than multiplied, by the weight conversion factor. The respondent argues that the error alleged by petitioners does not qualify as a ministerial error under Section 353.28(d) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.28(d) (1995)). Respondent also argues that if the Department, nevertheless, decides to change its methodology, it should also make changes to the conversions of expense related data (conversions of home market inland freight, home market other expenses, home market global credits and debits, and home market credit) to be consistent.

As defined by section 751(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1675(f) (1988)), the term "ministerial error" includes errors "in

addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the [Department] considers ministerial."

We agree with petitioners' allegation that we should have divided, rather than multiplied, gross unit price by the conversion factor. This type of unintentional error meets the definition of ministerial error contained in the Act. We also agree with respondent's rebuttal that, to be consistent, we should also likewise change the conversions of expense related data (home market inland freight, home market other expenses, home market global credits and debits, and home market credit). We have therefore corrected our analysis to divide (rather than multiply) the following by the applicable weight conversion factor: gross unit price, home market inland freight, home market other expenses, home market global credits and debits, and home market credit.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our correction of the ministerial error, we have determined the following margin exists for the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin
AG der Dillinger Hüttenwerke	2.61

We will direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with the procedures discussed in the final results of this review (61 FR 13834), as amended by this determination.

These deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 of file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period.

Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(f) of the

Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(f)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: May 17, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-13178 Filed 5-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-423-602]

Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Belgium; 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 a request from FMC Corporation and Monsanto Company (petitioners), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial phosphoric acid (IPA) from Belgium. The review covers exports by one manufacturer, Société Chimique Prayon-Rupel (Prayon), during the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 24, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Genovese or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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)