

[A-412-810]

**Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review; certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom.

**SUMMARY:** On May 6, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 1, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** G. Leon McNeill or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

**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 (URAA). 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).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On May 6, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 20225) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom (58 FR 15324, March 22, 1993). The

Department has now completed the review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

**Scope of the Review**

The products covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of nonalloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined by the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1 (f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead, or 0.1 percent or more of bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00, 60.00; 7213.39.00.30, 00.60, 00.90; 7214.40.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.50.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.60.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; and 7228.30.80.00. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth steel products, United Engineering Steels Limited (UES), now British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES), and the period March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995.

**Analysis of the Comments Received**

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received comments from UES and petitioner.

*Comment 1:* Petitioner contends that the Department erred in the way it matched home market products to products sold to the United States. Petitioner maintains that the language included in the concordance program keeps only the first record of the home market control number, which identifies a particular home market model, and drops other records containing the subsequent matches if the same home market control number is matched to subsequent U.S. products, or to the same U.S. products in different six-month windows. (A match is made within a window of time from three months prior to two months after the

month of the U.S. sale.) As a result, petitioner claims, the Department dropped a number of legitimate home market product matches, and instead, used constructed value as the basis of normal value.

*Department's Position:* We agree with petitioner. The original computer program contained an inadvertent error. We have revised the computer programming language to correct this error for the final results of this review.

*Comment 2:* UES argues that the Department failed to match U.S. sales to home market sales in the most contemporaneous month. Instead, the Department matched each U.S. sale to all home market sales occurring within the six-month window. UES argues that, pursuant to the Department's matching rule, the most contemporaneous home market match is selected in the following order of preference: sales in the same month of the U.S. sale, sales in the month prior to the U.S. sale, sales in the second month prior to the month of the U.S. sale, sales in the third month prior to the month of the U.S. sale, sales in the month subsequent to the month of the U.S. sale, and finally, sales in the second month subsequent to the month of the U.S. sale.

*Department's Position:* We agree with UES and have revised our computer programming language accordingly for these final results of review.

*Comment 3:* UES maintains that the Department erred in its calculation of the profit in calculating constructed value. UES claims that the Department erred in calculating the ratio applied to the cost of production to calculate profit by first computing a profit percentage for each home market sales transaction, and then weight-averaging the percentages by quantity. UES contends that this methodology introduces serious distortion. UES suggests that, under the Department's normal methodology, total home market profit is divided by total home market costs to calculate the profit ratio.

*Department's Position:* We agree with UES and have revised our computer programming language accordingly for these final results of review.

**Clerical Errors**

For the preliminary results of review, the Department did not deduct U.S. brokerage and handling charges from the U.S. price. For these final results of review, we have deducted such charges from the U.S. price. See section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

## Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
United Engineering Steels Limited (UES) (now British Steel Engineering Steels Limited) .....	3/1/94–2/28/95	1.56

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and normal value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (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 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) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 25.82 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (58 FR 6207, January 27, 1993). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final 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 subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

## Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: October 23, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-28117 Filed 10-31-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## [A-549-502]

### Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On May 9, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. This review covers Saha Thai Steel Pipe Company, SAF Steel Pipe Export Company, and Pacific Pipe Company. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 1, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James Rice or Jean Kemp, AD/CVD

Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1374 or (202) 482-4037, respectively.

### 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), by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). 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).

#### Background

On May 9, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand (61 FR 21159, May 9, 1996). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

#### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review are certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. The subject merchandise has an outside diameter 0.375 inches or more, but not exceeding 16 inches. These products, which are commonly referred to in the industry as "standard pipe" or "structural tubing," are hereinafter designated as "pipe and tube." The merchandise is classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7306.30.1000, 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.30.5040, 7306.30.5055, 7306.30.5085 and 7306.30.5090. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.