Indian laws. See Memorandum to the File From Tamara Underwood, ''Labor Valuation Changes in Lug Nuts Final Calculation'', dated November 6, 1996. Therefore, we have not used *IL&T* data for the final results. The *YLS* provides wage rates on an industry-specific basis. We used the daily wage rate specified for SIC code 381, ''manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment,'' because the description of the various industries this category covers was the best match for the lug nut industry. Having found the *IL&T* data to be an inappropriate source for wage rates, it would be inappropriate to use the *IL&T* data to differentiate among skill levels. Because the *YLS* provides wage rates from 1990, we inflated the data for the review period, using the consumer price index, published in the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics.

Final Results of Review

As a result of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in our preliminary results of review. Therefore, we determine that the following margins exist as a result of our review:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Jiangsu Rudong Grease Gun Factory, also known as China Nantong HuangHai Auto Parts Group Co., Ltd.	09/01/94–08/31/95	2.70
China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp., Nantong Branch	09/01/93–08/31/94	44.99
PRC rate	09/01/94–08/31/95	44.99

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) For Rudong and Nantong, which have separate rates, the cash deposit rates will be the company-specific rates stated above; (2) for the companies named above which did not respond to our questionnaire (China National, Jiangsu, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai Automobile, and Tianjin), and for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate stated above; (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

These deposit rates shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the 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: November 6, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–29243 Filed 11–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–427–811]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From France: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Jacques 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) 482–3434 or (202) 482–4037, respectively.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review are certain stainless steel wire rods (SSWR), products which are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed, and/or pickled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons, or other shapes, in coils. SSWR are made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are only manufactured by hot-rolling, are normally sold in coiled form, and are of solid cross section. The majority of SSWR sold in the United States is round in cross-sectional shape, annealed, and pickled. The most common size is 5.5 millimeters in diameter.

The SSWR subject to this review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7221.00.0005, 7221.00.0015, 7221.00.0020, 7221.00.0030, 7221.00.0040, 7221.00.0045, 7221.00.0060, 7221.00.0075, and 7221.00.0080 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Amendment of Final Results

On September 11, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from France (61 FR 47874). This review covered Imphy S.A., and Ugine-Savoie, two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is August 5, 1993, through December 31, 1994.

On September 17, 1996, counsel for the petitioning companies Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Armco Stainless &

Alloy Products, Carpenter Technology Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Talley Metals Technology, Inc., United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC (''petitioners'') filed allegations of clerical errors with regard to the final results in the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order of certain stainless steel wire rods from France manufactured by Imphy and Ugine-Savoie (''respondents''). We also received allegations from respondents on September 18, 1996. Respondents submitted rebuttal comments on September 20, 1996 and petitioners submitted their rebuttal comments on September 25, 1996. The allegations and rebuttal comments of both parties were filed in a timely fashion.

Petitioners alleged that the Department made four ministerial errors in the final results.

First, petitioners contend that the Department inputted an incorrect date for the calculation of credit expenses for U.S. sales with missing pay date information. Second, petitioners contend that the Department incorrectly applied an exchange rate to respondents' reported marine insurance expenses that were already denominated in U.S. dollars. Third, petitioners argued that the Department failed to include repacking expenses in its calculation of total expenses incurred by respondents in the United States which was subsequently used by the margin calculation program to calculate CEP profit. Fourth, petitioners alleged that the Department failed to use the correct computer code to cap the CEP offset by the amount of indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States.

Respondents did not object to petitioners' ministerial allegations but argued that certain computer coding suggested by petitioners was incorrect (For further discussion of respondents' arguments concerning the computer code to correct these clerical errors, please see Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa dated November 6, 1996 (''Memorandum'')). Although respondents did not object to petitioners' ministerial error allegation regarding repacking expenses, they argued that to assure consistent treatment, the Department should also include repacking as an expense which is deducted from U.S. revenue, in calculating total actual profit.

After a review of petitioners' allegations, we agree with petitioners' allegations and have corrected these errors for the amended final results. We also agree with respondents' argument and will include repacking expenses in the calculation of the U.S. selling expense (''SELLEXPU'') variable to ensure consistent treatment in the calculation of total actual profit. For the computer code we used to correct these ministerial errors, please see the Memorandum.

Respondents alleged that the Department's margin calculation program failed to match sales without regard to level of trade when a control number (CONNUM) was sold in the U.S. at both the end user level of trade and the distributor level of trade. Respondents alleged that in these instances, all constructed export price (CEP) and constructed export price/further manufactured (CEP/FM) sales of the CONNUM were compared to constructed value, rather than to home market sales of comparable merchandise.

We agree that this is a clerical error and have corrected it for the amended final results.

Second, respondents alleged that in determining CEP profit, the Department neglected to include expenses and profit on those sales in France that failed the arm's-length test. Respondents contend that the Department should amend the margin calculation program by including the arm's-length dataset.

Petitioners contend that respondents are not making a ministerial error allegation but challenging the Department's decision to exclude sales that failed the arm's-length test from the calculation of CEP profit. Petitioners also note that the Department employed the same methodology in the preliminary results and that respondents did not dispute the methodology in their case briefs. Petitioners argue that since the Department must disregard a respondents' sales to its affiliated parties as a basis for normal value if such sales are not arm's-length transactions, the expenses associated with such sales should also be disregarded in the CEP profit calculation. Petitioners contend that respondents' allegation of a clerical error is misplaced and should be rejected.

We disagree with respondents that this is a ministerial error. The exclusion of related party sales from the calculation of CEP profit is a methodological issue. Consequently, it is inappropriate to change the CEP profit methodology at this time as a ministerial error. Moreover, the Department used the same methodology in the preliminary results and the respondents did not address this issue in their case briefs for the preliminary results.

Third, respondents alleged that the Department inadvertently overstated CV profit on the sales used in its computation of CV, by failing to take packing expense into account.

We agree that this is a clerical error and have corrected the error for the amended final results.

Fourth, respondents alleged that we failed to make a circumstance of sale adjustment for credit expense in constructed value comparisons.

Petitioners objected to this ministerial error allegation and contend that respondents have raised a challenge to a methodological decision by the Department that was included in the preliminary results but was never challenged by respondents. Petitioners argue that having failed to question this methodology in the preliminary results, it is improper for respondents to make a ministerial error allegation.

We disagree that this is a ministerial error. A circumstance of sale adjustment for credit expense in constructed value comparisons is a methodological issue. It is not the Department's policy to make a circumstance of sale adjustment for credit expense in constructed value comparisons (see, e.g. Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy, 61 FR 30326, 30360 (June 14, 1996). Thus, it is inappropriate to alter the constructed value comparison as a ministerial error. Moreover, the Department used this methodology in the preliminary results and the respondents did not address this issue in their case briefs.

Fifth, respondents alleged that the Department's margin calculation program erroneously multiplied the aggregate amount of the margin calculated by product, sale type and importer by the quantity sold. Also, respondents stated that there is no need for separate calculations by importer and that the Department should compute a uniform duty assessment amount or rate.

Petitioners agree with respondents that the Department's calculations inadvertently multiplied the aggregate amount of the margin found for each category (which already reflected the quantity) by the quantity sold resulting in a clerical error. However, petitioners state that respondents' argument concerning assessment instructions were considered and rejected by the Department in the final results of the first administrative review. Consequently, petitioners state that it is inappropriate for respondents to raise this issue again in the context of ministerial error allegations.

We agree that the Department's calculations inadvertently multiplied the aggregate amount of the margin found for each category by the quantity

sold resulting in a clerical error. We disagree with respondents' assertion that the issue of separate calculations by importer versus a uniform duty assessment rate is a ministerial error; it is a methodological issue.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Imphy/Ugine-Savoie	8/5/93–12/31/94	14.15

The Department shall determine, and the Customs service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective, upon publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of certain stainless steel wire rods from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates for those firms as stated above; (2) for previously 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, or the original 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 24.51 percent for stainless steel wire rods, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigations. See Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France, (59 FR 4022, January 28, 1994).

These deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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 section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely 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: November 7, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–29241 Filed 11–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

[A–821–803]

Titanium Sponge From the Russian Federation; Notice of 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.

SUMMARY: On July 29, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping finding on titanium sponge from the Russian Federation (Russia). This notice of final results covers the review period of August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995. This review covers one manufacturer, Berezniki Titanium-Magnesium Works (AVISMA), and two trading companies, Interlink Metals & Chemicals, Inc. (Interlink) and Cometals, Inc. (Cometals). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from AVISMA, Interlink, Cometals, and Titanium Metals Corporation (TIMET), a petitioner. A public hearing was held on September 11, 1996. Based on our analysis of these comments, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy S. Wei or Zev Primor, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, 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:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 July 29, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 39437) the preliminary results of the 1994–1995 administrative review of the antidumping finding on titanium sponge from Russia (33 FR 12138, August 28, 1968). This notice of final results covers the review period for August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995, covering one manufacturer, AVISMA, and two trading companies, Interlink and Cometals.

On September 12, 1996, the Department requested that AVISMA provide the Harmonized System (HS) classified data from the United Nations Trade Commodity Statistics (UN Trade Statistics) for Brazil for all factors of production and by-products used to calculate normal value in the preliminary results. AVISMA provided this data on September 19, 1996.

The Department has conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this administrative review is titanium sponge from Russia. Titanium sponge is chiefly used for aerospace vehicles, specifically, in construction of compressor blades and wheels, stator blades, rotors, and other parts in aircraft gas turbine engines. Imports of titanium sponge are currently classifiable under the harmonized tariff schedule (HTS)