

	Period
GERMANY: Sugar, A-428-082 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
HUNGARY: Tapered Roller Bearings, A-437-601 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
ITALY: Large Power Transformers, A-475-031 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
ITALY: Synchronous and V-Belts, A-475-802 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Fishnetting, A-588-029 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Forklift Trucks, A-588-703 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel, A-588-831 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Industrial Belts, A-588-807 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Large Power Transformers, A-588-032 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: Nitrile Rubber, A-588-706 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
JAPAN: PET Film, A-588-814 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
NEW ZEALAND: Kiwifruit, A-614-801 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
ROMANIA: Tapered Roller Bearings, A-485-602 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
RUSSIA: Ferrosilicon A-821-804 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
SINGAPORE: V-Belts, A-559-803 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
SOUTH AFRICA: Furfuryl Alcohol, A-791-802 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
SWEDEN: Stainless Steel Plate, A-401-040 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
TAIWAN: Carbon Steel Plate, A-583-080 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
TAIWAN: Oil Country Tubular Goods, A-583-505 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
TAIWAN: Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings, A-583-816 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
TAIWAN: Washers, A-583-820 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
THE NETHERLANDS: Aramid Fiber, A-421-805 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Furfuryl Alcohol, A-570-835 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Silicon Metal, A-570-806 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Sparklers, A-570-804 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Tapered Roller Bearings, A-570-601 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
VENEZUELA: Ferrosilicon, A-307-807 .....	6/1/96-5/31/97
<b>Countervailing Proceedings</b>	
ITALY: Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel, C-475-812 .....	1/1/96-12/31/96

In accordance with sections 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interested party as defined by section 353.2(k) may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. The Department has changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interest party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order or suspension agreement for which they are requesting a review (Interim Regulations, 60 FR 25130, 25137 (May 11, 1995)). Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise for other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Enforcement, Attention: Sheila Forbes, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party of the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation," for requests received by the last day of June 1997. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of June 1997, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for

consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute, but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: June 4, 1997.

**Jeffrey P. Bialos,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-15288 Filed 6-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-412-810]

#### **Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom: Notice of Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** We are amending our final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom, published on April 17, 1997, to reflect

the correction of ministerial errors made in the margin calculation in those final results. We are publishing this amendment to the final results in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 11, 1997.

**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 stated, 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 December 10, 1996, we published the preliminary results of our administrative review of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom (61 FR 65022). We published the final results of review on April 17, 1997 (62 FR 18744). On May 1, 1997, we received a timely allegation from respondent, British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES), alleging that the Department made ministerial errors in the final results.

#### Scope of 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.

### Amended Final Results

On May 1, 1997, BSES alleged that the Department of Commerce (the Department) committed ministerial errors in calculating the final antidumping duty margin. BSES argues that, in calculating constructed value (CV) profit, the Department made a ministerial error in failing to ensure that the profit ratio and the value by which the ratio was multiplied shared the same basis. BSES argues that the Department overstated the CV profit by including direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses, and packing in "CVPROFIT," the value by which the profit ratio ("PRATE2CV") was multiplied, but excluding those expenses from the total cost of production used in the denominator of the profit ratio. In order to ensure that denominator "TOTHEMCO" of the profit ratio and value "CVPROFIT" shared the same basis, BSES suggests that the Department either delete such expenses from "CVPROFIT" or include them in the denominator "TOTHEMCO."

We agree with BSES that the Department made a ministerial error by inadvertently excluding direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses and packing expenses in the calculation of CV profit. These items should have been included. Furthermore, we note that we erred by deducting these expenses from gross price before the comparison of gross price with cost of production. Therefore, we have excluded these expenses from the net cost of production, "NPRICOP," and have added them to the total cost of production, "TOTCOP," for these amended final results.

Second, BSES alleges that, in the calculation of CV, the Department

understated imputed credit and inventory carrying costs. BSES points out that the Department calculated credit and inventory carrying costs for CV by first creating CV credit and inventory carrying costs ratios. The Department then multiplied the ratios by total CV to yield the unit values of CV credit and inventory carrying costs. BSES argues that, since the denominator of the ratios was on a different basis than total CV (the value by which the ratio was multiplied), the results of the calculations were understated. BSES claims that the Department normally creates these variables by weight-averaging values from above-cost home market sales. As support for its argument, BSES cites our Final Results Analysis memorandum of April 9, 1997, where the Department states that "we weighted-averaged the variables, including credit and inventory carrying costs." BSES notes that the total CV ("TOTCV") does not include movement expenses, while the home market total unit price ("HMTOTUPR"), which serves as the denominator of the imputed credit and inventory carrying costs ratios, does include movement expenses. BSES argues that the resulting unit values for credit and inventory carrying costs are therefore understated. BSES suggests that the Department correct this error by using the Department's standard weighted-average method; alternatively, BSES suggests, if the Department continues to use the ratio, the Department may correct its error by either deducting movement expenses from the denominator "HMTOTUPR" or by adding the movement expenses to "TOTCV."

We agree that the Department made a ministerial error as it intended to calculate a weighted-average of the listed variables including credit and inventory carrying costs. See Final Analysis memorandum dated April 9, 1997. Therefore, we have revised the margin calculation program by replacing "SUM" with "MEAN" at line 441, and deleting lines 454, 455, 456, 457, 1009, 1010, 1014, and 1015.

### Amended Final Results of Review

Upon review of the submitted allegation, the Department has determined that the following margin exists for the period March 1, 1995 through February 29, 1996.

Manufacturer/Exporter	Period of Review	Margin (percent)
British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES) (formerly United Engineering Steels Limited) .....	3/1/95-2/29/96	4.52

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. Because there is a concurrent review of the countervailing duty order on the subject merchandise, final assessments for BSES will reflect the final results of the countervailing duty administrative review in accordance with section 772(c)(1)(C) of the Act. The Department will issue appraisal 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 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: May 30, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-15289 Filed 6-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-580-810

#### **Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea; Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from SEAH Steel Corporation (SEAH), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Korea. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Korea*, 60 FR 10064 (February 23, 1995). *See also Antidumping Duty Order and Clarification of Final Determination; Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea*, 57 FR 62301, (December 30, 1992).

SEAH requested that the Department determine that SEAH is the successor firm to Pusan Steel Pipe (PSP). During the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, PSP was assigned a cash deposit rate of 2.67 percent. *See Antidumping Duty Order and Clarification of Final Determination; Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea*, 57 FR 62301 (December 30, 1992). SEAH's request is filed pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

We are initiating an antidumping duty changed circumstances administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe

from Korea to determine whether or not SEAH is the successor firm to PSP, and to determine whether SEAH is entitled to PSP's cash deposit rate.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 11, 1997.

**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 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).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On March 27, 1997, SEAH requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act to determine whether SEAH should properly be considered the successor firm to PSP and if, as such, SEAH should be entitled to PSP's cash deposit rate.

According to SEAH, PSP legally changed its name to SEAH on December 28, 1995, which change became effective on January 1, 1996. SEAH claims that its name change from PSP was a change in name only, and that the legal structure of the company, its management, and ownership were not affected by the name change. SEAH also claims that it is a part of a larger group of related companies, certain members of which had SEAH in their names prior to January 1, 1996.

In its request for a changed circumstances review, SEAH indicated that PSP had acquired certain production assets formerly owned by Sammi Metal Products Co (Sammi). SEAH asserts that the acquisition, which occurred more than a year before the name change and was effective January 3, 1995, is not related to the name change. SEAH claims that its acquisition of the products and facilities of Sammi is functionally no different from PSP expanding its existing facilities or contracting a new manufacturing facility.