

41 (CIT 1984) as stating that under the ministerial error procedure the Department may only correct an inadvertence or mistake that involves no discretionary considerations. Petitioner further contends that the Department applied the interest expense and GNA factors to Mannesmann's adjusted COM correctly under the law. Petitioner asserts that Mannesmann fails to cite any previous case where, unlike in this case, the Department performed its build-up of cost of production (COP) by applying GNA and interest expense factors to a COM that values a major input at the affiliates' reported cost of production even though the Department expressly disregarded those costs. Petitioner argues that it is standard Department practice that all COP/CV cost calculations be based on a respondent's manufacturing costs as adjusted, when appropriate, under the major input rule.

We agree with petitioner that this issue is methodological in nature and have not made this correction in the amended final results. We note that the same calculation was made in the preliminary results of review, and Mannesmann did not comment on it in its case brief.

Third, petitioner argues that the Department erred in the calculation of net price (NPRICOP) for use in the cost test. Petitioner asserts that the calculations performed understate the adjustments to GRSUPRH (gross unit price) and overstate NPRICOP. Petitioner notes that Mannesmann's failure at verification on certain inland freight charges (INLFTC2H) essentially resulted in the Department's application of adverse facts available in the calculation of normal value. The petitioner further argues that the Department's calculation of NPRICOP in the below-cost test rewards Mannesmann by raising net price, thereby tending to cause fewer sales to fall below cost.

We disagree with petitioner that this issue is clerical in nature. We find that this issue is methodological in nature and have not made this correction in the amended final results. Since most of petitioner's argument is business proprietary, please see Amended Final Analysis Memorandum for a more detailed explanation of this issue. We note that the same calculation was made in the preliminary results of review, and petitioner did not comment on it in its case brief.

#### Amended Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Period of review	Margin (per- cent)
Mannesmann	1/27/95—7/31/96	21.94

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the entered value of each entry of subject merchandise during the POR. We will direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The amended 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 date of this notice and will remain in effect until the 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.

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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

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

Dated: April 16, 1998.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-10999 Filed 4-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-423-808, A-122-830, A-475-822, A-791-805, A-580-831 and A-583-830]

### Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 27, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steve Presing (Belgium), at (202) 482-0194; Maureen McPhillips (Canada), at (202) 482-0193; Rick Johnson (Italy, Republic of Korea, and Taiwan) at (202) 482-3818; Robert James (Republic of South Africa), at (202) 482-5222, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

### Initiation of Investigations

#### The 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 regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27296).

### The Petition

On March 31, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by Armco, Inc., J&L Specialty Steel, Inc.<sup>1</sup>, Lukens, Inc., North American Stainless<sup>2</sup>, the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC<sup>3</sup>, the Butler Armco Independent Union and the Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. (petitioners). The Department received supplemental information to the petition on April 14, 15, 17 and 20, 1998.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, petitioners allege that imports of stainless steel plate in coils (SSPC) from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of South Africa, Republic of Korea and

<sup>1</sup>J&L Specialty Steel, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Belgium case.

<sup>2</sup>North American Stainless is not a petitioner in the Italy case.

<sup>3</sup>The United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC is not a petitioner in the Canada case.

Taiwan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that petitioners filed the petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations they are requesting the Department to initiate (see *Discussion* below).

### Scope of Investigations

For purposes of these investigations, the product covered is certain stainless steel plate in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject plate products are flat-rolled products, 254 mm or over in width and 4.75 mm or more in thickness, in coils, and annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject plate may also be further processed (e.g., cold-rolled, polished, etc.) provided that it maintains the specified dimensions of plate following such processing. Excluded from the scope of this petition are the following: (1) Plate not in coils, (2) plate that is not annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled, (3) sheet and strip, and (4) flat bars.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) at subheadings: 7219.11.00.30, 7219.11.00.60, 7219.12.00.05, 7219.12.00.20, 7219.12.00.25, 7219.12.00.50, 7219.12.00.55, 7219.12.00.65, 7219.12.00.70, 7219.12.00.80, 7219.31.00.10, 7219.90.00.10, 7219.90.00.20, 7219.90.00.25, 7219.90.00.60, 7219.90.00.80, 7220.11.00.00, 7220.20.10.10, 7220.20.10.15, 7220.20.10.60, 7220.20.10.80, 7220.20.60.05, 7220.20.60.10, 7220.20.60.15, 7220.20.60.60, 7220.20.60.80, 7220.90.00.10, 7220.90.00.15, 7220.90.00.60, and 7220.90.00.80. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petition, we discussed scope with the petitioners to insure that the scope in the petition accurately reflects the product for which they are seeking relief. Moreover, as

discussed in the preamble to the new regulations (62 FR 27323), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments by May 8, 1998. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Record Unit at Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

### Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether the petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who account for production of the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771 (10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988); High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," i.e., the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

The domestic like product referred to in the petition is the single domestic like product defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section, above. The Department has no basis on the record to find the petition's definition of the domestic like product to be inaccurate. The Department has, therefore, adopted the domestic like product definition set forth in the petition. In this case, the Department has determined that the petition and supplemental information to the petition contain adequate evidence of sufficient industry support. For all countries, producers and workers supporting the petition represent over 50 percent of total production of the domestic like product. Therefore, polling was not necessary. Accordingly, the Department determines that the petition is filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

On April 14, 1998, Atlas Stainless Steels (Sammi Atlas), a producer of SSPC in Canada, requested that the Department poll the domestic industry regarding its support for the petition as required by 19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(4)(A). Sammi Atlas alleges that the petitioners are not sufficiently representative of a domestic industry to permit them to maintain a petition on stainless steel plate in coils from Canada pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(4)(A)(ii). Sammi Atlas argues that the petitioners overstated their share of U.S. production of SSPC by including the further processing of largely-imported products into SSPC. Moreover, Sammi Atlas contends that the petitioners have inflated production volumes of two other petitioning companies. Therefore, Sammi Atlas maintains that after the exclusion of the further-processed production volumes and the application of the correct U.S. production volumes, the petitioners fail to have enough support for the petition, as required in section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

Accordingly, Atlas requests that the Department poll the domestic stainless plate industry to determine whether there is industry support for the petition with respect to Canada, as required by 19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(4)(A).

In response to Sammi Atlas' submission, the Department requested and received affidavits from each of the petitioning companies testifying to the accuracy of the production volumes of SSPC reported in the petition. In addition, we contacted Armco and North American Stainless to obtain additional information which corroborated their affidavits. While both parties have submitted affidavits in support of their production volumes, we believe that the individual affidavits from each petitioning company for their own production lend more credibility to the petitioners' production volumes than those submitted by the Canadian producer, Sammi Atlas. Even if North American Stainless were not included as a producer of SSPC, producers supporting the petition still account for more than 50% of total production of domestic like product. Therefore, the issue of whether or not North American is a producer of the subject merchandise is moot. Accordingly, the Department has determined that the petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act (see, Memorandum to the file, dated April 20, 1998).

#### **Export Price and Normal Value**

The following are descriptions of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which our decisions to initiate these investigations are based. Should the need arise to use any of this information in our preliminary or final determinations for purposes of facts available under section 776 of the Act, we may re-examine the information and revise the margin calculations, if appropriate.

#### *Belgium*

The petitioners identified ALZ, N.V. (ALZ), Cockerill Sambre S.A., and Fabrique de Fer Charleroi as possible exporters of SSPC from Belgium. The petitioners further identified ALZ as the sole producer of subject merchandise in Belgium. The petitioners based export price (EP) for ALZ on U.S. sales prices (from foreign market research) for the first sales to unaffiliated purchasers in January 1998. Because the terms of ALZ's U.S. sales were delivered to the U.S. customer, the petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by subtracting estimated costs for shipment from ALZ's factory in Belgium to the port of export (from foreign market research). In addition, the petitioners subtracted ocean freight, insurance (from official year U.S. import statistics), and estimated costs for U.S. import duties and fees (from the 1997 HTSUS schedule). Petitioners also subtracted amounts for the U.S. harbor

maintenance fee and U.S. merchandise processing fee (19 CFR, §§ 24.23 and 24.24). Finally, the petitioners obtained net U.S. prices by also subtracting costs incurred to transport the merchandise from the U.S. port to the customer's location in the United States (from affidavit from petitioners), and credit expenses.

With respect to normal value (NV), based on information available to them, petitioners determined that volume of Belgium home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for normal value, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners obtained gross unit prices (from foreign market research) for the products offered for sale to customers in Belgium which are either identical or similar to those sold to the United States. Petitioners adjusted these prices by subtracting estimated average delivery costs and credit expenses (from foreign market research). Petitioners provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of SSPC in the home market provided in the petition were made at prices below the cost of production (COP), within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales below cost investigation. Because one of the home market sales used in the petition was below the calculated COP, pursuant to sections 773(a)(4) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners based NV for that sale in Belgium on constructed value (CV).

Pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, CV consists of the cost of materials, fabrication, other processing (*i.e.*, cost of manufacturing (COM)) and selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A) and profit. To calculate COM and SG&A, the petitioners relied on market research data, and ALZ's 1996 financial statements. The petitioners added to CV an amount for profit obtained from ALZ's 1996 financial statements.

The estimated dumping margins in the petition, based on a comparison between ALZ's U.S. prices and CV, are 12.06 percent and 16 percent. Based on a comparison of EP to home market prices, petitioners calculated dumping margins are 9.33 percent.

#### *Canada*

The petitioners identified Atlas Stainless Steels (Sammi Atlas), Division of Sammi Atlas, Inc., a member of the Sammi Group, a major South Korean producer of stainless steel products, as the sole Canadian producer of SSPC. Therefore, the petitioners conclude that Sammi Atlas accounts for substantially

all Canadian exports of SSPC to the United States.

The petitioners based EP on two of Sammi Atlas' export sales to steel service centers/distributors in the United States (from domestic industry sources). To calculate the net export price for the first U.S. sale, dated September 1997, petitioners deducted estimated U.S. inland freight (from the experience of U.S. producers), international freight and insurance (from the 1997 HTSUS schedule), customs duties, harbor maintenance, merchandise processing fees (from official year U.S. import statistics), and foreign inland freight (from affidavit from petitioners).

Because the terms of the gross unit price of the February 1998 sale to the U.S. were ex-mill, duty-paid, petitioners adjusted the gross unit price by subtracting U.S. import duties, harbor maintenance, and merchandise processing fees.

With respect to NV, based on information available to them, petitioners determined that the volume of Canadian home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for NV, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners used the prices for two home market sales of SSPC made in May 1997 and February 1998 by Sammi Atlas to unaffiliated steel service centers. Since the gross unit price of the May 1997 sale was on an FOB basis with 30-day payment terms, they calculated the net home market price for this sale to the first unaffiliated customer by subtracting the estimated credit expense (from "International Financial Statistics" of the International Monetary Fund).

The gross unit price for the February 1998 sale of the same product included an amount for an alloy surcharge and inland freight charges (from foreign marker research). Petitioners subtracted from the price to the unaffiliated customer these two items and an amount reflecting estimated credit expenses for the 30-day payment (from foreign marker research) terms to yield the net home market price in Canadian dollars. The two Canadian home market sales were then converted to U.S. dollar prices using the official exchange rate in effect on the month of the comparison U.S. sale.

The two price comparisons of EP to NV yield dumping margins of 15.35 percent and 6.85 percent, respectively.

#### *Italy*

The petitioners identified Arinox Srl (Arinox) as an exporter and Acciai Speciali Terni SpA (AST) as an exporter and producer of SSPC from Italy.

Petitioners relied on price information for AST, basing EP on U.S. sales prices obtained by two of the petitioning companies for sales to an unaffiliated purchaser in November 1997. The petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by subtracting amounts for foreign inland freight (from foreign market research), U.S. inland freight (from an affidavit from petitioners), international freight and insurance (the average difference in the C.I.F. values and the U.S. Customs values reported in the official U.S. import statistics for 1997), U.S. harbor maintenance and U.S. merchandise processing fees (19 CFR, §§ 24.23 and 24.24), and estimated costs for U.S. import duties (from the 1997 HTSUS schedule). Imputed credit was also deducted from export price for the price-to-price comparison (lending rate as published in International Financial Statistics).

With respect to NV, based on information reasonably available to them, petitioners determined that the volume of Italian home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for normal value, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners obtained gross unit prices from a foreign market research for products offered for sale to customers in Italy which are either identical or similar to those sold to the United States. Petitioners adjusted these prices by subtracting estimated average delivery costs (from foreign market research). Petitioners did not adjust for packing costs because petitioners claim that packing for export is more expensive than packing for domestic shipment.

Petitioners provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that the sales of stainless steel plate in coils in the home market provided in the petition were made at prices below COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales below cost investigation. Because the home market sales used in the petition were below the calculated COP, pursuant to sections 773(a)(4) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners also based NV for sales in Italy on CV.

CV consists of COM, SG&A, and profit. The petitioners calculated the direct portion of COM based on Italian costs obtained through foreign market research. To calculate the indirect portion of COM, SG&A, and profit, the petitioners relied on public information and the 1995 financial statements of AST, which were provided in the petition.

The estimated dumping margins in the petition, based on a comparison

between AST's U.S. price and the CV, range from 49.99 to 59.02 percent. Based on a comparison of EP to home market price, petitioners calculate a dumping margin range from 11.36 percent to 34.59 percent.

#### *Republic of South Africa*

Petitioners identified two South African exporters and producers of stainless steel coiled plate: Columbus Stainless Steel Co., Ltd. (Columbus) and Iscor Ltd. (Iscor). Petitioners noted that, to the best of their knowledge, Columbus accounted for over 90 percent of the exports of subject merchandise from The Republic of South Africa. Petitioners based EP on two duty-paid, delivered price quotes made by Columbus to unaffiliated U.S. steel service centers/distributors. The quoted prices were for two grades of coiled plate during the fourth quarter of 1997.

Because the terms of Columbus' U.S. sales were delivered to the U.S. customer, the petitioners made deductions for international freight and insurance, average U.S. inland freight charges (from the experience of U.S. producers.) from the U.S. port to all U.S. purchaser locations, U.S. import duties, and harbor maintenance and merchandise processing fees. To calculate international freight and insurance, petitioners divided import charges by the weight of imported coiled plate from The Republic of South Africa in 1997 for the two HTS numbers named in the petition. Petitioners used the specific *ad valorem* harbor maintenance and merchandise processing fees that U.S. Customs levies on imported merchandise.

With respect to normal value (from foreign market research), petitioners determined that the volume of South African home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for NV pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners obtained two price quotes from Columbus for coiled plate offered for sale to customers in The Republic of South Africa which are either identical or similar to those sold to the United States. Petitioners adjusted these prices for estimated inland freight, packing and credit expenses. Petitioners provided information alleging that the sales of SSPC in the home market provided in the petition were made at prices below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a sales below cost investigation. However, based on our review of the foreign market research and a discussion with the foreign market researcher whose data formed the basis for petitioners' below-cost

allegation, the Department has found that the information contained in the petition did not provide reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales in the home market have been made at below COP.

The estimated dumping margins in the petition based on a comparison between U.S. prices and NV are 14.09 percent to 19.46 percent.

#### *Republic of Korea*

The petitioners identified Pohang Iron and Steel Company (POSCO) and Sammi Steel Company (Sammi) as exporters and producers of SSPC from the Republic of Korea. The petitioners based export price on price quotations obtained by two of the petitioning companies for sales to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers of SSPC manufactured by POSCO. The quoted prices were (with the exception of one sale) delivered, duty paid sales of SSPC sold during the first, third, and fourth quarters of 1997. Petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by subtracting from the reported U.S. price estimated shipment costs from POSCO's factory in Korea to the port of export (from foreign market research), costs for ocean freight and insurance (the average import charges reported in official U.S. import statistics for Korea), import duties (1997 HTSUS schedule), harbor maintenance and merchandise processing fees (19 CFR 24.23 and 24.24) and domestic inland freight (from affidavit provided by one of the petitioning companies).

With respect to NV, based on information available to them, petitioners determined that the volume of South Korean home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for normal value, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners obtained gross unit prices from market research for SSPC manufactured by POSCO and offered for sale to customers in the Republic of Korea which are either identical or similar to those sold to the United States. Petitioners adjusted these prices by subtracting estimated average delivery costs (from foreign market research).

Petitioners provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of SSPC in the home market provided in the petition were made at prices below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales below cost investigation. Because the home market sales used in the petition were below the calculated COP, pursuant to sections 773(a)(4) and 773(e) of the Act, petitioners based NV

for sales in The Republic of Korea on CV.

Pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, CV consists of the COM, SG&A, and profit. The petitioners calculated the direct portion of COM based on South Korean costs obtained through market research. To calculate the indirect portion of COM, SG&A and CV profit, petitioners relied on POSCO's 1996 financial statements. Based on comparisons of EP to CV, petitioners estimated margins range from 30.96 to 35.78 percent. Based on a comparison of EP to home market price, estimated dumping margins range from 4.20 percent to 11.97 percent.

#### Taiwan

The petitioners identified Chang Mien Industries Co., Ltd. (Chang Mien), Chia Far Industrial Factory Co., Ltd. (Chia Far), Chien Shing Stainless Steel (Chien Shing), China Steel Corp. (China Steel), Tang Eng Iron Works, Co., Ltd (Tang Eng), Tung Mung Development Co. Ltd. (Tung Mung), and Yieh United Steel Corp. (Yieh United) as exporters and producers of SSPC from Taiwan. The petitioners based EP on price quotations made to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation. The quoted prices were for delivered and duty paid SSPC during the fourth quarter of 1997. Petitioners calculated net U.S. price by subtracting amounts for international freight and insurance (the average import charges reported in the official U.S. import statistics under the 1997 HTS subheading 7219.12.0045 from Taiwan), U.S. import duties (from the 1997 HTSUS schedule) and harbor maintenance and merchandise processing fees (19 CFR 24.23 and 24.24) from the quoted prices. Finally, petitioners obtained net U.S. prices by also subtracting cost incurred to transport the merchandise from the U.S. port to the customer's location in the United States (from an affidavit from petitioner).

With respect to NV, based on information available to them, petitioners determined that the volume of Taiwanese home market sales was sufficient to form a basis for normal value, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Act. Petitioners obtained gross unit prices from foreign market research for sales of SSPC by Tang Eng and Tung Mung which are either identical or similar to those sold to the United States. Petitioners adjusted these prices by subtracting amounts for inland freight and packaging (from foreign market research). Petitioners submitted information alleging that the sales of SSPC in the home market provided in

the petition were made at prices below COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales below cost investigation. However, based on our review of the foreign market research study and a discussion with the foreign market researcher whose data formed the basis for petitioners' below-cost allegation, the Department has found that the information contained in the petition did not provide reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales in the home market have been made at below COP.

The estimated dumping margins in the petition, based on a comparison between Tang Eng's and Tung Mung's U.S. prices and home market price, range from 0.29 to 8.02 percent.

#### Initiation of Cost Investigations

Pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, petitioners provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales in the home markets of Belgium, Italy, and the Republic of Korea were made at prices below the fully allocated COP and, accordingly, requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales below COP investigation in connection with the requested antidumping investigations in each of these countries. The Statement of Administrative Action ("SAA"), submitted to the Congress in connection with the interpretation and application of the Uruguay Round Agreements, states that an allegation of sales below COP need not be specific to individual exporters or producers. SAA, H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess., at 833 (1994). The SAA, at 833, states that "Commerce will consider allegations of below-cost sales in the aggregate for a foreign country, just as Commerce currently considers allegations of sales at less than fair value on a country-wide basis for purposes of initiating an antidumping investigation."

Further, the SAA provides that "new section 773(b)(2)(A) retains the current requirement that Commerce have 'reasonable grounds to believe or suspect' that below cost sales have occurred before initiating such an investigation. 'Reasonable grounds' \* \* \* exist when an interested party provides specific factual information on costs and prices, observed or constructed, indicating that sales in the foreign market in question are at below-cost prices." *Id.* Based upon the comparison of the adjusted prices from the petition of the representative foreign like products in their respective home markets to their costs of production, we find the existence of "reasonable

grounds to believe or suspect" that sales of these foreign like products in each of the listed countries were made below their respective COPs within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating the requested country-wide cost investigations, except with regard to Taiwan and Republic of South Africa. (see Country specific sections above.)

#### Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of SSPC from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of Korea, The Republic of South Africa, and Taiwan are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

#### Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petition alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, and is threatened with material injury, by reason of the individual and cumulated imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV. Petitioners explained that the industry 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. The Department assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and determined that these allegations are sufficiently supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.

#### Initiation of Antidumping Investigations

Based upon our examination of the petition on SSPC, as well as our discussion with the authors of the foreign market research reports (see, Memoranda to the file, dated April 20, 1998), we have found that the petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of SSPC from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of Korea, Republic of South Africa, and Taiwan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determinations by September 8, 1998.

#### Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of each petition has been

provided to the representatives of Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of Korea, Republic of South Africa, and Taiwan. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of each petition to each exporter named in the petition (as appropriate).

#### International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

#### Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will determine by May 15, 1998, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of SSPC from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of Korea, Republic of South Africa, and Taiwan are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will, for any country, result in the investigations being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

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

Dated: April 20, 1998.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-10997 Filed 4-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-570-815]

#### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Sulfanilic Acid From the Peoples' Republic of China

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 27, 1998.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the 1996-1997 administrative review for the antidumping order on Sulfanilic Acid from the PRC, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay

Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, "the Act").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kristin Stevens, Doug Campau or Steven Presing, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3793.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit.

Since it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Act (245 days from the last day of the anniversary month for preliminary results, 120 additional days for final results), in accordance with Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit as follows:

Product	Country	Review period	Initiation date	Prelim due date	Final due date*
Sulfanilic Acid (A-570-815) .....	PRC	8/1/96-7/31/97	9/25/97	7/03/98	10/31/98

\*The Department shall issue the final determination 120 days after the publication of the preliminary determination.

Dated: April 21, 1998.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, Group III.*

[FR Doc. 98-11136 Filed 4-24-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-588-604; A-588-054]

#### Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Termination in Part

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews and termination in part.

**SUMMARY:** On May 20, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the

Department) published the preliminary results of its 1992-93 and 1993-94 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings (TRBs) and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from Japan (A-588-604), and of the finding on TRBs, four inches or less in outside diameter, and components thereof, from Japan (A-588-054). The review of the A-588-054 finding covers four manufacturers/exporters and ten resellers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, and one manufacturer/exporter for the period October 1, 1992, through September 30, 1993. The review of the A-588-604 order covers five manufacturers/exporters, ten resellers/exporters, and seventeen firms identified by the petitioner in this case as forging producers, and the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994. The A-588-604 review also covers one manufacturer/exporter for the period October 1, 1992, through September 30, 1993.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our

preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 27, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert James at (202) 482-5222 or John Kugelman at (202) 482-0649, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS:** Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 18, 1976, the Treasury Department published in the **Federal Register** (41 FR 34974) the antidumping finding on TRBs from Japan, and on October 6, 1987, the Department published the antidumping duty order