suspended investigations. Therefore, because administrative reviews were requested or because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

Antidumping Proceeding

A–357–802
Argentina
Rectangular Carbon Steel Tubing
Objection Date: May 30, 1996
Objector: Hannibal Industries, Inc.
Contact: Tom Killiam at (202) 482–2704

A–351–503
Brazil
Iron Construction Castings
Objection Date: May 7, 1996
Objector: East Jordan Iron Works, Inc.
Contact: Hermes Pinilla at (202) 482–3477

A–533–502
India
Pipes and Tubes
Review Requested By: Rajinder Pipes Limited of India on May 22, 1996, Allied Tube and Conduit Corporation, Sawhill Tubular Division of Armco Inc., Wheatland Tube Company, and Laclede Steel Company on May 24, 1996, Lloyds Metals & Engineers Ltd. on April 30, 1996
Contact: Davina Hashmi at (202) 482–0180

A–588–066
Japan
Impression Fabric
Objection Date: May 30, 1996
Objector: Bomont Industries
Contact: Lyn Johnson at (202) 482–5287

A–580–507
South Korea
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings, Other than Grooved
Objection Date: May 8, 1996
Objector: Grinnell Corporation, Ward Manufacturing, Inc., and Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Inc.
Contact: Thomas Schauer at (202) 482–4852

A–583–008
Taiwan
Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe & Tubes
Review Requested By: Allied Tube and Conduit Corporation, Sawhill Tubular Division of Armco Inc., Wheatland Tube Company, and Laclede Steel Company on May 24, 1996
Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

A–583–507
Taiwan
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings, Other Than Grooved
Objection Date: May 8, 1996
Objector: Grinnell Corporation, Ward Manufacturing Inc., Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Inc.
Contact: Laurel LaCivita at (202) 482–4740

Dated: July 12, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–18053 Filed 7–15–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–331–602]

Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Ecuador; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On August 2, 1995, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Ecuador. The review covers 12 producers and/or exporters of this merchandise to the United States and the period March 1, 1993 through February 28, 1994.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received and the correction of certain clerical errors, we have made certain changes for the final results. The review indicates the existence of dumping margins for certain firms during the review period. Therefore, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the foreign market value (FMV).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 16, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas E. Schauer or Richard Rimlinger, Office of Antidumping Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4852/4477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 18, 1987, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register (52 FR 8494) the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Ecuador. On March 4, 1994, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' with respect to the period March 1, 1993 through February 28, 1994 (59 FR 14608). The Department received a timely request for review from the petitioner, the Floral Trade Council, on March 31, 1994, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a). On August 2, 1995, we published the preliminary results of the administrative review (60 FR 39358). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Two respondents have asked that we correct clerical errors contained in their responses. We have had a long-standing practice of correcting a respondent's clerical errors after the preliminary results only if we can assess from information already on the record that an error has been made, that the error is obvious from the record, and that the correction is accurate. *See Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 8295, 8297 (March 9, 1992). In light of a recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC), we have reevaluated our policy for correcting clerical errors of respondents. *See NTN Bearing Corp.* v. *United States*, Slip Op. 94–1186 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (*NTN*).

In *NTN*, the CAFC ruled that the Department had abused its discretion by refusing to correct certain clerical errors, which the respondent brought to the Department's attention after the preliminary results of review. Specifically, the CAFC found that the Department's application of its test for determining whether to correct clerical errors in *NTN* was unreasonable for the following reasons: 1) the requirement that the record disclose the error essentially precludes corrections of clerical errors made by a respondent; 2) draconian penalties are inappropriate for clerical errors because clerical errors are by their nature not errors in judgment but merely inadvertencies; 3) in NTN's case, a straightforward mathematical adjustment was all that was required, so correction of NTN's errors would neither have required beginning anew nor have delayed issuance of the final results of review.

As a result of the NTN decision, we are modifying our policy regarding the correction of alleged clerical errors. We will accept corrections of clerical errors under the following conditions: (1) the error in question must be demonstrated to be a clerical error, not a methodological error, an error in judgment, or a substantive error; (2) the Department must be satisfied that the corrective documentation provided in

support of the clerical error allegation is reliable; (3) the respondent must have availed itself of the earliest reasonable opportunity to correct the error; (4) the clerical error allegation, and any corrective documentation, must be submitted to the Department no later than the due date for the respondent's administrative case brief; (5) the clerical error must not entail a substantial revision of the response; and (6) the respondent's corrective documentation must not contradict information previously determined to be accurate at verification. In the *Analysis of Comments Received* section of this notice, we have evaluated company-specific situations using the above criteria.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of certain fresh cut flowers from Ecuador (standard carnations, standard chrysanthemums, and pompom chrysanthemums). This merchandise is classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) items 0603.10.30.00, 0603.10.70.10, 0603.10.70.20, and 0603.10.70.30. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers Flores La Antonia, Flores del Quinche S.A., Florisol Cia Ltda., Flores de Ibarra, Flores de Puewmbo, Flores del Ecuador, Flores Pichincha, Florestrade, Guaisa S.A., Inlandes S.A., Mundiflor, and Velvet Flores Cia S.A., which are producers and/or exporters of certain fresh cut flowers from Ecuador to the United States and the period March 1, 1993 through February 28, 1994.

Best Information Available

Because certain companies did not provide a response to our request for information, we have determined that the use of best information otherwise available (BIA) is appropriate for these firms in accordance with section 776(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). Our regulations provide that we may take into account whether a party refuses to provide information in determining what rate to use as BIA (19 CFR 353.37(b) (1994)). Generally, whenever a company refuses to cooperate with us or otherwise significantly impedes the proceeding, we use as adverse BIA the highest rate for any company for the same class or kind of merchandise from this or any other segment of the proceeding. When a company substantially cooperates with our requests for information, but fails to provide all the information requested in a timely manner or in the form requested, we use as cooperative BIA the higher of (1) the highest rate (including the ''all others'' rate) ever applicable to the firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country from either the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a prior administrative review; or (2) the highest calculated rate in this review for any firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country. *See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the Federal Republic of Germany, et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 57 FR 28360, 28379–80 (July 24, 1992); *see also Allied-Signal Aerospace Co. v. United States,* 996 F.2d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For these final results we have applied a cooperative BIA rate to sales made by Flores de Ibarra, Flores de Puewmbo, Flores del Ecuador, Flores Pichincha, Florestrade, and Mundiflor. These firms are no longer in business, and we have determined, in accordance with the standards enumerated in *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Notice of Revocation of Order (in Part),* 59 FR 15159 (March 31, 1994) (*Colombian Flowers*), that they are incapable of responding to the Department's questionnaire. In *Colombian Flowers,* the Department treated bankrupt, or otherwise out-of-business, firms as cooperative provided that they explained their situation to the Department. In this case, the firms mentioned above submitted certifications that they are no longer in business and thus could not respond.

Therefore, in accordance with *Colombian Flowers,* we find these firms to be cooperative.

In this proceeding, the highest rate ever applicable to all of the firms to which we are applying second-tier BIA is the ''all others'' rate from the less-than-fair-value investigation. None of the rates calculated for this review exceeded the ''all others'' rate. Therefore, we have applied the ''all others'' rate, which is 5.89 percent, to Flores de Ibarra, Flores de Puewmbo, Flores del Ecuador, Flores Pichincha, Florestrade, and Mundiflor.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. At the request of counsel for Expoflores, an Ecuadorian trade association representing Ecuadorian flower producers including the respondents in this review, we held a hearing on September 26, 1995. We received case and rebuttal briefs from the Floral Trade Council (FTC), petitioner in this proceeding, and Expoflores, on behalf of respondents in this proceeding.

Issues Raised by the FTC

Comment 1: The FTC argues that the Department should deduct commissions paid to related consignees where they are at arm's length and directly related to sales, and that both commissions and indirect selling expenses should be deducted from ESP regardless of the relationship of the consignee. The FTC contends that where the statute (section 772(e)(1)) and the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.41) direct the Department to deduct commissions from ESP, no distinction is made for commissions paid to related or unrelated consignees, nor is there any language directing the Department to deduct either commissions or indirect selling expenses, but not both. The FTC also argues that not deducting related party commissions is inconsistent with the Court of International Trade's (CIT) finding in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 630 F. Supp. 1327, 1341 (1986). The FTC further argues that, even assuming that the statute at section 772(e)(1) does not direct the Department to deduct commissions paid to related parties, such commissions should be deducted as a circumstance-of-sale adjustment whenever such commissions are at arm's length and directly related to sales. Finally, the FTC argues that commissions paid to related parties in the U.S. market are likely to be understated rather than overstated, and that the statute requires that, when commissions are not at arm's length, the Department is to deduct any commissions and remaining general expenses.

Expoflores claims that this issue is not relevant because none of the companies under review have related importers.

Department's Position: We agree with Expoflores. None of the companies for which we calculated margins have related importers. Therefore, this issue does not apply in this case. As for the FTC's argument that we should deduct both commissions and indirect selling expenses regardless of the relationship between the exporter and the consignee, we note that for the preliminary and these final results of review we deducted both commissions paid to unrelated consignees and indirect selling expenses incurred in the home market on U.S. sales.

Comment 2: The FTC claims that the Department did not specifically describe its treatment of FONIN export taxes in

the preliminary results of review, and asks the Department to ensure that it deducts these taxes correctly from U.S. price in the final results of review.

Department's Position: We deducted FONIN export taxes from USP, in accordance with section 772(d)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act.

Issues Raised by Respondents

Comment 3: Expoflores claims that Flores La Antonia (Antonia) made several obvious clerical errors in its questionnaire response, and that the Department should correct these errors. The clerical errors alleged by Expoflores are (1) the quantity of pompons shipped to a certain customer in a certain month is dramatically overstated; (2) box charges were inadvertantly not reported; (3) domestic inland freight expense is overstated in one month; (4) the sales values of certain flowers for a few months for one importer were shifted by one month; and (5) the quantity of subject merchandise shipped to a certain customer in a certain month is understated. Expoflores argues that these errors are of the sort normally found and corrected at verification, but, because the Department chose not to verify Antonia, these errors were not discovered until after issuance of the preliminary results. Expoflores asks that, in the interest of fairness and accuracy, the Department correct these errors so as not to unduly penalize Antonia for not having undergone verification. Expoflores claims that the accuracy of the corrections submitted on behalf of Antonia is clear from the administrative record. Expoflores further argues that the corrections should not be considered untimely on the grounds that they cannot be verified, because it was the Department's decision not to verify Antonia. Finally, Expoflores argues that because the corrections refer to original timely submitted data provided in Antonia's original response to the Department's questionnaire, they do not constitute new information.

The FTC contends that the Department should not make these corrections as submitted by Antonia, because these errors were not obvious from the record and could not have been identified by the Department without additional information. The FTC asserts that the fact that neither the Department nor Antonia identified the errors prior to issuance of the preliminary results is compelling evidence that the errors were not obvious. In addition, the FTC contends that the Department should reject the information Antonia submitted in its case brief to support its argument because it contained untimely new information.

The FTC also argues that Antonia's claim that these errors are of the sort normally found at verification has no relevance here. Because the Department did not conduct verification and did not find the errors in preparing the preliminary results, the FTC argues that the burden is on Antonia to ensure that the data submitted is correct. The FTC argues that the purpose of verification is not to discover errors so that corrections can be made, but rather to determine the accuracy of submitted data. Furthermore, the FTC states that it is not clear whether there are any other unidentified reporting errors in the response. The FTC further argues that the Department has no way of confirming the accuracy of the remaining portions of Antonia's response without verification and should consider rejecting the response entirely and assigning a margin based on best information available.

Department's Position: Because we received Antonia's request that we correct its response after publication of our preliminary results and the alleged errors were not apparent from the record, we have applied the six criteria explained in the *Background* section of this notice. First, we examined the errors, and have determined that they are clerical, and not methodological, in nature. Second, respondent submitted, with its case brief, grower's reports, as well as cites to its original response, that substantiated its claims with regard to these clerical errors. Third, no note that these errors in the original submission existed was made by any party prior to respondent's case brief. Fourth, the clerical error allegation was not made later than the due date for respondent's case brief. Fifth, we determine that, because each of the errors affected one or a few figures for individual line items for the POR, correction of these errors does not entail a substantial revision of the response. Finally, we had not previously verified the information submitted. Thus, we find that Antonia met all of the criteria for each of the errors. Therefore, we have accepted Antonia's corrections as clerical in nature and have made these changes for the final results.

Comment 4: Expoflores argues that the interest rate that the Department used in calculating interest expense for Flores del Quinche (Quinche) is incorrect. Expoflores claims that Quinche inadvertantly entered the wrong value in the spreadsheet, but noted this mistake, and reported the correct interest rate in its narrative response. Expoflores asks that the Department correct this error for the final results.

The FTC contends that because the record is inconsistent with respect to the correct interest rate, the Department should select the higher rate as best information available.

Department's Position: Since Quinche's request that we correct its response was received after publication of our preliminary results, we have applied the six criteria from our new policy which we explained in the *Background* section of this notice. We find that Quinche met all of the criteria, with the substantiating evidence having been on the record prior to the preliminary results. Therefore, we have made this change for the final results.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following margins exist for the period March 1, 1993 through February 28, 1994:

	Margin (percent)
Manufacturer/Exporter:	
Flores la Antonia	0.51
Flores del Quinche S.A	1.17
Florisol Cia Ltda	0.06
Flores de Ibarra	5.89
Flores de Puewmbo	5.89
Flores del Ecuador	5.89
Flores Pichincha	5.89
Florestrade	5.89
Guaisa S.A	([1])
Inlandes S.A	([1])
Mundiflor	5.89
Velvet Flores Cia S.A	([1])

[1] No shipments during the period of review; since there was no prior review of this company, the ''all other'' rate from the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation is applicable.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to 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 on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be the rates as listed above, except for Florisol Cia, Ltda., for which, because the margin is *de minimis*, we will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit of zero percent; (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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be the ''all other'' rate of 5.89 percent. This is the rate established during the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements 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 the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

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: July 8, 1996.

Robert LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–18054 Filed 7–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Minority Business Development Agency

Nationwide Capital Development Center

AGENCY: Minority Business Development Agency, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Funds are available to conduct a competitive solicitation in order to select an applicant to operate a nationwide Capital Development Center to assist minority business clients to access debt and equity capital. This Center, to be operated under detailed work requirements established by the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA), will provide client services designed to enable minority business enterprises (MBEs) to implement long-term growth strategies by securing capital through both mainstream and specialized capital markets. Such services shall include analyzing an MBE's financial statements, assisting in the preparation of financial plans, introduction of the MBE to prospective investors and lenders, and assistance in transaction closings. The Center will act as a liaison between the MBE community and the capital markets, serving as a clearinghouse for available resources and opportunities, and matching qualified MBEs with potential funding sources.

The project will be national in scope, and will serve eligible minority firms throughout the fifty states, as provided by the work requirements. Firms eligible to receive client assistance shall be growth-oriented firms, in business for not less than two years, and who seek to engage in capital transactions of $500,000 or more.

Executive Order 11625, effective October 13, 1991, authorizes MBDA to provide management and technical assistance to socially and economically disadvantaged businesses and to coordinate Federal efforts to assist in the growth and expansion of the nation's minority business sector. MBDA has determined that a substantial impediment to minority business growth involves the inability to access financial capital. The primary objective of this project is to provide management and technical assistance to middle-market MBEs who are seeking to approach the capital markets to obtain financing. Areas of assistance will include: obtaining venture capital financing, the design and implementation of financial plans as vehicles for sustained growth, replacement of debt with equity capital, and financing business acquisitions and mergers.

The successful applicant will operate the Center for a three-year period, subject to agency priorities, recipient performance and the availability of funds.

DATES: The closing date for applications is August 15, 1996. Applications must be received in the MBDA Headquarters' Executive Secretariat on or before August 15, 1996. A pre-application conference to assist all interested applicants will be held on July 30, 1996, at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room 5045, Washington, D.C. 20230.

PROPER IDENTIFICATION IS REQUIRED FOR ENTRANCE INTO ANY FEDERAL BUILDING.

ADDRESSES: Competitive Application Packages for the Capital Development Center will be available from MBDA beginning on the date this Notice is published. To obtain a copy of the Application Package, please call via telephone (202) 482–3261, or facsimile (202) 482–6021, or send a written request with two (2) self-addressed mailing labels to Robert Hooks, Chief, Resource and Market Division, Minority Business Development Agency, Room 5092, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Completed proposals should be submitted to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency, Executive Secretariat, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room 5073, Washington, D.C. 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elio Muller, Associate Director for Strategic Planning and Operations, (202) 482–1015.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Contingent upon the availability of Federal funds, the cost of performance for the first budget period (13 months) from October 1, 1996 to October 31, 1997, is estimated at $588,235. A 30-day start-up period will be added to the first budget period, making it a 13-month award. The application must include a minimum cost-share of $88,235 or 15% of the total project cost, through non-Federal contributions. The Federal share, to be in the amount of $500,000, includes $12,000 for an annual audit fee. Cost-sharing may be in the form of cash contributions, client fees, in-kind contributions or combinations thereof.

The funding instrument for this project will be a cooperative agreement. Competition is open to individuals, non-profit and for-profit organizations, state and local governments, American Indian tribes and educational institutions.

Applications will be evaluated on the following criteria: the expertise and capabilities of the firm and its staff in addressing the capital needs of businesses in general and, more specifically, of minority businesses (50 points); the resources available to the firm in assisting minority firms to raise capital (10 points); the firm's approach (techniques and methodologies) to performing the work requirements developed for this project (20 points);