Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
CBCC	0.37
CCM	35.23
Eletrosilex	6.68
Minasligas	43.53
RIMA	51.23

The Department shall determine, and the U. S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of silicon metal from Brazil entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed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 named above will be the rates published in these amended final results; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed 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 these reviews, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigations, 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these reviews, the cash deposit rate will continue to be 91.06 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Metal from Brazil*, 56 FR 26977 (June 12, 1991).

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.

These amended final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.28(c) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: October 14, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–27632 Filed 10–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–806]

Silicon Metal From Brazil; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is amending its final results of review, published on January 14, 1997, of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil, to reflect the correction of ministerial errors in those final results. These amended final results are for the review covering the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker, Alain Letort, or John Kugelman, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone 202/482–2924 (Baker), 202/482–4243 (Letort), or 202/482–0649 (Kugelman), fax 202/482–1388.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Background

The Department published the final results of the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil on January 14, 1997 (62 FR 1954) (*Third Review Final Results*), covering the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994. The respondents are Companhia Brasileira Carbureto de Cálcio (CBCC), Companhia Ferroligas Minas Gerais—Minasligas (Minasligas), Eletrosilex Belo Horizonte (Eletrosilex), Rima Industrial S.A. (RIMA), and Camargo Corrêa Metais (CCM). The petitioners are American Alloys, Inc., Elken Metals, Co., Globe Metallurgical, Inc., SMI Group, and SKW Metals & Alloys.

On February 12, 1997, the petitioners filed clerical error allegations with respect to CCM and Minasligas. The same day we received clerical error allegations from respondent CCM. On February 18, 1997, we received rebuttal comments from the petitioners regarding CCM's clerical error allegations. Pursuant to the CIT's order, we are now addressing the ministerial allegations and amending our final results of the third review. *See American Silicon Technologies et al.*, v. *United States*, Slip Op. 97–114, August 18, 1997.

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this review is silicon metal from Brazil containing at least 96.00 percent but less than 99.99 percent silicon by weight. Also covered by this review is silicon metal from Brazil containing between 89.00 and 96.00 percent silicon by weight but which contains a higher aluminum content than the silicon metal containing at least 96.00 percent but less than 99.99 percent silicon by weight. Silicon metal is currently provided for under subheadings 2804.69.10 and 2804.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) as a chemical product, but is commonly referred to as a metal. Semiconductor grade silicon (silicon metal containing by weight not less than 99.99 percent silicon and provided for in subheading 2804.61.00 of the HTS) is not subject to the order. HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of product coverage.

Clerical Error Allegations

Comment 1

CCM argues that the Department erred in its calculation of its U.S. imputed credit expenses in three ways. First, it argues that the Department should have

used CCM's ''actual credit'' expense, rather than an imputed figure. (The ''actual credit expense'' figure reported by CCM reflects the actual interest charged on its export credit line for its U.S. shipment.) CCM argues that this ''actual credit expense'' amount is the most accurate, transaction-specific measure of CCM's interest expense in connection with its U.S. sale. Second, CCM argues that if the Department continues to believe that it should use an imputed credit figure, it should use CCM's bill of lading date as the start of the credit period, rather than the date of shipment from CCM's factory. It bases this argument on the fact that title transfers from CCM to the U.S. purchaser on the bill of lading date. Thus, CCM argues, the credit period should begin on the bill of lading date because a credit expense cannot be incurred until CCM is no longer in possession of the merchandise. Third, CCM argues that the Department erred in its calculation of credit by not removing from the U.S. price the value of the ICMS tax (a value-added tax (VAT)) that the Brazilian government assessed on the sale. Doing so was an error, CCM argues, because in its response to comment 10 of the final results the Department stated that its practice ''is to calculate imputed credit exclusive of VAT.'' *See Third Review Final Results* at 1961.

Petitioners argue that the Department made no clerical error in calculating an imputed figure for CCM's credit expenses or in using the date of shipment from CCM's plant as the start of the credit period. They argue that the Department specifically addressed these issues in the final results of review when it stated:

> We disagree with CCM that we should use its reported ''actual expense'' for U.S. credit. The Department requires that the credit expenses reflect the opportunity cost of the entire period between shipment from the plant and payment by the customer. That is not the case for CCM's reported ''actual expense.'' The actual expense covers only a portion of the imputed credit expense period. Therefore, in these final results of review we have calculated imputed credit using the shipment date from CCM's plant as given in verification exhibit 11.

See Third Review Final Results at 1962.

Department's Position: We agree with both parties in part. We agree with petitioners that we did specifically address CCM's first two contentions in our final results of review. Thus, calculating an imputed credit figure and using the date of shipment from CCM's plant as the start of the credit period did not constitute clerical errors. However, we do agree with CCM that in the calculation of U.S. imputed credit we inadvertently included the ICMS tax assessed on the sale. We have corrected this error in these amended final results.

Comment 2

Petitioners argue that the Department made a ministerial error in the cost test for CCM. It states that the Department made a number of changes to CCM's reported costs, and that when it made these changes it gave the revised costs the variable name COP. However, when the Department performed the cost test, petitioners argue, it used the variable TOTCOP, which represents CCM's reported costs without any of the intended changes.

Department's Position: We agree, and have corrected this error in these amended final results of review.

Comment 3

Petitioners argue the Department made a clerical error in its calculation of Minasligas' G&A expenses. It argues that the Department incorrectly transcribed the G&A expenses for one month of the period of review (POR).

Department's Position: We agree, and have corrected this error in these amended final results of review.

Comment 4

Petitioners argue that the Department made a clerical error in converting Minasligas' brokerage, foreign inland freight, and warehousing expenses from Brazilian cruzeiros reais into U.S. dollars. They argue that the Department should have used the exchange rates of the dates of shipment for these expenses, rather than the exchange rates of the dates of sale.

Department's Position: We agree, and have corrected this error in these amended final results of review.

In addition to the changes made in response to the above comments, we have corrected an error in our calculations for all respondents with calculated margins. In our final results, we calculated G&A and interest expenses for the computation of COP/CV using a COM figure inclusive of VAT. In these amended final results we have calculated G&A and interest expenses using a COM figure exclusive of VAT. *See* our amended final results analysis memoranda for our revised calculations.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that the following margins exist for the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994:

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
CBCC	61.58
CCM	35.23
Eletrosilex	38.39
Minasligas	0.00
RIMA	91.06

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of silicon metal from Brazil 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 named above will be the rates published in the amended final results of review for the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil for the period July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995, published concurrently with this notice; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed 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 these reviews, 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these reviews, the cash deposit rate will continue to be 91.06 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Metal from Brazil,* 56 FR 26977 (June 12, 1991).

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.

These amended final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.28(c) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: October 10, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–27633 Filed 10–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 16, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Engelmeier, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Dan Viele, National Marine Fisheries Service, 501 W. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90802, (562–980–4039).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The Treaty on Fisheries Between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America, signed in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, in 1987, and its annexes, schedules and implementing agreements, as amended (Treaty), authorizes U.S. tuna vessels to fish within fishing zones of a large region of the Pacific Ocean. The South Pacific Tuna Act (16 U.S.C. 973g and 973j) and U.S. implementing regulations (50 CFR 282.3 and 282.5) authorize the collection of information from participants in the Treaty fishery.

Vessel operators who wish to participate in the Treaty fishery must submit annual license and registration applications and periodic written reports of catch and unloading of fish from a licensed vessel. The information collected is submitted to the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) on forms supplied by the FFA through the U.S. government (National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]). License and registration application information is used by FFA to determine the operational capability and financial responsibility of a vessel operator interested in participating in the Treaty fishery. Information obtained from vessel catch and unloading reports is used by FFA to assess fishing effort and fishery resources in the region and to track the amount of fish caught within each Pacific island state's exclusive economic zone for fair disbursement of Treaty monies. If the information is not collected, the U.S. government will not meet its obligations under the Treaty, and the lack of fishing information will result in poor management of the fishery resource.

II. Method of Collection

The information is collected using the forms required under the Treaty.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0648–0218.
Form Number: N/A.
Type of Review: Regular Submission.
Affected Public: Businesses (respondents are the operators of U.S. commercial tuna purse seine vessels participating in the Treaty fishery).
Estimated Number of Respondents: Approximately 32 vessels are expected to participate in the fishery during each year the Treaty is in effect, however, the number may vary.
Estimated Time Per Response: The estimated response times for the reporting requirements are: .25 hours for a license application form; .25 hours for a registration application form; 1 hour for a catch report form; and .5 hours for an unloading log sheet.
Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: The estimated total annual burden has decreased from 337 hours to 248 hours due to a decrease in the number of respondents and responses.
Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $576 for mailing costs.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 9, 1997.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 97–27525 Filed 10–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Evaluation of Coastal Zone Management Program and National Estuarine Research Reserves

AGENCY: Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), DOC.

ACTION: Notice of intent to evaluate.

SUMMARY: The NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) announces its intent to evaluate the performance of Hawaii and New Jersey Coastal Zone Management Programs and the Chesapeake Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve in Maryland.

These evaluations will be conducted pursuant to sections 312 and 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), as amended. The CZMA requires a continuing review of the performance of states with respect to coastal program or estuarine research reserve program implementation. Evaluation of Coastal Zone Management and Estuarine Research Reserve Programs require findings concerning the extent to which a state has met the national objectives, adhered to its