This notice of initiation is being published in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c).

Dated: June 29, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–17789 Filed 7–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–485–602]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof From Romania: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: On March 6, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished or unfinished (''TRBs''), from Romania. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period June 1, 1996, through May 31, 1997. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

We received no comments from interested parties with regard to the Department's preliminary determination to grant Tehnoimportexport, S.A. (''TIE'') a separate rate for this review. Therefore, for the final results of review, we reaffirm our determination that TIE is entitled to a separate rate.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Blozy or Rick Johnson, Office of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0374 or (202) 482–3818.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1997).

Background

On March 6, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 11217) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Romania (''*Preliminary Results*''). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received written comments from respondent, TIE, and from Universal Automotive Trading Company Ltd. (''Universal''), an interested party. Comments submitted consisted of respondent's case brief of April 6, 1998 and Universal's rebuttal brief of April 13, 1998.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of TRBs from Romania. These products include flange, take-up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings, and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 8482.20.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8483.30.40, and 8483.90.20. Although the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

The period of review (''POR'') is June 1, 1996, through May 31, 1997.

Analysis of Comment Received

Comment 1: Respondent and Universal assert that the Department erred in its calculation of freight for certain steel supplies imported from Russia. Respondent states that, based on the Department's language in its analysis memorandum, the longest possible distance used in this review to calculate freight for steel supplies should be either the distance from the Romanian steel mill to the Alexandria factory (280 km) or from Constanza, the port, to the Alexandria factory (350 km).

Petitioner did not comment on this issue.

Department's Position: We disagree with respondent and Universal. As stated in the analysis memorandum for the preliminary results, the Department ''added to CIF surrogate values from Indonesia a surrogate freight cost using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest port to the manufacturer's factory, or from the actual supplier to the manufacturer's factory.'' *See TIE Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Review (''Analysis Memorandum'')* at page 5 (March 2, 1998). The Department established this methodology for accounting for the freight component of surrogate values in *Collated Roofing Nails from the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 25895 (May 12, 1997) (''*Nails*''). Thus, if the material was domestically produced or imported from a non-market economy (''NME'') supplier, we used the shorter of (a) the distance between the closest Romanian port and the factory, or (b) the distance between the actual supplier and the factory to calculate a freight cost.

As noted on page 5 of the *Analysis Memorandum,* some of the distances between Alexandria and NME suppliers were not reported. For those missing distances, the Department assigned a distance of 3000 km, the longest distance reported in the submission. *See Analysis Memorandum* at page 5. However, despite respondent's assertion, the Department correctly calculated a freight cost for those inputs using 350 km, which is the shorter of the distance between Constanza and Alexandria (350 km) and the distance between Alexandria and the Russian NME supplier (3000 km). Therefore, the Department calculated freight in a manner consistent with the methodology established in *Nails.*

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine the dumping margin (in percent) for the period June 1, 1996, through May 30, 1997, to be as follows:

Exporter	Margin (percent)
TIE	0.86

The Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For assessment purposes, we have calculated an importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rate for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total quantity of sales examined during the POR. The

Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of TRBs from Romania entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for TIE will be the rate we determine in the final results of review; (2) for all other Romanian exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the Romania-wide rate made effective by the amended final results of the 1994–95 administrative review (*see Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, from Romania; Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 61 FR 59416 (November 22, 1996)); (3) for non-Romanian exporters of subject merchandise from Romania, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the Romanian supplier of that exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 of the Department's regulations 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 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 11, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–17788 Filed 7–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is announcing procedures and required certifications pursuant to the USEC Privatization Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 20, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Doyle, Karla Whalen, or Letitia Kress, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–0159, (202) 482–1386, or (202) 482–6412, respectively.

Background

On April 25, 1996, Congress passed the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (The USEC Privatization Act), 42 U.S.C. 2297h *et seq.* The USEC Privatization Act required the U.S. Department of Commerce (the Department) to administer and enforce the limitations set forth in Section 42 U.S.C. 2297h–10(b)(5) of the USEC Privatization Act. On January 7, 1998, the Department issued Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States (The HEU Procedures).

On March 20, 1998, the Department issued Annex 1 to the HEU Procedures to clarify certain requirements detailed in the HEU Procedures. This announcement provides public notification of the HEU Procedures and their Annex 1. Annex 1 details required certification language and includes two additional certification requirements in items A and C. Item A is an amendment to the certifications currently required of all importers of uranium, regardless of national origin. Item B is the designated agent's certification referred to Section B of the HEU Procedures. Item C lists all the certifications which must accompany all quarterly reports submitted to the Department in accordance with section C of the HEU Procedures.

The following Attachment 1 provides the Procedures for the Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States and Attachment 2 provides Annex 1 to the HEU Procedures.

Dated: June 25, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Import Administration.

Attachment 1—Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States

A. Annual Maximum Deliveries

The United States Department of Commerce (''the Department'') designates the Ministry of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation (''MINATOM''), or its designated agent, to allocate the annual maximum deliveries of HEU natural uranium component among any marketing agent(s) authorized by MINATOM to sell the HEU natural uranium component in the United States. The annual maximum deliveries which may be allocated by MINATOM are set forth in the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) Privatization Act, 42 U.S.C. 2297h–10(b)(5) (''Delivery Schedule'').

For each agent receiving a delivery allocation, MINATOM will issue a certificate identifying such agent, the duration of the allocation, and the maximum annual amount to be delivered under that certificate. The certificate(s) will also contain a statement that the material to be delivered to the agent for sale in the United States will be delivered for consumption only. MINATOM will provide a copy of all such certificates to the Department within 10 days of issuance.

The cumulative amount of the deliveries authorized by such certificates each year may not exceed the annual maximum deliveries set forth in the Delivery Schedule. Annual deliveries allocated to any given agent may be re-allocated to any other agent(s) or to MINATOM within the same annual period subject to the annual maximum deliveries under the following conditions:

—The Department is notified of the re-allocation no later than December 1 of the affected annual period;

—MINATOM provides the Department with a copy of the amended and/or terminated certificate(s) from which delivery allocation is to be withdrawn and a copy of the new certificate(s) re-allocating such deliveries.

New contracts entered into by any agent(s) as a result of re-allocation will be subject to the approval process outlined in paragraph B.

If, in any given annual period, an agent delivers less than the maximum flexibility(ies) under an approved contract(s), such agent may enter into a new contract(s) for the difference between its actual deliveries during that year and the maximum flexibilities under the contract(s) for that same year, provided that the agent's total annual deliveries under all contracts do not exceed the agent's delivery allocation or the annual maximum deliveries and provided that the following conditions are met:

—The Department is notified of the agent's intention to re-direct deliveries by December 1;