

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

We have examined the petition on fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirement concerning allegation of material injury or threat of material injury to the domestic producers of a domestic like product by reason of subject imports allegedly sold at less than fair value. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Our preliminary determination will be issued by November 19, 1997, unless the deadline for the determination is extended.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the Government of Chile. 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 initiation of this investigation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by July 28, 1997, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in termination of the investigation; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Dated: July 2, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-18112 Filed 7-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: 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: Stainless Steel Bar from India.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Yeske or Zak Smith, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0189 or 482-1279, respectively.

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to those published in the Code of Federal Regulations, April 1997, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**Background**

On March 7, 1997, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India (61 FR 54774). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise for the period August 4, 1994 through January 31, 1996. The manufacturer/exporter is Isibars Limited ("Isibars" or "respondent"). The Department gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have found no basis to modify our preliminary results. Therefore, we have adopted the preliminary results of this review as the final results.

On May 1 and May 28, 1997, Isibars submitted untimely arguments and new factual information. We rejected these submissions on May 1, 1997, and June 4, 1997, respectively. On May 20, 1997, and June 9, 1997, respondent filed its objection to the Department's rejection of its submissions.

Scope of the Review

For purposes of this administrative review, the term "stainless steel bar" means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross

section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. Stainless steel bar includes cold-finished stainless steel bars that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut length flat-rolled products (i.e., cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness have a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), wire (i.e., cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The stainless steel bar subject to this administrative review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.11.0005, 7222.11.0050, 7222.19.0005, 7222.19.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Interested Party Comments

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment. We received written comments from petitioners (Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division, Crucible Materials Corp., Electralloy Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Slater Steels Corp., Talley Metals Technology, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC)) and the respondent.

Comment 1: Petitioners claim the Department used the wrong date of sale for the reported U.S. sales. They believe the material terms of sale changed significantly enough to warrant using the invoice date, instead of the purchase order date, as the date of sale. Petitioners allege that because the quantity shipped was different than the quantity ordered, the terms of sale changed and thus the invoice date should be viewed as the date of sale. According to petitioners, this change in quantity falls outside the delivery

allowance stipulated in the purchase order.

Isibars disagrees with petitioners' interpretation of the purchase order. Isibars asserts that this sale adhered to the essential terms set by the purchase order. Isibars says that price and quantity were set with the purchase order, the quantity ordered was delivered within the delivery allowance range and the customer paid for the order. Therefore, Isibars argues that the date of sale should be based on the purchase order date.

DOC Position: We agree with respondent. We have no basis for rejecting Isibars' characterization of this transaction, and we are using the purchase order date as the date of sale. The Department instructed Isibars to report date of sale as when the basic terms of sale are set. In this instance, the purchase order fulfills that criterion. We found no evidence in the course of this review suggesting that the essential terms of sale changed between the purchase order date and delivery. While the quantity specified in the purchase order differed from the quantity delivered to the customer, this variance was permitted in the terms of the purchase order. For further discussion of the Department's position, see the Memorandum from Team to Richard Moreland dated June 26, 1997.

Comment 2: Based on their claim that the appropriate date of sale is invoice date, petitioners argue that the Department did not use contemporaneous sales in the home market to calculate normal value. If the Department agrees that the date of sale should be based on the invoice date, the Department must use "facts available" for determining the extent of dumping because the invoice date falls outside the period for the information provided by respondent about the comparison market.

DOC Position: As discussed in response to Comment 1, above, we have determined that the purchase order date is the appropriate date of sale. Therefore, there is no need to resort to facts available.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period August 1, 1994 through January 1, 1996:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin
Isibars	0.00

The results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping

duties on entries of merchandise covered by the review and for future deposits of estimated duties for the manufacturer/exporter subject to this review. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for companies not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original less-than-fair-value investigation, 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 investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the most recent rate established for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be the "all others" rate of 12.45 percent established in the final determination of sales at less than fair value. (59 FR 66915, December 28, 1994).

These deposit requirements will 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 a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APOs") 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) and 19 CFR 353.22(h), and this notice is published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: July 2, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-18113 Filed 7-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[Docket No. 970702162-7162-01]

International Buyer Program (Formerly Known as the Foreign Buyer Program); Support for Domestic Trade Shows

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and Call for Applications for the FY 1999 International Buyer Program (October 1, 1998, through September 30, 1999).

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth objectives, procedures and application review criteria associated with the U.S. Department of Commerce's International Buyer Program (IBP) to support domestic trade shows: Selection in the International Buyer Program for Fiscal Year (FY) 1999.

The International Buyer Program was established to bring international buyers together with U.S. firms by promoting leading U.S. trade shows in industries with high export potential. The International Buyer Program emphasizes cooperation between the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) and trade show organizers to benefit U.S. firms exhibiting at selected events and provides practical, hands-on assistance to U.S. companies interested in exporting such as export counseling and market analysis. The assistance provided to show organizers includes worldwide overseas promotion of selected shows to potential international buyers, end-users, representatives and distributors. The worldwide promotion is executed through the offices of the Commercial Service of the Commerce Department in 69 countries representing America's major trading partners, and also in U.S. Embassies in countries where the Commercial Service does not maintain offices.

The Commercial Service expects to select approximately 24 shows for FY 1999 from among applicants to the program. Successful applicants will be required to enter into a Memorandum of