

States District Court for the District of Columbia of violating the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C.A. 1701-1706 (1991 & Supp. 1997)) (IEEPA). McNeil was convicted of knowingly and willfully exporting, and causing to be exported, United States-origin electronic riot shields from the United States to Romania, without applying for and obtaining from the Department of Commerce the required authorization.

Section 11(h) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. 2401-2420 (1991 & Supp. 1997)) (the Act),¹ provides that, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce,² no person convicted of violating IEEPA, or certain other provisions of the United States Code, shall be eligible to apply for or use any license, including any License Exception, issued pursuant to, or provided by, the Act or the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (1997)) (the Regulations), for a period of up to 10 years from the date of the conviction. In addition, any license issued pursuant to the Act in which such a person had any interest at the time of conviction may be revoked.

Pursuant to Sections 766.25 and 750.8(a) of the Regulations, upon notification that a person has been convicted of violating IEEPA, the Director, Office of Exporter Services, in consultation with the Director, Office of Export Enforcement, shall determine whether to deny that person permission to apply for or use any license, including any License Exception, issued pursuant to, or provided by, the Act and the Regulations, and shall also determine whether to revoke any license previously issued to such a person.

Having received notice of McNeil's conviction for violating IEEPA and following consultations with the Acting Director, Office of Export Enforcement, I have decided to deny McNeil permission to apply for or use any license, including any License Exception, issued pursuant to, or provide by, the Act and the Regulations, for a period of five years the date of his conviction. The denial period ends on

August 8, 2001. I have also decided to revoke all licenses issued pursuant to the Act in which McNeil had an interest at the time of his conviction.

Accordingly, *it is hereby ordered*

I. Until August 8, 2001, William F. McNeil, #5 Woodland Road, Pittsfield, Massachusetts 01201, may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way, in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States, that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations, including but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations.

II. No person may directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the denied person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the denied person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the denied person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and that is owned,

possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

III. After notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to McNeil by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order.

IV. This Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

V. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until August 8, 2001.

VI. A copy of this Order shall be delivered to McNeil. This Order shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 3, 1997.

Eileen M. Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 97-30063 Filed 11-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-056]

Melamine From Japan; Notice of Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by an importer, Taiyo America, Inc., the Department of Commerce initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty finding on melamine from Japan for the period of review, February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997. The importer's request covered two producers/exporters of subject merchandise. Because no other interested party requested a review, this review has now been terminated as a

¹ The Act expired on August 20, 1994. Executive Order 12924 (3 CFR, 1994 Comp. 917 (1995)), extended by Presidential Notices of August 15, 1995 (3 CFR, 1995 Comp. 501 (1996)), August 14, 1996 (3 CFR, 1996 Comp. 298 (1997)) and August 13, 1997 (62 FR 43629, August 15, 1997) continued the Export Administration Regulations in effect under IEEPA.

² Pursuant to appropriate delegations of authority, the Director, Office of Exporter Services, in consultation with the Director, Office of Export Enforcement, exercises the authority granted to the Secretary of Section 11(h) of the Act.

result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the importer.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4195 or (202) 482-3814.

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 regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) published an antidumping duty finding on melamine from Japan on February 2, 1977 (42 FR 6866). On February 3, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty finding on melamine from Japan (62 FR 4978). On February 7, 1997, an importer, Taiyo America, Inc., requested an administrative review of two producers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c), we initiated the review on March 18, 1997 (62 FR 12793) covering the period of February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997. On September 2, 1997, the importer withdrew its request for administrative review.

Termination of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department may allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. The Department may extend this time limit if the Department decides it is reasonable to do so.

This request for withdrawal was made early in the review process and there were no requests for review from other interested parties. Therefore, the Department is terminating this review.

This notice is in accordance with section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22(a)(5)).

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with § 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return or 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.

Dated: October 30, 1997.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-30145 Filed 11-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-429-601]

Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Solid Urea From the Former German Democratic Republic

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review

SUMMARY: On July 8, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on solid urea from the Former German Democratic Republic (GDR). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, SKW Stickstoffwerke Piesteritz GmbH (SKWP), and the period July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nithya Nagarajan or Steven Presing, Office VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations, as codified at 19 C.F.R. part 353 (1996).

Background

On July 8, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 35712) a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" for the July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996, period of review (POR) of the antidumping duty order on solid urea from the former GDR. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22, the Ad Hoc Committee of Domestic Nitrogen Producers (petitioners) requested a review for the aforementioned period. On August 15, 1996, the Department published a notice of initiation of antidumping review (61 FR 42416, 42417). The Department is conducting a review of this respondent pursuant to section 751 of the Act.

On July 8, 1997, the Department published the preliminary results of review (62 FR 36492). The Department has now completed the review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are those of solid urea. At the time of the publication of the antidumping duty order, such merchandise was classifiable under item 480.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA). This merchandise is currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) item number 3102.10.00. These TSUSA and HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The Department's written description of the scope remains dispositive for purposes of the order.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: Affiliation. Petitioners argue that the Department must adjust SKWP's cost of production to reflect an appropriate amount for depreciation of production equipment transferred to SKWP by Stickstoffwerke AG Wittenberg-Piesteritz (STAG). Petitioners contend that STAG is under the "control" of SKWP and that in accordance with section 771(33) of the Act, the Department must find SKWP and STAG to be "affiliated" persons. According to petitioners, the Department is required by sections 773(f)(2) and (3) of the Act to disregard STAG's "transfer" price to SKWP of the production equipment and substitute, in