

Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR 351 (62 FR 27296).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 29, 1997, Saehan requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act to determine whether Saehan should properly be considered the successor firm to Cheil and if, as such, the revocation issued for Cheil should apply to Saehan. Saehan also requested the Department to publish the preliminary results concurrently with this notice of initiation, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). In its request, Saehan notified the Department that on February 28, 1997, Cheil officially changed its corporate name to Saehan, and despite this change in corporate name, the management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer base of Saehan are virtually identical to those of the former Cheil. In support of its claim, Saehan submitted documentary evidence demonstrating that Saehan maintained essentially the same management, production facilities, supplier, and customer relationships as Cheil. Citing the Department's determinations in *Sugars and Syrups from Canada; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 61 FR 48885 (Sept. 17, 1996) and *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 58 FR 59010 (Nov. 5, 1993), Saehan claimed that the Department should determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Cheil.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate, film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films, and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States subheading

3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

This changed circumstances administrative review covers Saehan.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Tariff Act, as amended (the Act), the Department is initiating a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether Saehan is the successor company to Cheil. In making such a determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in (1) management, (2) production facilities, (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. *See e.g., Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992). While no one or several of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if its resulting operation is similar to that of the predecessor. *See e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel, Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same entity as the former company, the Department will treat the successor company the same as the predecessor for purposes of antidumping liability, e.g., assign the same cash deposit rate, revocation, etc.

We have examined the information provided by Saehan in its September 29, 1997 letter and determined that Saehan has established a *prima facie* case that it is the successor-in-interest to Cheil. The management and organizational structure of the former Cheil has remained intact under Saehan, and there have been no changes in the production facilities, supplier relationships, or customer base. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that Saehan has maintained the same management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer bases as did Cheil.

Based upon the foregoing, we preliminarily determine that the July 5, 1996 revocation issued for Cheil applies to Saehan. Because Saehan has presented evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of its successorship status, we find it appropriate to issue the preliminary results in combination with

the notice of initiation in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii).

Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, which will include the results of its analysis raised in any such written comments.

This initiation of review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)), and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: November 12, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-30388 Filed 11-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-502]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 19, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review for the antidumping order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, "the Act").

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Totaro or Dorothy Woster, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482-1398 or 482-3362, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not

practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit (see *Memorandum to Robert S. LaRussa from Joseph A. Spetrini*, November 12, 1997).

Since it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Act (245 days from the last day of the anniversary month for preliminary results, 120 additional days

for final results), in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit as follows:

Product	Country	Review period	Initiation date	Prelim due date	Final due date*
Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes (A-549-502).	Thailand	03/01/96-02/28/97	04/24/97	03/31/98	08/05/98

*The Department shall issue the final determination 120 days after the publication of the preliminary determination. This final due date is estimated based on publication of the preliminary notice five business days after signature.

Dated: November 12, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97-30398 Filed 11-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-337-802]

Preliminary Negative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination: Fresh Atlantic Salmon From Chile

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 19, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosa Jeong, Marian Wells or Todd Hansen, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Group 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-1278, 482-6309 or 482-1276, respectively.

Preliminary Determination

The Department of Commerce (the "Department") preliminarily determines that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to producers or exporters of fresh Atlantic salmon ("salmon") in Chile.

Petitioners

The petition in this investigation was filed by the Coalition for Fair Atlantic Salmon Trade ("FAST") and the following individual members of FAST: Atlantic Salmon of Maine; Cooke Aquaculture U.S., Inc.; DE Salmon, Inc.; Global Aqua—USA, Inc.; Island Aquaculture Corp.; Maine Coast Nordic, Inc.; ScanAm Fish Farms; and Treats

Island Fisheries (collectively referred to hereinafter as "petitioners").

Case History

Since the publication of the notice of initiation in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 36772 (July 9, 1997) ("Initiation Notice"), the following events have occurred.

We deemed this case to be extraordinarily complicated and on July 28, 1997, we postponed the preliminary determination until November 10, 1997 (62 FR 40335).

On July 23, 1997, we issued a countervailing duty questionnaire to the Government of Chile ("GOC"). Due to the large number of producers and exporters of fresh Atlantic salmon in Chile, and with the GOC's assurance that it could provide aggregate data for most programs, we solicited information from the GOC on an aggregate or industry-wide basis, rather than from the individual producers and exporters. On August 1, 1997, the GOC notified us that it lacked usage information for the following programs: Chilean Production Development Corporation ("CORFO") Export Credits and Long-Term Export Financing, Law 18,439 Export Credit Limits, Law 18,449 (Stamp Tax Exemption), and Article 59 of Decree Law 824. Therefore, on August 7, 1997, we issued an additional questionnaire to four producers/exporters of the subject merchandise concerning the above four programs as well as Chapter XVIII and Chapter XIX. The questionnaire was sent to the following companies: Pesquera Mares Australes Ltda., Marine Harvest Chile, Aguas Claras S.A., and Pesquera Eicosal Ltda.

On August 1, 1997, petitioners submitted comments arguing that the Law No. 18,480 program should have been included in the initiation. In the *Initiation Notice*, the Department declined to initiate on Law No. 18,480, partly based on information provided during consultations with the GOC. Upon further review of information on the record, we determined that our initial rejection of petitioners' allegation

was unwarranted. On August 21, 1997, we decided to include certain benefits allegedly provided under Law No. 18,480 in our investigation (see *Memorandum from team to Richard W. Moreland*, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration). On August 25, 1997, the Department requested that the GOC provide information regarding rebates for exports using domestically produced inputs provided under Law No. 18,480.

The Department received the GOC and company questionnaire responses on September 15, 1997 and September 22, 1997. The Department issued supplemental questionnaires to the GOC and the four companies, and their affiliates, on September 30, 1997, and received the supplemental responses on October 14, 1997. On October 21, 1997, the Department issued a second supplemental questionnaire to the GOC. The GOC responded to this questionnaire on October 27 and October 29, 1997.

On November 6, 1997, we received a request from petitioners, pursuant to 19 CFR 355.20(c), to postpone the final determination in this investigation to coincide with the final determination in the antidumping duty investigation of the fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile. Accordingly, we are aligning the final determination in this investigation with the date of the final determination in the antidumping duty investigation of the fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile.

Scope of Investigation

The scope of this investigation covers fresh, farmed Atlantic salmon, whether imported "dressed" or cut. Atlantic salmon is the species *Salmo salar*, in the genus *Salmo* of the family *salmoninae*. "Dressed" Atlantic salmon refers to salmon that has been bled, gutted, and cleaned. Dressed Atlantic salmon may be imported with the head on or off; with the tail on or off; and with the gills in or out. All cuts of fresh Atlantic salmon are included in the scope of the investigation. Examples of cuts include, but are not limited to: crosswise cuts