

Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230, no later than the close of business of the tenth calendar day following the publication of this notice.

(The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official program number and title of the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance)

Dated: November 24, 1997.

**Anthony J. Meyer,**

*Coordinator, Trade Adjustment and Technical Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 97-32156 Filed 12-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-24-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-301-602]

#### Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

**SUMMARY:** On October 14, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results and partial rescission of the ninth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (62 FR 53287). Based on the correction of ministerial errors made in those final results with respect to two manufacturer/exporters, and the subsequent changes in duty absorption amounts and the rate for non-selected respondents, we are publishing this amendment to the final results in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 9, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cynthia Thirumalai or Zak Smith, Office 1, Group 1, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4087 and (202) 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 Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition,

unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to those codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1997).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On October 14, 1997, we published a notice of *Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (Final Results)*. We received timely allegations of ministerial errors made in the final results by Hosa Ltda (Hosa) and Maxima Farms Group (Maxima) on October 22 & 23, 1997, respectively.

##### Scope of Review

Imports covered by these reviews are shipments of certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (standard carnations, miniature (spray) carnations, standard chrysanthemums and pompon chrysanthemums). These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 0603.10.30.00, 0603.10.70.10, 0603.10.70.20, and 0603.10.70.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

##### Alleged Ministerial Errors

###### Hosa

###### Issue 1: Calculation of CEP Profit

In our final results, HOSA claims that the Department erred by failing to include indirect selling expenses incurred in Colombia in calculating constructed export price (CEP) profit.

**DOC Position:** We agree with HOSA that we failed to include indirect selling expenses incurred in Colombia in calculating CEP profit. We intended to include indirect selling expenses and have made this correction for the amended final results. We note that this omission was unique to HOSA.

###### Issue 2: Returned Flowers

HOSA alleges that the Department erred in its calculation of costs associated with returned flowers. HOSA claims that the Department should have used cost of production (COP) rather than constructed value (CV), because CV includes an amount for profit.

**DOC Position:** The question of whether to use CV or COP is a methodological issue. Our use of CV in this calculation was intentional. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(d), we do not consider this to be a ministerial error (see, 19 CFR 353.28(d) (1996)).

##### Issue 3: Calculation of Indirect Selling Expenses

While reviewing the above allegations, we discovered an additional ministerial error. When generating the multiplier used in the calculation of indirect selling expenses for CV we did not use the correct number of minicarnations sold in all markets. We have corrected this error.

##### Maxima

##### Issue 1: Calculation of Number of Stems of Export-Quality Standard Carnations Sold

Maxima alleges that we failed to increase the number of export-quality stems of standard carnations sold to reflect information obtained at verification regarding home market sales.

**DOC Position:** We agree with Maxima that the number of stems of export-quality standard carnations sold should be increased by the number of stems sold in the home market. We intended to increase the number pursuant to information gathered at verification and have corrected this error in these amended final results.

##### Issue 2: Input of Monthly Number of Stems of Minicarnations Transshipped to Third Country

Maxima claims that the final digits of the monthly volumes of minicarnations transshipped through the United States were omitted.

**DOC Position:** We agree with Maxima and have made this correction in these amended final results.

##### Duty Absorption

As a result of correcting these ministerial errors, the amount of U.S. sales through affiliated importers has also changed:

| Name of company | Percentage of U.S. affiliated importer sales with margins |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Hosa .....      | 15.83                                                     |
| Maxima .....    | 31.61                                                     |

##### Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of these amended final results, we determine the following percentage weighted-average margins to exist for Hosa and Maxima (both selected respondents) for the period of review (March 1, 1995 through February 29, 1996):

|                  | Percent |
|------------------|---------|
| Hosa Group ..... | 2.01    |

|                                                                                                                                       | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Horticultura de la Sabana S.A.<br>Hosa Ltda.<br>Innovacion Andina S.A.<br>Minispray S.A.<br>ProHosa Ltda.<br>Maxima Farms Group ..... | 3.02    |
| Agricola los Arboles S.A.<br>Colombian D.C. Flowers<br>Polo Flowers<br>Rainbow Flowers<br>Maxima Farms Inc.                           |         |

Based on the above, the new rate for those companies not selected as respondents is 2.25 percent.

These amended final results of administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 2, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-32211 Filed 12-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-412-810]

#### Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom in response to requests by respondents, British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES) and Glynwed Metal Processing Ltd. (Glynwed), and petitioner, Inland Steel Bar Company. This review covers the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments are requested to submit with each comment (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the comment.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 9, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** G. Leon McNeill, Gideon Katz or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

#### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, 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 stated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the regulations as codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (1996).

#### SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom on March 22, 1993 (58 FR 15324). On March 7, 1997 we published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 10521) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom covering the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1), BSES and Glywed requested that we conduct an administrative review of their sales, and the petitioner, Inland Steel Bar Company, requested that we conduct an administrative review of BSES's sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on April 24, 1997 (62 FR 19988). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

##### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of nonalloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined by the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1(f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead, or 0.1 percent or more of

bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00, 60.00; 7213.39.00.30, 00.60, 00.90; 7214.40.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.50.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.60.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; and 7228.30.80.00. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

This review covers two manufacturers/exporters, BSES and Glynwed, and the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

#### Verification

As provided in section 782(1) of the Act, we verified information provided by BSES using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in public versions of the verification reports.

#### United States Price

We based United States price on export price (EP), as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold directly by the exporter to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and constructed export price was not indicated by other facts of record.

#### BSES

The Department calculated EP for BSES based on packed, delivered prices to customers in the United States. We made deductions, where applicable, for foreign inland freight, FOB charges in the United Kingdom, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. Customs duties, brokerage and handling charges, merchandising processing fees, and U.S. inland freight charges, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.41(d). We also made an adjustment for invoice corrections (billing adjustments) made after shipment.

BSES's sales in the United Kingdom and the United States were made in quantities of less than 25 metric tons and 25 metric tons or more. As in all prior segments of the proceeding, where possible we matched U.S. sales to U.K. sales within the same quantity group: 25 tons or more, or less than 25 tons. (See,