

purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

#### *Amended Final Results of Review*

Upon correction of the ministerial error, we have determined that the margin remains unchanged from the amended final results published on January 15, 1997. However, as discussed above, importer specific assessment rates will change and we will instruct Customs accordingly.

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Saha Thai/SAF .....	3/1/94–2/28/95	7.27

The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates for those firms as stated above; (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, 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, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.67 percent for circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigations. See *Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand*, (51 FR 8341, March 11, 1986).

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall 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 order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. 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)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: February 13, 1997.  
Robert S. LaRussa,  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*  
[FR Doc. 97-4632 Filed 2-24-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### [A-580-815 & A-580-816]

#### **Certain Cold-Rolled and Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Korea; Extension of Time Limits for Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews**

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

**ACTION:** Extension of time limits for antidumping duty administrative reviews of certain cold-rolled and corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limits for the preliminary results of the third antidumping duty administrative reviews of the antidumping orders on certain cold-rolled and corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea. These reviews cover three manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise: Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd., Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd., and Pohang Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. The period of review is August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 25, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alain Letort or John R. Kugelman, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III—Office 8,

Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482-4243 or 482-0649, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department initiated these administrative reviews on September 16, 1996 (61 FR 48882). Because it is not practicable to complete these reviews within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results of the aforementioned reviews to August 1, 1997. See memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, which is on file in Room B-099 at the Department's headquarters.

This extension of time limits is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: February 18, 1997.  
Joseph A. Spetrini  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.*  
[FR Doc. 97-4508 Filed 2-24-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### [A-570-830]

#### **Coumarin From the People's Republic of China: Amended Order and Final Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand**

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

**ACTION:** Amendment to final determination of antidumping duty investigation in accordance with decision upon remand.

**SUMMARY:** On May 9, 1996, the Court of International Trade (CIT) remanded to the Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration (the Department), one issue arising from the antidumping determination titled *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Coumarin From the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 66895, December 28, 1994).

Pursuant to the remand order, the Department filed its *Remand Determination: Rhone-Poulenc, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 95-03-00275, on September 23, 1996. Upon finding errors in the Remand Determination, the Department filed its *Amended Remand Determination: Rhone-Poulenc, Inc. v. United States* on October 3, 1996 (the "Amended Remand Results"). In

accordance with the remand order, the Department reconsidered its valuation of the by-products of coumarin production in light of the presence of impurities, recalculated the value of the by-products, and adjusted the subject PRC exporters' dumping margins accordingly. The Department applied best information available (BIA) in revaluing Tianjin Native Produce Import and Export Corporation's by-products because of the company's failure to provide information in response to the Department's remand questionnaire. After recalculation, the Department revised the final determination margins, as shown below.

In plaintiff's comments to the Department's Amended Remand Results, filed October 7, 1996, Rhone-Polenc indicated its concurrence with said results and asked that they be affirmed by the CIT. The CIT affirmed and dismissed (*Rhone-Poulenc, Inc., v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-15 (dated February 4, 1997)).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 30, 1994, pursuant to the CIT's preliminary injunction dated July 7, 1995 (see "Suspension of Liquidation" section).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David J. Goldberger, Office 5, AD/CVD Enforcement II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4136.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On December 28, 1994, the Department published its Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Coumarin from the People's Republic of China (59 FR 66895). In its final determination, the Department calculated the foreign market value (FMV) for each exporter by valuing the factors of production according to the appropriate surrogate value, in accordance with Section 773(c)(2)-(4) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. In the LTFV investigation, the Department had offset the cost of manufacturing by the surrogate value of the by-products recovered, *i.e.*, acetic acid, hydrochloric acid and alcohol, as adjusted (where appropriate) only for concentration levels. The CIT remanded the final determination to the Department for reconsideration of its valuation of the by-products for Changzhou, Jiangsu Native's supplier, and Tianjin Perfumery, Tianjin Native's supplier, to either take into account whether there were impurities, and their effect on value, or alternatively, to

present valid reasons for the Department's failure to determine the effect of impurities on the value of the by-products.

##### **Remand Results**

The Department set about requesting and obtaining information to determine whether there were impurities in the by-products in question. Both petitioner and Changzhou submitted information in this regard, but Tianjin Perfumery did not respond to a questionnaire or provide any other information for the remand proceeding. In addition, the Department obtained information concerning acetic acid from *Chemical Business*, an Indian publication used as the source for a number of surrogate values in the original proceeding and also consulted with chemical industry specialist at the International Trade Commission (ITC). In the LTFV investigation, the Department had valued by-product acetic acid as glacial acetic acid, which has a concentrated level of 99% purity. However, for the remand, in comparing the chemical specification of glacial acetic acid provided by *Chemical Business* to the composition of Changzhou's recovered acetic acid, we found that Changzhou's recovered acetic acid was not glacial acetic acid. As a result, for the remand, the Department attempted to find a value from the surrogate country that best approximated the recovered acetic acid reported.

##### **Acetic Acid**

For the remand, Changzhou provided the Department with the actual percentage of acetic acid (97%-98%) found in its recovered acetic acid resulting from its production of coumarin during the POI. Changzhou also indicated that it did not have any impurities in its recovered acetic acid. The Department was able to obtain additional information on Indian price data for recovered acetic acid at a concentration level comparable to Changzhou's actual recovered acetic acid. However, neither the Department nor the petitioner was able to obtain any information as to what impurities may also be present in the recovered acetic acid. The price quote was corroborated by the Department through the research performed by the U.S. Consulate General in Mumbai, India. It appeared that recovered acetic acid of 97-98% concentrate is not typically traded in India, but at least two Indian companies offered this product for sale. The Consulate General contacted the source of the July 1996 written price quote that petitioner had submitted for the remand and confirmed that this company

offered 96%-98% recovered acetic acid at the price reported by petitioner. We determined that this price quote would take into account whatever impurities may exist. As a result, we revised our valuation of Changzhou's recovered acetic acid using this verified Indian price quote, after making adjustments.

Our recalculation adjusted the tax-exclusive POI glacial acetic acid value, which the Department had obtained in the LTFV investigation from *Chemical Weekly*, an Indian industry publication, to reflect a recovered acetic acid value of 96-98% percent concentration. This adjustment was based on the percentage difference between the price levels of these two grades of acetic acid as observed in July 1996. The resulting POI surrogate value for this by-product factor more accurately reflects the actual concentration level of the Changzhou product as well as the price impact of any chemical impurities that might be present at that concentration level.

##### **Hydrochloric Acid**

For the remand, Changzhou stated that there were no impurities in its recovered hydrochloric acid, apart from water. In consultation with the ITC, the Department determined that the presence of any alleged impurities (*i.e.* other than water) was insignificant and would not affect the value for Changzhou's recovered hydrochloric acid. Further, the Department determined that the water present in the hydrochloric acid only affected the value by establishing the concentration level. In our LTFV calculation, we had already reduced the surrogate value of Changzhou's recovered hydrochloric acid to account for its lower concentration level compared to standard commercial grades. However, for the remand, the Department also obtained additional information on the standard commercial grades of hydrochloric acid, ranging from petitioner's 31.45% grade to the 36% grade found in the *The Merck Index* which was used by the ITC chemists. These two grades fall within the range of standard commercial grades of 28% to 37% described in *The Condensed Chemical Dictionary*. In the LTFV investigation, we used the midpoint of this range, 32.5%, as the average commercial grade, and then adjusted the surrogate value for this by-product by the ratio of Changzhou's verified concentration level to the average commercial concentration. For these remand results, we found no basis to further adjust the surrogate value.

Because Tianjin Perfumery did not respond to our questionnaire, we drew adverse inferences regarding the extent

to which impurities reduced the value of its recovered acetic acid. Therefore, as BIA, we discounted this value by 52%, the amount calculated by petitioner, based on the lowest price on the LTFV investigative record for recovered acetic acid of unknown specifications sold in India. Additionally, we had no information on the impurities present in Tianjin Perfumery's hydrochloric acid. As BIA, we drew the adverse inference that it contained impurities which reduced its value. We had no information on the record from which to quantify the effect of these impurities beyond the adjustment for the concentration percentage. However, the Department had verified that this by-product was sold, and not given away, to unrelated parties during the POI. Therefore, as BIA, we did not value hydrochloric acid at zero. Rather, for the remand, instead of using petitioner's price quote as BIA as we did in the final LTFV determination, we used price information from export statistics which was lower. Finally, since Tianjin Perfumery refused to provide information about the impurities present in its alcohol by-product, as BIA, we made the adverse inference that the effect of impurities is great enough to render negligible the value of the recoverable alcohol. Accordingly, we revised Tianjin Perfumery's FMV calculation by valuing the offset for the recovered alcohol as zero.

On February 4, 1997, the CIT affirmed the remand results of the Department in the matter of: Coumarin from the People's Republic of China; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, *Rhone Poulenc, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 95-03-00275 (May 9, 1996). As a result, the margins changed as listed below.

#### Suspension of Liquidation

During the pendency of the court suit, on July 7, 1995, the Court of International Trade preliminarily enjoined liquidation on all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 30, 1994, the date of publication of the preliminary determination in the LTFV investigation. Therefore, because no request for review was made in the anniversary month of the first review, and in accordance with 19 USC 1516a(e)(2), the Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate entries from July 30, 1994, up to and including February 29, 1996, the period of the first review, at the rates set forth below. Additionally, the Department will instruct the Customs

Service to collect cash deposits at these same rates for entries of subject merchandise occurring on or after March 1, 1996.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, we have re-calculated the LTFV margins as follows:

Exporter	Margin (percent)
Jiangsu Native Produce Import and Export Corp.	31.02.
Tianjin Native Produce Import and Export Corp.	70.45.
PRC-Wide Rate .....	160.80 (no change).

Dated: February 18, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-4509 Filed 2-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-560-801, A-570-844, A-583-825]

#### Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders and Amendment to Final Determination: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products From Indonesia, the People's Republic of China, and Taiwan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 25, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Everett Kelly or David J. Goldberger, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4194, or (202) 482-4136, respectively.

#### Amended Final Determination

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on January 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) made its final determinations that melamine institutional dinnerware from Indonesia, the People's Republic of China (PRC), and Taiwan is being sold at less than fair value (62 FR 1708-1733, January 13, 1997).

After publication of our final determinations, the American Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Association, the petitioner in these cases, alleged that the Department committed certain ministerial errors in calculating the

margins in these investigations. We have determined that ministerial errors were committed in calculating the margin from the Indonesian respondent P.T. Multi Rayah Indah Abah (Multiraya) (See, Memoranda to the file dated January 31, 1997, and February 3, 1997).

We are amending the final determination of the antidumping investigation of melamine institutional dinnerware from Indonesia to correct the ministerial error in the calculation for Multiraya. The correct cash deposit rate for Multiraya and the "all others" category producers/exporters of the subject merchandise from Indonesia is 8.95 percent.

With respect to the Department's final determinations for melamine institutional dinnerware from the PRC and Taiwan, the Department determined that certain corrections to these determinations were appropriate (see Memoranda to the file dated January 30 (Taiwan) and 31 (PRC), 1997). However, these corrections did not alter the margin percentages in the Taiwan case, nor alter the *de minimis* finding in the PRC case. Therefore, no amendments to the final determinations are necessary.

#### Scope of Orders

The merchandise covered by these orders is all items of dinnerware (e.g., plates, cups, saucers, bowls, creamers, gravy boats, serving dishes, platters, and trays) that contain at least 50 percent melamine by weight, have a minimum wall thickness of 0.08 inch, and are intended for use by institutions such as schools, hospitals, cafeterias, restaurants, and nursing homes. Melamine dinnerware that meets the physical characteristics described above that is generally sold to the retail sector and intended for use by households is not covered by these orders. Excluded as well from the scope of these orders are flatware products (e.g., knives, forks, and spoons).

The merchandise is classifiable under subheadings 3924.10.20, 3924.10.30, and 3924.10.50 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 these orders is dispositive.

#### Antidumping Duty Orders

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Act, the Department made its final determinations that melamine institutional dinnerware from Indonesia, the PRC, and Taiwan is being sold at less than fair value (62 FR 1708-1733, January 13, 1997). On February 18, 1997, the International Trade