

	Period
Potassium Chloride, A-122-701 .....	1/1/97-12/31/97
Japan:	
Sodium Azide, A-588-839 .....	1/1/97-12/31/97

In accordance with § 351.213 of the regulations, an interested party as defined by section 771(9) of the Act may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. In recent revisions to its regulations, the Department changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 771(9) of the Act, an interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order or suspension agreement for which they are requesting a review (Department of Commerce Regulations, 62 FR 27295, 27424 (May 19, 1996)). Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which export(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Enforcement, Attention: Sheila Forbes, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 351.303(f)(1)(i) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation" for requests received by the last day of January 1998. If the

Department does not receive, by the last day of January 1998, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: January 6, 1998.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-612 Filed 1-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[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 final 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:** January 12, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alain Letort or John R. Kugelmann, 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 published the preliminary results of these administrative reviews in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 1997 (62 FR 47422). Because it is not practicable to complete these reviews by the current deadline of January 7, 1998, the Department is extending the time limits for the final results of the aforementioned reviews to March 9, 1998, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994. 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: December 29, 1997.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.*

[FR Doc. 98-607 Filed 1-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

[A-570-849]

#### **Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From the People's Republic of China**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 12, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lyn Baranowski, Doreen Chen, or Stephen Jacques, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th

Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1385, (202) 482-0413 or (202) 482-1391, respectively.

### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this investigation are hot-rolled iron and non-alloy steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm but not exceeding 1250 mm and of a thickness of not less than 4 mm, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain iron and non-alloy steel flat-rolled products not in coils, of rectangular shape, hot-rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 mm or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness. Included as subject merchandise in this petition are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. This merchandise is currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) under item numbers 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, 7208.51.0030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

### Amendment of Final Determination

On November 20, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final determination of the less than fair value ("LTFV") investigation on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from the People's Republic of China ("Final Determination"), 62 FR 61964 (November 20, 1997). This investigation

covered the following PRC firms unless otherwise indicated:

(1) China Metallurgical Import & Export Liaoning Company ("Liaoning"), an exporter of subject merchandise; Wuyang Iron and Steel Company ("Wuyang"), which produced the merchandise sold by Liaoning;

(2) Anshan Iron and Steel Complex ("AISCO"), a producer of subject merchandise; Angang International Trade Corporation ("Anshan International"), a wholly-owned AISCO subsidiary in China which exported subject merchandise made by AISCO, and Sincerely Asia, Limited ("SAL"), a partially-owned Hong Kong affiliate of AISCO involved in sales of subject merchandise to the United States (collectively, "Anshan");

(3) Baoshan Iron & Steel Corporation ("Bao"), a producer of subject merchandise; Bao Steel International Trade Corporation ("Bao Steel ITC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Bao responsible for selling Bao material domestically and abroad; and Bao Steel Metals Trading Corporation ("B.M. International"), a partially-owned U.S. subsidiary involved in U.S. sales (collectively, "Baoshan");

(4) Wuhan Iron & Steel Company ("Wuhan"), a producer of subject merchandise; International Economic and Trading Corporation ("IETC"), a wholly-owned subsidiary responsible for exporting Wuhan merchandise; Cheerwu Trader Ltd. ("Cheerwu"), a partially-owned Hong Kong affiliate of Wuhan involved in sales of subject merchandise to the United States (collectively, "WISCO");

(5) Shanghai Pudong Iron and Steel Company ("Shanghai Pudong"), a producer and exporter of subject merchandise. During the investigation, we also requested information from and conducted verification of Shanghai No. 1, a non-exporting producer of subject merchandise which Shanghai Pudong had earlier indicated shared a common trustee, Shanghai Metallurgical Holding (Group) Co. ("Shanghai Metallurgical").

We consider Liaoning, Anshan, Baoshan, WISCO and Shanghai Pudong to be sellers of the subject merchandise during the period of investigation (POI). The POI is April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1996.

On November 7, 1997, we received a submission from Anshan, Baoshan, Shanghai Pudong, and WISCO ("respondents") alleging clerical errors with regard to the final determination in the LTFV investigation of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from the PRC. On November 19, 1997, counsel for the petitioning companies, Geneva Steel Company and Gulf States Steel

Company ("petitioners") submitted rebuttal comments. The allegations and rebuttal comments of both parties were filed in a timely fashion.

Respondents allege that the Department made eleven ministerial errors in the final results. First, respondents contend that the Department did not value silicon sand in the same manner for all companies. In particular, the Department, they allege, valued silicon sand based on "stones, sand, and gravel" from the UN Trade Commodity Statistics for one company and based on pure silicon for another company. To avoid asymmetrical treatment of respondents, they argue that, in an amended final determination, the Department should value silicon sand using the value for "stones, sand, and gravel" for both companies using this input. Petitioners did not comment on this issue.

We agree with respondents that this error was clerical in nature and have made the suggested correction for the amended final determination.

Second, respondents additionally contend that the Department erred in assigning consumption factor information field names for two inputs for WISCO. Petitioners did not comment on this issue.

We agree with respondents that this error was clerical in nature and have made the suggested correction for the amended final determination. Because this issue involves business proprietary information, please see the Concurrence Memorandum which corresponds to this Amended Final Determination for more information.

Third, respondents allege that the Department incorrectly increased a certain factor for each of WISCO's control numbers, citing a clerical error in the spreadsheets for the iron-making stage of production. Respondents state that there does not appear to be any error in the calculation of this factor and the Department should use the original factor. Petitioners maintain that the Department was clear that it was correcting an error made by respondents, and thus the correction is not a ministerial error.

We have determined that the correction at issue was not an error but an appropriate correction made as a result of the Department's identification of an error made by respondents in the spreadsheets. Because this information involves business proprietary information, please see the Concurrence Memorandum corresponding to this Amended Final Determination for a further explanation of this issue.

Fourth, respondents argue that Department erred in assigning adverse

facts available to certain of WISCO's inputs which were not reported prior to verification. Instead, because the Department verified the actual consumption information, they argue that the Department should use the verified information as facts available. In addition, respondents state that it is the Department's practice, under Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the PRC, 59 FR 22585, 22591 (May 2, 1994) and Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware from the PRC: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 32757, 32760 (June 17, 1997), to use verified information in the final determination. Petitioners disagree with respondents and state that this decision was clearly methodological in nature.

We agree with petitioners that this decision was methodological in nature; see WISCO's Calculation Memorandum dated October 24, 1997 at 3 and the Concurrence Memorandum dated October 24, 1997 ("Final Determination Concurrence Memorandum") at 25-26. As much of this information is business proprietary, please see the Final Determination Concurrence Memorandum that corresponds to this Amended Final Determination for a more detailed explanation of this issue.

Fifth, respondents allege that the Department erroneously used incorrect factor information for three of Anshan's factors. Petitioners argue that the Department's treatment of these factors is the result of a substantive methodological choice.

We have determined that we did use the correct factor information for these factors in our margin calculation for Anshan. For a further explanation of this issue, please see the Concurrence Memorandum which corresponds to this Amended Final Determination.

Sixth, respondents contend that the Department erroneously used incorrect factor information for one of Baoshan's factors. Petitioners argue that the Department should reject this allegation since Baoshan failed to state what the correct value should be for this input.

The Department has determined that it used the correct consumption factor in its calculations. See Baoshan's Calculation Memorandum at 5 and in Baoshan's Margin Calculation program at line 654 and 662. See the Concurrence Memorandum which corresponds to this Amended Final Determination for more information.

Seventh, respondents argue that the Department incorrectly rejected gas factors for both Baoshan and WISCO. For Baoshan, respondents assert that the three justifications that the Department

gives for not using the reported factors are factually incorrect; they claim that Baoshan submitted complete information within the deadline set for the supplemental questionnaire response, and that this information was verified by the Department. For WISCO, respondents contend that gas information was submitted within the deadline set by the Department's regulations, and thus rejection of this information constitutes a "manifest legal error." Petitioners contend that the record shows that the Department carefully considered Baoshan's and WISCO's claims that they had submitted complete, accurate, and timely information on factors of production for gases. Thus, the decision to reject information for both Baoshan and WISCO was clearly methodological in nature and involves the Department's rejection of information based on the fact that respondents failed to provide complete and timely information in a useable form.

We agree with petitioners that the Department's decision with respect to the gas factors of both companies was clearly methodological. See Final Determination at 61976-61977 and Final Determination Concurrence Memorandum at 20-21 and 28-29. As much of this information is business proprietary, please refer to the Concurrence Memorandum that corresponds to this Amended Final Determination for a more detailed explanation of this issue.

Eighth, respondents contend that the Department erred in applying adverse facts available to surrogate values for certain inputs and freight charges for WISCO and that the Department was, in fact, able to verify the terms of sale for these market economy purchases.

Petitioners argue that the Department is clear that it was not able to verify all the terms of sale, and thus these items could not be considered "verified." Because the Department is required to base its final determination on verified information, petitioners claim that the Department was correct in applying facts available to this input.

We have determined that this decision was clearly methodological in nature. See Final Determination at 61997 and Final Determination Concurrence Memorandum at 27. As much of this information is business proprietary, please see the Concurrence Memorandum corresponding to this Amended Final Determination for a complete explanation of this issue.

Ninth, respondents argue that the Department erred, in two respects, in its implementation of the decision of *Sigma v. United States*, 117 F.2d 1401

(Fed. Cir. 1997) ("*Sigma*"). First, respondents allege the Department misapplied the *Sigma* decision for all of WISCO's inputs valued using CIF surrogate data by adding freight charges to WISCO's inputs valued using CIF surrogate data when instead, the Department should not have added any freight cost to these inputs since WISCO is located on a port. Second, respondents allege that the Department misapplied the *Sigma* decision when determining the "highest calculated freight rate" as best information available for Anshan, Baoshan and WISCO. Respondents argue that the Department erred by using as the "highest calculated freight rate" the highest freight charge for any input based on a weighted average freight calculation of all suppliers of that input. Respondents maintain that based on the *Sigma* decision, the highest calculated freight rate for inputs valued using freight-inclusive surrogate values should be, instead, the highest of freight charges calculated for any input based on either (1) the shortest distance from the respondents to the closest port; or (2) the shortest distance from the respondent to the closest supplier. Petitioners argue that the Department's methodology conforms to the *Sigma* decision. Petitioners argue that the Department's choice of freight methodology is not a ministerial error, and the court in *Sigma* did not dictate what the Department's freight methodology should be.

We agree that this decision was clearly methodological in nature. See Final Determination at 61977. See the Concurrence Memorandum which corresponds to this Amended Final Determination for a more detailed explanation.

Tenth, respondents suggest that the Department committed a clerical error by averaging the river freight rates from two sources in the final determination. Petitioners state that the decision to average the two rates is a deliberate methodological choice, based on the Department's reservations about using either set of rates exclusively.

We agree that the decision was clearly methodological in nature. See Final Determination at 61983-61984 and Final Determination Concurrence Memorandum at 13-14.

Eleventh, respondents allege that the Department erred in its calculation of overhead, SG&A and profit rates because the Department based its calculations on only two Indian companies' annual reports used instead of using six submitted annual reports for Indian companies and the industry financial information from the Reserve

Bank of India Bulletin, all of which were also on the record. Respondents argue that one of the two Indian companies whose reports were used by the Department did not produce subject merchandise as of 1993. Therefore respondents argue that the Department was not justified in rejecting the financial statements of the other four companies for not being "actual producers of subject merchandise in the surrogate country." Petitioners argue that the Department's decision to use financial data from only two Indian companies, SAIL and TATA, was correct and consistent with Department's practice in other investigations. Petitioners point out that the Department stated that its decision to include TATA's annual reports in their calculations was based on the statement that TATA is a significant producer of steel and hot rolled coils and TATA may also produce products that the Department considers to be plate, but which may be incorporated into TATA's annual report in the category "sheets." See Final Determination at 61970.

We agree with petitioners this decision was clearly methodological in nature. See Final Determination at 61969-70. Although one sentence in TATA's annual report indicates that TATA has not produced any "plate" since 1993, another section of the same annual report lists plate as a product produced by TATA. In addition, Iron and Steel Works of the World, 12th Edition lists both companies as producers of plate.

**Amended Final Results of Review**

As a result of our review of the errors alleged and the correction of the two ministerial errors described above, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Weighted-average manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Anshan (AISCO/Anshan International/Sincerely Asia Ltd).	30.68
Baoshan (Bao/Baoshan International Trade Corp/Bao Steel Metals Trading Corp). ..	30.51
Liaoning .....	17.33
Shanghai Pudong .....	38.16
WISCO (Wuhan/International Economic and Trading Corp/ Cheerwu Trader Ltd). .....	128.59
China-wide Rate .....	128.59

**China-wide Rate**

The China-wide rate applies to all entries of the subject merchandise except for entries from exporters that are identified individually above.

On October 24, 1997, the Department entered into an Agreement with the Government of the PRC suspending this investigation. Pursuant to Section 734(g) of the Act, petitioners, Liaoning and Wuyang requested that this investigation be continued. Because the International Trade Commission's determination was affirmative, the Agreement shall remain in force but the Department shall not issue an Antidumping duty order so long as (1) the Agreement remains in force, (2) the Agreement continues to meet the requirements of subsection (d) and (l) of the Act, and the parties to the Agreement carry out their obligations under the Agreement in accordance with its terms. See Section 734(f)(3)(B) of the Act.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act.

Dated: December 22, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-609 Filed 1-9-98; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-580-812]

**Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabyte or Above From the Republic of Korea Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Time Limits**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limits of preliminary results of review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit of the preliminary results of the fourth antidumping duty administrative review of dynamic random access memory semiconductors one megabyte and above from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period May 1, 1996 through April 30, 1997.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 12, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Blankenbaker or John Conniff, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office IV, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0989/1009.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Currently, the preliminary results for the fourth review of Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMS) from Korea are due January 30, 1998. This review covers the period May 1, 1996 to April 30, 1997. The Department has received submissions from three respondents: LG Semicon, Hyundai and Techgrow Limited. However, due to the complexity of the issues involved in this case, including an allegation of transshipment through third country exporters and the requests by respondents for revocation the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits set forth by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until March 2, 1998. This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

**Robert S. LaRussa,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Dated: January 5, 1998.  
[FR Doc. 98-610 Filed 1-9-98; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-401-040]

**Stainless Steel Plate From Sweden: 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.

**SUMMARY:** On July 8, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the review of the antidumping duty finding on stainless steel plate from Sweden. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 12, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael J. Heaney or Linda Ludwig, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.,