James C. Doyle at 202/482–0159, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 4, 1998, the Department and the Government of the People's Republic of China initialed an Amendment to change the base period for calculating reference prices from the most recent six months of data to the most recent three months of data. The purpose of this amendment is to allow the reference prices to conform more closely to market conditions. The Department subsequently released the Amendment to interested parties for comment. After careful consideration by the Department of the comments submitted on March 24, 1998, and further consultations between the parties, the Department and the Government of the People's Republic of China signed a final Amendment on April 13, 1998. The text of the final Amendment follows this notice.

Dated: April 16, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

The United States Department of Commerce and the Government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) hereby amend Section IV. REFERENCE PRICE of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Honey from the PRC, signed August 2, 1995 to read as follows:

Section IV. REFERENCE PRICE

The reference prices are equal to the product of 92 percent and the weighted-average of the honey unit import values from all other countries based on the most recent three months of data at the time the reference price is calculated. The source of the unit import values is publicly available United States trade statistics from the United States Bureau of the Census.

This amendment shall apply to all reference prices effective on and after July 1, 1998.

Dated: April 10, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

For the United States Department of Commerce.

Dated: April 13, 1998.

Qian Changyong,

For the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation, PRC.

[FR Doc. 98–10998 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–820]

Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany: Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On March 18, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany (63 FR 13217) covering the period January 27, 1995 through July 31, 1996. Based on the correction of a ministerial error made in the final results, we are publishing this amendment.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 27, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Decker or Linda Ludwig, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0196 or 482–3833, respectively.

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 by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1, 1997).

Background

On March 18, 1998, the Department published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany (63 FR 13217). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Mannesmannroehren-Werke AG (''MRW''), and Mannesmann Pipe & Steel Corporation (''MPS'') (collectively ''Mannesmann''), for the period January 27, 1995 through July 31, 1996. After publication of our final results, we received timely allegations from petitioner and Mannesmann that we had made ministerial errors in calculating the final results. The petitioner filed a timely rebuttal to Mannesmann's ministerial error allegations. We corrected our calculations, where we agree that we made ministerial errors, in accordance with section 751 (h) of the Tariff Act.

Analysis of Ministerial Error Allegations Received From Interested Parties

We received two ministerial error allegations from Mannesmann and one from petitioner. First, Mannesmann contends that the Department neglected to convert certain indirect selling expenses and inventory carrying costs (RINDIRSU and INVCARU) to U.S. dollars from Deutsche Marks. Mannesmann notes that these variables are created using a factor multiplied by the cost of manufacturing (TOTCOMCV) which is reported in Deutsche Marks. Mannesmann asserts that the Department should correct the final results by converting RINDIRSU and INVCARU to U.S. dollars.

As defined by section 751(h) Act, the term ''ministerial error'' includes errors ''in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the [Department] considers ministerial.'' We agree with Mannesmann that RINDIRSU and INVCARU should be converted to U.S. dollars. This type of unintentional error meets the definition of ministerial error contained in the Act. We have made the suggested correction for the amended final results.

Second, Mannesmann asserts that the factors for general and administrative expenses (GNA) and interest expenses are based upon cost data as reported by Mannesmann and not as adjusted by the Department. Therefore, Mannesmann argues, these GNA and interest factors should be applied before the Department's billet cost adjustment is made to material costs.

Petitioner argues that Mannesmann has made no showing that applying the GNA and expense factors to Mannesmann's adjusted cost of manufacturing (COM) was an inadvertent or unintentional act, as opposed to a deliberate, methodological choice by the Department. Petitioner cites *Melamine Chemicals, Inc.* v. *United States,* 592 F. Supp. 1338, 1340–

41 (CIT 1984) as stating that under the ministerial error procedure the Department may only correct an inadvertence or mistake that involves no discretionary considerations. Petitioner further contends that the Department applied the interest expense and GNA factors to Mannesmann's adjusted COM correctly under the law. Petitioner asserts that Mannesmann fails to cite any previous case where, unlike in this case, the Department performed its build-up of cost of production (COP) by applying GNA and interest expense factors to a COM that values a major input at the affiliates' reported cost of production even though the Department expressly disregarded those costs. Petitioner argues that it is standard Department practice that all COP/CV cost calculations be based on a respondent's manufacturing costs as adjusted, when appropriate, under the major input rule.

We agree with petitioner that this issue is methodological in nature and have not made this correction in the amended final results. We note that the same calculation was made in the preliminary results of review, and Mannesmann did not comment on it in its case brief.

Third, petitioner argues that the Department erred in the calculation of net price (NPRICOP) for use in the cost test. Petitioner asserts that the calculations performed understate the adjustments to GRSUPRH (gross unit price) and overstate NPRICOP. Petitioner notes that Mannesmann's failure at verification on certain inland freight charges (INLFTC2H) essentially resulted in the Department's application of adverse facts available in the calculation of normal value. The petitioner further argues that the Department's calculation of NPRICOP in the below-cost test rewards Mannesmann by raising net price, thereby tending to cause fewer sales to fall below cost.

We disagree with petitioner that this issue is clerical in nature. We find that this issue is methodological in nature and have not made this correction in the amended final results. Since most of petitioner's argument is business proprietary, please see Amended Final Analysis Memorandum for a more detailed explanation of this issue. We note that the same calculation was made in the preliminary results of review, and petitioner did not comment on it in its case brief.

Amended Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
Mannesmann	1/27/95—7/31/96	21.94

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the entered value of each entry of subject merchandise during the POR. We will direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The amended deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication date of this notice and will remain in effect until the publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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 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 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of 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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with Section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 16, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–10999 Filed 4–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–423–808, A–122–830, A–475–822, A–791–805, A–580–831 and A–583–830]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 27, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Presing (Belgium), at (202) 482–0194; Maureen McPhillips (Canada), at (202) 482–0193; Rick Johnson (Italy, Republic of Korea, and Taiwan) at (202) 482–3818; Robert James (Republic of South Africa), at (202) 482–5222, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigations

The 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 current regulations, as amended by the regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27296).

The Petition

On March 31, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by Armco, Inc., J&L Specialty Steel, Inc.[1], Lukens, Inc., North American Stainless[2], the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO/CLC[3], the Butler Armco Independent Union and the Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. (petitioners). The Department received supplemental information to the petition on April 14, 15, 17 and 20, 1998.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, petitioners allege that imports of stainless steel plate in coils (SSPC) from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of South Africa, Republic of Korea and

[1] J&L Speciality Steel, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Belgium case.

[2] North American Stainless is not a petitioner in the Italy case.

[3] The United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO/CLC is not a petitioner in the Canada case.