3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below.

A copy of the application and the amendment and accompanying exhibits are available for public inspection at the following locations:

Office of the Port Director, U.S. Customs Service, 3575 Concord Drive, Vandalia, Ohio 45377

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230

Dated: June 11, 1998.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–16107 Filed 6–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Advocacy Questionnaire

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burdens, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before August 17, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Engelmeier, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; Phone number: (202) 482–3272.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Request for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to: Jay Brandes, The Advocacy Center, Room 3814A, the Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; Phone number: (202) 482–3896, and fax number: (202) 482–3508.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The International Trade Administration's Advocacy Center marshals federal resources to assist U.S. firms competing for foreign government procurements worldwide. The Advocacy Center is under the umbrella of the Trade Promotion Coordination Committee (TPCC), which is chaired by the Secretary of Commerce and includes 19 federal agencies involved in export promotion. The TPCC is tasked with assessing the U.S. Government (USG) advocacy in order to achieve a maximum increase in exports and to maximize job creation for American workers. The purpose of the questionnaire is to collect the necessary information to make an evaluation as to whether a U.S. firm qualifies for USG advocacy assistance. There are clear, well-established USG Advocacy Guidelines that describe the various situations in which the USG can provide advocacy support for a U.S. firm. The questionnaire was developed to collect only the information necessary to determine if the U.S. firm meets the conditions set forth in the guidelines. The Advocacy Center, appropriate ITA officials, our U.S. Embassies worldwide, and other federal government agencies that provide advocacy support to U.S. firms (Advocacy Network), will request U.S. firm(s) seeking USG advocacy support to complete the questionnaire. Without this information we will be unable to determine if a U.S. firm is eligible for U.S. Government advocacy assistance.

II. Method of Collection

Form ITA–4133P is sent to U.S. firms that request USG advocacy assistance.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0625–0220.

Form Number: ITA–4133P.

Type of Review: Revision-Regular Submission.

Affected Public: Companies who desire USG advocacy.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 400.

Estimated Time Per Response: 15 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 105.

Estimated Total Annual Costs: The estimated annual cost for this collection is $6,300. ($2,625 for federal government and $3,675 for respondents).

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and costs) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: June 11, 1998.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 98–16007 Filed 6–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–601]

Brass Sheet and Strip From Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not to Revoke Order in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the respondent, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Canada. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States, Wolverine Tube (Canada), Inc. The period covered is January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996. As a result of the review, the Department preliminarily determined that no dumping margins existed for this respondent. However, upon consideration of petitioner's and respondent's case briefs and rebuttal briefs, we have now determined that a dumping margin does exist. Therefore, we are not revoking the order with respect to brass sheet and strip from Canada manufactured by Wolverine Tube (Canada), Inc.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 17, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Stolz or Tom Futtner, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th

Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4474 or 482–3814, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) 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 references to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 353 (April 1, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) published an antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Canada on January 12, 1987 (52 FR 1217). On February 9, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Canada (63 FR 6519) (preliminary results). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received written comments from Hussey Copper, Ltd.; The Miller Company; Olin Corporation; Revere Copper Products, Inc.; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Union, Allied Industrial Workers of America (AFL–CIO); Merchandise Educational Society of America, and United Steelworkers of America (AFL–CIO), collectively, the petitioner, and Wolverine Tube (Canada), Inc., the respondent.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of brass sheet and strip (BSS), other than leaded and tinned BSS. The chemical composition of the covered products is currently defined in the Copper Development Association (C.D.A.) 200 Series or the Unified Numbering System (U.N.S.) C2000. This review does not cover products the chemical compositions of which are defined by other C.D.A. or U.N.S. series. In physical dimensions, the products covered by this review have a solid rectangular cross section over 0.006 inches (0.15 millimeters) through 0.188 inches (4.8 millimeters) in finished thickness or gauge, regardless of width. Coiled, wound-on-reels (traverse wound), and cut-to-length products are included. The merchandise is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7409.21.00 and 7409.29.00. Although the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive. Pursuant to the final affirmative determination of circumvention of the antidumping duty order, covering the period September 1, 1990, through September 30, 1991, we determined that brass plate used in the production of BSS falls within the scope of the antidumping duty order on BSS from Canada. *See Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order.* 58 FR 33610 (June 18, 1993).

The review period (POR) is January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996. The review involves one manufacturer/exporter, Wolverine Tube (Canada), Inc. (Wolverine).

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise from Canada to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the Export Price (EP) to the Normal Value (NV), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of the preliminary results of review notice (see Preliminary Results, 63 FR at 6520). On January 8, 1998, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued a decision in *CEMEX* v. *United States*, 1998 WL 3626 (Fed Cir.). In that case, based on the pre-URAA version of the Act, the Court discussed the appropriateness of using constructed value (CV) as the basis for foreign market value when the Department finds home market sales to be outside the ''ordinary course of trade.'' This issue was not raised by any party in this proceeding. However, the URAA amended the definition of sales outside the ''ordinary course of trade'' to include sales below cost. See Section 771(15) of the Act. Consequently, the Department has reconsidered its practice in accordance with this Court decision and has determined that it would be inappropriate to resort directly to CV, in lieu of foreign market sales, as the basis for NV if the Department finds foreign market sales of merchandise identical or most similar to that sold in the United States to be outside the ''ordinary course of trade''. We will match a given U.S. sale to foreign market sales of the next most similar model when all sales of the most comparable model are below cost. The Department will use CV as the basis for NV only when there are no above-cost sales that are otherwise suitable for comparison. Therefore, in this proceeding, when making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the ''Scope of Review'' section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in Sections B and C of our antidumping questionnaire. We have implemented the Court's decision in this case, to the extent that the data on the record permitted.

Revocation

Under the Department's regulations, the Department may revoke and order in part if the Secretary concludes that: (1) ''one or more producers or resellers covered by the order have sold the merchandise at not less than fair value for a period of at least three consecutive years''; (2) ''[i]t is not likely that those persons will in the future sell the merchandise at less than fair value * * *; and (3) ''the producers or resellers agree in writing to the immediate reinstatement of the order as long as any producer or reseller is subject to the order, if the Secretary concludes that the producer or reseller, subsequent to the revocation, sold the merchandise at less than fair value.'' *See* 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2).

Upon review of the three criteria described above, and of the case briefs and rebuttal briefs, and on the basis of all the evidence on the record, we determine for the final results of this review that the Department's requirements for revocation have not been met.

The Department found that Wolverine's sales reviewed during the eighth (1994) and ninth (1995) reviews under this order were made at not less than NV. However, in this tenth review, we have determined that Wolverine's sales were made at less than NV. We, therefore, do not revoke in part the antidumping duty order with respect Wolverine.

Changes

In our preliminary results we inadvertently failed to make a certain adjustment reported by the respondent. Since the adjustment constitutes business proprietary information, it is described in our analysis memorandum dated June 9, 1998.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: Wolverine claims that the Department erred in not taking into

consideration, in matching home market and U.S. sales, the product code information it submitted identifying reroll/nonreroll material. Petitioner states that the Department properly disregarded non-physical characteristics of Wolverine's product control numbering system, such as whether the brass content was reroll material, and that the Department should not accept a product matching system that is not based on actual physical elements of the merchandise.

Department Position: We agree with the Petitioner. The Department believes that the reroll/nonreroll designation, and its revision, ''type 1/type 2'' designation, indicates only whether Wolverine purchased brass for further rolling or cast the material itself. Wolverine maintains that brass it purchased from unrelated suppliers and then rerolled itself resulted in an end product more chemically pure and of a higher grain density than the end product produced from brass it cast itself. The Department believes that, although this designation may indicate a probability or tendency with respect to purity and grain density of the final end product, this designation does not objectively and scientifically describe actual purity and grain density as measurable physical characteristics of the end product. Wolverine has provided no quantifiable or verifiable data on the differences in purity and grain density between BSS made from reroll material and that made from non-reroll material. Therefore this criterion should not be considered as a product matching characteristic. Moreover, in its supplemental questionnaire, the Department stated that Wolverine should delete the reroll/nonreroll designation from its product matching criteria and report instead the actual chemical purity and grain density of sales of subject merchandise for the POR. Wolverine deleted the reroll/nonreroll designation from its product description but then did not add chemical purity and grain density designations to its product numbering system. Instead, Wolverine simply designated reroll and nonreroll as ''type 1'' and ''type 2'' subject merchandise, respectively. This designation does not provide an objective, measurable basis upon which to segregate the end-product into separate product groups for purposes of creating product matches. In addition, the record does not include details supporting separation of the subject merchandise into separate product groups on the basis of production process/costs and/or market selling prices, additional factors the Department might consider in establishing the product concordance.

Comment 2: Wolverine asserts that sales verification exhibit 19 should be included in the record of this proceeding. Wolverine maintains that topics covered in this exhibit, covering revocation issues, were listed in the verification outline, and it, therefore, created and presented exhibit 19 to avoid the possibility of the application of facts available by the Department in its analysis. In addition, Wolverine claims that sales verification exhibit 19, which the Department removed from the record as untimely submitted new information, should be placed back on the record in accordance with established rules of evidence because the petitioner, it claims, relied on exhibit 19 in arguments made in its case brief.

Petitioner states that the Department properly removed sales verification exhibit 19 from the administrative record as new information. Petitioner asserts that the respondent had ample opportunity to present company-specific information regarding revocation but waited until verification to do so. Furthermore, petitioner claims that the information presented in exhibit 19, covering revocation topics, did not correspond to information previously placed on the record and was not itself verified. Therefore, this exhibit cannot be relied upon as part of the administrative record.

Department Position: the Department believes that exhibit 19 contained untimely submitted new factual information. The Department believes that this information should have been presented, at the latest, when the Department opened the record for 30 days beginning on October 16, 1998, so that such information could be presented. The Department's verification outline stated only that the respondent should be prepared to discuss revocation topics. The Department did not request or solicit additional factual information pertaining to the revocation issue from respondent. In addition, the verifier informed respondent's counsel at the time exhibit 19 was presented that it could be considered new information and did not verify this information when it was presented for the first time at verification. Finally, we note that, because it has rejected exhibit 19, the Department has not relied on petitioner's reference in its case brief to exhibit 19 in reaching its final determination and therefore that reference does not incorporate exhibit 19 into the record of this proceeding.

Comment 3: Petitioner claims that Wolverine's per-unit cost of materials was understated because the overall cost of materials was divided by a quantity factor that included metals provided to Wolverine at no cost by customers to whom Wolverine provided only fabrication services. Wolverine did not purchase these metal input materials for these customers; therefore, the quantities of these materials should not have been added to quantities purchased by Wolverine for processing to determine total cost of materials. Respondent states that it reported material costs are accurate and require no adjustment. Wolverine notes that a standard mill loss allowance was deducted from tolled production quantity and was then added to non-tolled production quantity to be incorporated into calculations showing mill loss, in terms of quantity, including both tolled and non-tolled merchandise. Respondent cites verification cost exhibit 9a, which shows that the quantity of copper used for non-tolled production divided into the total cost of copper equals the reported per pound copper cost.

Department Position: We agree with the respondent. The Department verified that the reported per-unit materials cost was accurate. Although a mill loss adjustment was made to the metal pools account which reflected decreased quantities, this adjustment does not affect the cost of materials account. We also verified that the mill loss allowance was consistently applied in terms of quantity according to company accounting procedures. Because proprietary information is involved, please refer to our analysis memorandum dated June 9, 1998, for further information.

Comment 4: Petitioner assets that net home market prices, as calculated by the Department for purposes of the cost analysis, included indirect selling expenses. However, by definition, the cost of production (COP), to which net home market prices are compared for purposes of the below COP test, did not include indirect selling expenses. Petitioner claims, therefore, that the comparison of per unit COP with home market net prices results in an understatement of number of below cost sales. That is, home market prices are artificially high with respect to COP since home market prices include indirect selling expenses while COP does not. Respondent asserts that the COP already includes indirect selling expenses as these expenses are grouped under the general and administrative expenses (G&A) of the consolidated company, Wolverine USA, which were

included in the Department's calculation of COP.

Department Position: We agree with the respondent. Respondent's financial statements demonstrate that indirect selling expenses were included in general and administrative expenses. Adding an additional amount for indirect selling expenses to the COP would result in double-counting.

Comment 5: Petitioner states that the Department's calculation applied to Wolverine's general and administrative expenses to include an allocated portion of the expenses of Wolverine's corporate headquarters' included two minor errors with respect to the exchange rate and the revised selling, general and administrative (SG&A) ratio: (1) The Department used an incorrect exchange rate in calculating the preliminary results, and (2) the Department slightly understated the revision of the SG&A ratio. Wolverine did not specifically comment on this issue.

Department Position: We agree with petitioner that the exchange rate was rounded incorrectly and that the revised SG&A ratio was inaccurately recorded. We have corrected these errors which were clerical in nature. See our analysis memorandum dated 9, 1998; for the proprietary version of this amount.

Comment 6: Petitioner states that the Department properly adjusted Wolverine's general and administrative expenses to include an allocated portion of the G&A expenses incurred by Wolverine's corporate headquarters. Respondent asserts that no general expenses of the corporate headquarters should be allocated to the Fergus plant. Wolverine claims that the only U.S. operation of Wolverine that provided services to the Fergus facility was Wolverine Finance USA, which handles customer credit. Wolverine states that an appropriate proportion of Wolverine Finance USA expenses were allocated to the Fergus plant.

Department Position: We agree with petitioner that the adjustment to Wolverine's general and administrative expenses to include an allocated portion of expenses incurred by Wolverine's corporate headquarters is appropriate.

For purposes of the below COP test conducted for home market comparison sales we allocated a portion of SG&A expenses for the corporate headquarters in Huntsville/Decatur, Alabama to Wolverine's COP. This additional allocation was based on SG&A and cost of sales information taken from Wolverine's financial statements. In its questionnaire response, Wolverine did not allocate SG&A for its Huntsville/Decatur corporate headquarters, although it did allocate SG&A for its London, Ontario corporate offices. At verification, however, discussions with company officials and a review of company correspondence revealed that the Fergus, Ontario facility was subject to significant guidance and control by corporate headquarters in Huntsville/Decatur during the POR. Therefore, we calculated a ratio based on the Fergus Facility's reported cost of sales and the U.S. total cost of sales as follows. First we converted the reported Fergus cost of sales from Canadian dollars to U.S. dollars. Second, we divided the Fergus cost of sales (in U.S. dollars) by the U.S. total cost of sales as reported in respondent's 1996 consolidated income statement included in its April 28, 1997 questionnaire response as appendix. The result represents the appropriate proportion of U.S. SG&A expense to be applied to the Fergus operation. We then multiplied the appropriate proportion of U.S. SG&A expense to be applied to the Fergus operation by total SG&A taken from appendix A–5. We then converted this amount to Canadian dollars and added the U.S. portion of SG&A expense to the Canadian portion shown in exhibit H. Finally, we divided total G&A allocable to Fergus by the total cost of sales of Wolverine Tube (Canada), Inc. to yield the revised G&A factor. We adjusted the computer program to apply this revised G&A factor. See our analysis memorandum dated June 9, 1998, for the proprietary version of this comment.

Comment 7: Petitioner claims that the Department erroneously applied its revised SG&A ratio to Wolverine's originally reported SG&A amount, whereas it should have applied the revised ratio to Wolverine's reported cost of manufacture. Wolverine did not comment specifically on this issue.

Department Position: The Department agrees with petitioner that the revised SG&A should have been applied to Wolverine's cost of manufacture in accordance with our usual practice. We have adjusted our calculations to reflect this revision.

Comment 8: Petitioner claims that the Department failed to include revised warranty expenses outlined in the respondent's pre-verification submission of December 1, 1997. Respondent does not dispute petitioner's claim regarding the inclusion of warranty expenses.

Department Position: We agree with petitioner. The Department overloaded the submission of the revised warranty expenses in its calculations. We have revised our computer program in include the revised warranty expenses.

Comment 9: Petitioner argues that the Department erred by not requiring that additional historical data be placed on the record to inform the Department's decision with respect to the revocation issue. Petitioner asserts that the Department, as the administering authority, has not complied with its investigative responsibilities in this respect. In addition, petitioner maintains that the burden is on Wolverine to demonstrative that it is not likely to resume dumping if the order were revoked, and that Wolverine has not been forthcoming with company-specific information on this point. Furthermore, petitioner claims that respondent should not be able to obtain revocation based on a limited number of sales, of a limited product range, to a limited number of customers. Respondent states that no compelling need exists to place further information with respect to revocation on the record. Respondent states that ample opportunity has been provided for interested parties to place information on the record. In addition, respondent claims that volume and value information from previous proceedings would not have probative value in this review. Wolverine claims that it is not likely to dump in the future and rebuts petitioner's arguments that it is likely to do so. Finally, Wolverine states that it takes its legal responsibilities seriously and considers potential reinstatement of the order to be a viable remedy were it to resume dumping following revocation.

Department Position: The Department does not need to reach the issues raised by the parties in this review with respect to likelihood of future following a revocation of an antidumping duty order because it has determined on other grounds that the revocation of the order at issue is not appropriate.

Comment 10: Petitioner argues that Wolverine is likely to dump in the future because: (1) U.S. prices have been declining, (2) Wolverine's preliminary margin was just barely *de minimis*, (0.042 percent), (3) Wolverine has economic incentive to dump as it must replace certain lost business, and (4) the U.S. market is the most likely target for dumping due to the openness of the market, strong demand, and price competition. Wolverine denies that is likely to dump in the future. It asserts that the U.S. and Canadian brass market comprise a unified market, thus brass prices will rise and fall in tandem. In addition, Wolverine claims that although it lost certain business, that business involved non-subject merchandise which did not include the production process of annealing. Therefore, the loss of that business does not create additional capacity to

produce, and presumably dump, additional subject merchandise which requires annealing.

Department Position: These issues were addressed in the preliminary results wherein the Department indicated that it did not consider these factors conclusive. Final determinations regarding these points need not be reached in these final results since we not find that, due to the extensive of a non-*de-minimis* dumping margin in this review, Wolverine is not eligible for revocation pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2).

Final Results for the Review

As a result of our comparison of EP to NV, we determine that a dumping margin of 0.67 percent exists for Wolverine for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996, and we determine, not to revoke in part the antidumping duty order with respect to imports of subject merchandise from Wolverine.

The Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total quantity of sales examined during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Wolverine will be the rate stated above; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less than fair value (LTFV) 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 (3) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification of Interested Parties

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 the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). 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 sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 9, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–16106 Filed 6–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–805]

Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube From Mexico: 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 December 8, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from Mexico covering exports of this merchandise to the United States by one manufacturer/exporter, Hylsa S.A. de C.V. (''Hylsa'') during the period November 1, 1995 through October 31, 1996. *See Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Termination of Review,* 62 FR 64564 (*Preliminary Results*). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments and rebuttals from petitioners and Hylsa. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 17, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ilissa Kabak at (202) 482–0145 or John Kugelman at (202) 482–0649, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) 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 references to the Department's regulations are to 19 C.F.R. Part 353 (April 1, 1997). Where appropriate, we have cited the Department's new regulations, codified at 19 C.F.R. 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997). While not binding on this review, the new regulations serve as a restatement of the Department's policies.

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico on November 2, 1992 (57 FR 49453). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1995/96 review period on November 4, 1996 (61 FR 56663). On November 27, 1996, respondents Hylsa and Tuberia Nacional S.A. de C.V. (''TUNA'') requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico. We initiated this review on December 16, 1996. *See* 61 FR 66017. On February 4, 1997, TUNA requested a withdrawal from the proceeding. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department may allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. TUNA's request for withdrawal was timely and there were no requests for review of TUNA from other