

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Flood or Chip Hayes, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Tariff Act), as amended, are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR section 353 (April 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 18, 1998, the Department published the final results of its administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (63 FR 33320). The types of subject merchandise covered by these orders are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs), cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof (CRBs), and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof (SPBs). The reviews covered twenty manufacturers/exporters and the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997. After publication of our final results, we received timely allegations from the petitioner and two respondents that we made ministerial errors in calculating the final results with regard to BBs from Italy, Romania and the United Kingdom.

A summary of each allegation along with the Department's response is included below. We corrected our calculations, where we agree that we made ministerial errors, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Tariff Act.

Clerical Error Allegations

Allegation 1: The petitioner alleges that the Department made clerical errors in SKF Italy's margin program that fail to convert two variables to their full values and fail to include all necessary values in the calculation of revenue for home-market transactions.

Department's Position: We agree and have changed SKF Italy's margin program accordingly.

Allegation 2: The respondent, Technoimportexport (TIE), alleges that the Department made a clerical error in TIE's margin program for two different

models. TIE alleges this clerical error inflates certain values for packing materials by a factor of 1,000.

Department's Position: We agree that this was a clerical error and have changed the margin program accordingly.

Allegation 3: The petitioner alleges that due to a clerical error in the Barden Corporation (U.K.) Ltd's (Barden's) margin program certain values are being assigned incorrectly. For further proprietary discussion of this error, see Memorandum to the File, dated 7/17/98.

Department's Position: We agree and have changed the margin program accordingly. However, this change did not affect Barden's margin.

Amended Final Results of Reviews

As a result of the amended margin calculations, the following weighted-average percentage margins exist for the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997:

| Country and manufacturer/exporter | BBs margin (percent) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Italy: SKF | 3.80 |
| Romania: TIE | 0.02 |
| United Kingdom: Barden | *6.63 |

*This margin did not change as a result of the correction.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Because sampling and other simplification methods prevent entry-by-entry assessments, we have calculated, wherever possible, an exporter/importer-specific assessment rate in accordance with the methodology described in the final results (63 FR 33320, 33321). We will also direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with the procedures discussed in the final results of review and as amended by this determination. 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 of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

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 Department'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 an administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with section 751(a)(1) and (h) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR Section 353.28(c).

Dated: July 23, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-20515 Filed 7-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-802]

Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is hereby notifying interested parties of a change to the administration of matched sales. Effective immediately, the Department will use a calendar year quota accounting rather than the previously used delivery year quota accounting.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Doyle, Karla Whalen or Letitia Kress, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0159, (202) 482-1386 or (202) 482-6412, respectively.

Background

Under the Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation (57 FR

15373, April 1, 1994) (the "Matched Sales" Amendment), the Department has been administering the matched uranium sales quota on a quota year basis, April 1 through March 31, as listed in the "Matched Sales" Amendment. On March 6, 1998, the Department received a request from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) on behalf of certain of its members requesting that the Department revise its practice and administer the matched sales quota on a calendar year basis, January 1 through December 31. (See letter from NEI to the Department on March 6, 1998, on public record at the Department of Commerce in room B-099). In this letter, NEI suggests that a calendar year quota system would make tracking operational or contractual flexibilities for both buyers and sellers of uranium more consistent with their other internal tracking systems (*i.e.*, budgeting, requests for quotes, deliveries). NEI states that administration on a calendar year basis would make the matched sales quota system more consistent with industry contracting practices, thereby eliminating a potential barrier to participation in the matched sales program. Further, NEI notes that reconciliation of historical transactions which specified deliveries in 1996 and 1997 does not affect the commercial balance among competing suppliers as marketing opportunities have long passed.

On May 5, 1998, the Department requested comments from interested parties (63 FR 24772). The Department received ten sets of comments from affected companies and reviewed each set of comments. As all comments received were supportive of the change, and as the reallocation would not cause any quota limitations to be exceeded, the Department has determined that it is reasonable to change the administration of the matched sales quota from a quota year basis (*i.e.*, April 1–March 31) to a calendar year basis (*i.e.*, January 1–December 31).

The Department examined two ensuing issues: (1) The effect the change will have on the existing approved contracts and allocations of quota; and (2) the necessity to arrive at a proper accounting for the periods April 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996 and January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2004.

Concerning the first issue, the Department has determined that contracts already approved by the Department in quota years 1996–1997 (4/1/96–3/31/97; 4/1/97–3/31/98) will not be affected by the change to a calendar year basis other than on the Department's accounting system. Thus, these contracts stand as approved and

deliveries may continue as scheduled. Further, although the amount of used quota allocated to these two periods will change under the new system, the overall totals do not (See 63 FR 24772, May 5, 1997).

Concerning the second issue, the "Matched Sales" Amendment details that delivery quotas began on April 1, 1996, and would expire on March 31, 2004. By switching to a calendar year basis, neither the period April 1, 1996, through December 31, 1996 nor the period January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2004, which were covered under the Department's previous quota year methodology, can fall under a calendar year methodology absent modification. To resolve this issue, NEI proposed designating calendar year 1996 as a "short" quota year, starting April 1, 1996 and ending December 31, 1996. As these contracts have already been approved and as the Department has determined the appropriate reconciliation in accounting, (See 63 FR 24772, May 5, 1997), the Department agrees that the designation of a "short year" is a suitable resolution. In addition, NEI proposed that calendar year 2003 be designated as a "long" quota year, beginning January 1, 2003 and ending March 31, 2004. The Department agrees that it is reasonable to designate calendar year 2003 as a "long year" without disruption to the administration of matched sales.

Thus, effective immediately, the Department will use a calendar year quota system in administering matched sales. The following chart details the current effective time periods and applicable matched sales quotas.

| Calendar year | Available quota ¹ (in lbs. U308) |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1998 | 3,600,000 |
| 1999 | 4,040,000 |
| 2000 | 4,230,000 |
| 2001 | 4,040,000 |
| 2002 | 4,890,000 |
| 2003 ² | 4,300,000 |

¹ Please note that some quota has already been allocated to previously approved contracts. Please contact the listed Departmental personnel for the exact available quota in each calendar year.

² "Long year" dates (1/1/03–3/31/04)

Dated: July 27, 1998

Joseph A. Spetrini.

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping Countervailing Duty—Group III.

[FR Doc. 98–20516 Filed 7–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of First Request for Panel Review.

SUMMARY: On July 15, 1998, Wolverine Tube (Canada) Inc. filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the final antidumping duty administrative review determination made by the International Trade Administration, respecting Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 33037) on June 17, 1998. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA–CDA–98–1904–03 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James R. Holbein, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230, (202) 482–5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on July 15, 1998, requesting panel review of the