

**COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED ON OR BEFORE: November 23, 1998.**

**ADDRESSES:** Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Gateway 3, Suite 310, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-4302.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Beverly Milkman (703) 603-7740

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice is published pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 47(a)(2) and 41 CFR 51-2.3. Its purpose is to provide interested persons an opportunity to submit comments on the possible impact of the proposed actions.

**Additions**

If the Committee approves the proposed addition, all entities of the Federal Government (except as otherwise indicated) will be required to procure the commodities and services listed below from nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities. I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in connection with the commodities and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List. Comments on this certification are invited. Commenters should identify the statement(s) underlying the certification on which they are providing additional information.

The following commodities and services have been proposed for addition to Procurement List for production by the nonprofit agencies listed:

*Commodities*

Pen, Ballpoint, Pushcap w/Refills  
7520-01-451-1065 (Black Barrel, Black Ink)  
7520-01-451-1066 (Burgundy Barrel, Blue Ink)  
7510-01-451-2269 (Refill, Black Ink)  
7510-01-451-2273 (Refill, Blue Ink)

NPA: West Texas Lighthouse for the Blind, San Angelo, Texas

*Services*

Grounds Maintenance

Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California, NPA: Desert Area Resources and Training, Ridgecrest, California

Laundry Service

New England Area Requirements-FISC, NPA: Newport County Chapter of Retarded Citizens, Inc., Middletown, Rhode Island

**Deletions**

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities.

2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the commodities to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in connection with the commodities proposed for deletion from the Procurement List.

The following commodities have been proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

Tool Box, Portable

5140-00-651-7676

5140-00-388-3416

5140-00-226-9020

5140-00-226-9021

5140-00-329-6305

5140-00-226-9019

5140-00-226-9018

5140-00-289-8911

5140-00-289-8910

**Connie S. Corley,**

*Administrative Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-28469 Filed 10-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

**ACTION:** Amended final results of administrative review of antidumping duty order.

**SUMMARY:** On September 23, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) of One Megabit or Above from the Republic of Korea. This review covered two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and four third-country resellers from Singapore, Malaysia, Canada, and Hong Kong for the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997. The two manufacturers/exporters were Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co. (Hyundai), and LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LG, formerly Goldstar Electronics Co., Ltd.). The third-country resellers were Techgrow Limited (Hong Kong) (Techgrow), Singapore Resources Pte. Ltd. (Singapore), NIE Electronics Sdn. Bhd. (Malaysia) (NIE), and Vitel Electronics Ottawa Office (Canada) (Vitel).

LG and Hyundai submitted ministerial error allegations with respect to the final results of administrative review on September 17, 1998. The petitioner, Micron Technology Inc. (Micron), submitted rebuttal comments on September 24, 1998. Based on the correction of certain ministerial errors made in the final results of review, we are amending our final results of review with respect to LG. We are also clarifying the assessment language cited in our final results with respect to both LG and Hyundai.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 23, 1998.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Applicable Statute and Regulations**

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has now amended the final results of this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department's regulations are to the regulations set forth at 19 CFR 353 (1997).

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration**

**Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea: (A-580-812)**

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

## Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of DRAMs of one megabit or above from Korea. Included in the scope are assembled and unassembled DRAMs of one megabit and above. Assembled DRAMs include all package types. Unassembled DRAMs include processed wafers, uncut die, and cut die.

Processed wafers produced in Korea, but packaged or assembled into memory modules in a third country, are included in the scope; wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review includes memory modules. A memory module is a collection of DRAMs, the sole function of which is memory. Modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs), single in-line memory modules (SIMMs), or other collections of DRAMs, whether unmounted or mounted on a circuit board. Modules that contain other parts that are needed to support the function of memory are covered. Only those modules which contain additional items which alter the function of the module to something other than memory, such as video graphics adapter (VGA) boards and cards, are not included in the scope. The scope of this review also includes video random access memory semiconductors (VRAMS), as well as any future packaging and assembling of DRAMs; and, removable memory modules placed on motherboards, with or without a central processing unit (CPU), unless the importer of the motherboards certifies with the Customs Service that neither it nor a party related to it or under contract to it will remove the modules from the motherboards after importation. The scope of this review does not include DRAMs or memory modules that are reimported for repair or replacement.

The DRAMS and modules subject to this review are currently classifiable under subheadings 8471.50.0085, 8471.91.8085, 8542.11.0024, 8542.11.8026, 8542.13.8034, 8471.50.4000, 8473.30.1000, 8542.11.0026, 8542.11.8034, 8471.50.8095, 8473.30.4000, 8542.11.0034, 8542.13.8005, 8471.91.0090, 8473.30.8000, 8542.11.8001, 8542.13.8024, 8471.91.4000, 8542.11.0001, 8542.11.8024 and 8542.13.8026 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the Department's written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive.

## Background

On September 23, 1998, the Department published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on DRAMs from Korea. See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) of One Megabit or Above from the Republic of Korea, 63 FR 50867, September 23, 1998) (final results).

On September 17, 1998, LG and Hyundai submitted timely written allegations that the Department made certain ministerial errors in the above-referenced administrative review. Petitioner submitted timely rebuttal comments in regards to respondents' allegations. For a complete discussion of the allegations, see the Department's October 1, 1998, Memorandum from Tom Futtner to Holly A. Kuga regarding Antidumping Review of Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) from Korea: Ministerial Error Allegations Regarding the Final Results.

As discussed below, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(d), we have determined that the language used in our final results needed to be clarified and that certain ministerial errors were made in the margin calculations for LG.

## Alleged Ministerial Errors

### LG

*Comment 1:* Typographical Error in its Model Match Programming. LG claims that the Department made a typographical error when it defined the variable US MONTH for the model matching programming. Petitioner had no comment.

*DOC Position:* We agree with LG. We have corrected this typographical error.

*Comment 2:* Typographical Error in a Product Code. LG alleges that the Department incorrectly input a product code in the computer program. Petitioner had no comment.

*DOC Position:* We agree with LG. We have amended the computer program to correct this typographical error.

*Comment 3:* Selling Expenses by Product Code Rather Than Control Number. LG alleges that the Department assigned selling expenses to the unreported sales based on product code rather than control number since the Department stated in its final results that some of the unreported sales involved product codes that had not been part of the questionnaire response. LG claims that the Department had control numbers for the unreported sales that it assigned selling expenses to based on product code. LG, therefore,

claims that the Department should correct the program to assign selling expenses on the basis of control number.

Petitioner states that the Department intended to assign selling expenses on the basis of product code. Petitioner further contends that the Department rejected LG's argument to assign selling expenses to the unreported sales on the basis of control number in its final results.

*DOC Position:* We disagree with LG. We did not have product codes for all unreported sales. Furthermore, where we did not have product codes, we did not have control numbers. Independent of those facts, however, the Department decided to use product code where it existed as the basis for assigning selling expenses to the unreported DRAM transactions. Where we did not have product code, we relied on the density of the DRAM in question to assign the selling expenses that would be used in our analysis. Because this is not a clerical error, we have not made any changes to our calculations.

*Comment 4:* Control Numbers Used for Several Unreported Sales. LG alleges that the Department assigned the wrong control numbers to certain unreported sales. LG states that the Department assigned control numbers to certain unreported sales for the purpose of assigning costs to those products. However, according to LG, the Department should have, for model matching purposes, changed the control numbers for those products back to the original control number. LG claims that the dumping margin is distorted as a result of this failure to use the proper control number. Petitioner had no comment.

*DOC Position:* We agree with LG. We assigned control numbers to three models of DRAMs in the unreported sales for the purposes of assigning costs to those products. However, after assigning production costs to these products, we failed to re-apply the original control numbers to these products for sales comparison purposes. We have amended the computer program to ensure that the original control numbers are re-assigned to these products.

*Comment 5:* Calculation of Constructed Value (CV) Profit. LG alleges that the Department applied the CV-profit rate to a basis different than that used to calculate the profit rate. Specifically, LG claims that the CV-profit rate was calculated based on a cost of production ("COP") that excludes selling expenses and profit, while it was applied to a COP that included selling expenses and packing.

The petitioner claims that the CV-profit rate was calculated incorrectly, but that LG's proposed method of correction is incorrect as well. Petitioner contends instead that the Department should correct its error by applying the standard CV-profit calculation methodology.

**DOC Position:** We agree with LG and the petitioner that the CV-profit rate was applied to a basis different than that used to calculate the CV-profit rate. We have corrected our calculations to ensure that we calculate the CV-profit rate according to the standard methodology.

**Comment 6:** Deduction of Imputed Inventory Carrying Costs in the Calculation of CV. LG alleges that the Department failed to deduct imputed inventory carrying expenses in its calculation of CV. Petitioner claims that, since imputed inventory carrying expenses are not included in CV, they should not be deducted from CV.

**DOC Position:** We do not add amounts for imputed expenses in calculating CV. However, after calculating CV, we have, in essence, NV, and adjustments to NV are appropriate when CV is the basis for NV. In this case, imputed inventory carrying expenses are indirect selling expenses. Because LG's U.S. price was based on constructed export price (CEP), and an offset to CEP was appropriate in this case, we intended in the final review results to deduct the imputed inventory carrying expenses as an adjustment to CV. As this did not occur, we made the appropriate changes to our calculations to account for this clerical error (see DOC position on Comment 7).

**Comment 7:** Inclusion of Imputed Inventory Carrying Costs in the Calculation of the CEP Offset for CV Comparisons. LG alleges that the Department failed to include imputed inventory carrying expenses in its calculation of the CEP offset for CV comparisons. Petitioner agrees that imputed inventory carrying expenses should be included in the CEP offset.

**DOC Position:** We agree with LG and the petitioner. We failed to include imputed inventory carrying expenses in the calculation of LG's CEP offset calculations as we said we would in the final review results. For these amended results, we have adjusted our computations accordingly.

**Comment 8:** Adjustments made to Unreported Sales for Credit Expenses and Commissions. LG claims that the Department mistakenly made adjustments to the unreported sales for commissions and credit. LG states that the record supports the conclusion that there were no commissions or credits expenses associated with these sales.

Therefore, LG concludes, the Department should not have assigned these expenses to the unreported sales.

Petitioner claims that the Department intended, as part of its application of adverse facts available, to include commissions and credit expenses in its calculations of the adjustments for the unreported sales. Petitioner therefore concludes that the Department did not commit any clerical error by assigning these expenses to the unreported sales.

**DOC Position:** We disagree with LG. We intentionally assigned selling expenses, including credit expenses and commissions, to the unreported sales on an adverse facts available basis. No changes have been made to the program.

**Comment 9:** Calculation of Duty Assessment Rates by Importer. LG alleges that the Department's computer program failed to appropriately calculate importer-specific rates. Instead, LG claims that the program calculated an assessment rate for only one importer of record, LG Semicon America, Inc. ("LGSA"). LG states that the Department should amend its computer program to ensure that duty assessment rates are calculated for each importer.

The petitioner claims that the Department properly attributed the antidumping duties related to the unreported sales to LG. Petitioner therefore concludes that the Department should continue to calculate a single weighted-average assessment rate for LGSA as the importer.

**DOC Position:** We agree with LG. As stated in the final results, we intended to calculate importer-specific assessment rates. We have corrected the computer program to ensure that an assessment rate is calculated for each importer of record in this review.

#### Hyundai

**Comment 1:** Calculation of Duty Assessment Rate. Hyundai alleges that the Department mistakenly calculated its assessment rate by dividing the total antidumping duty by the total entered value of sales made during the POR. Hyundai argues that the Department should have divided the antidumping duty by the value of the entries made during the POR.

Petitioner points out that the Department included only Hyundai's CEP sales in its calculation of an assessment rate. It mistakenly excluded the duties due and total value of further manufactured sales.

**DOC Position:** We disagree with Hyundai. We intentionally based Hyundai's assessment rate on the entered value of the sales made during the POR. In our preliminary results, we

stated that we "calculated importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping margins calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties." See Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) of One Megabit or Above from the Republic of Korea, 63 FR 11411, March 9, 1998 (Preliminary Results). We received no comments from either respondent or petitioner regarding that methodology. However, in the final results, we stated that we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total value of subject merchandise entered during the POR for each importer. The sentence should have read that we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total *entered value of sales* of subject merchandise *sold* during the POR for each importer (emphasis added). We are amending these final results to reflect that assessment language.

We agree with the petitioner. We mistakenly excluded the total value and duties related to the further manufactured sales. We have corrected the computer program to calculate an assessment rate for Hyundai based on its CEP sales as well as the further manufactured sales.

#### Amended Final Results

We are clarifying the assessment language with respect to both LG and Hyundai and, as a result of our correction of the ministerial errors for LG, we have determined the following amended margin exists for LG for the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Amended weighted-average margin percentage
LG .....	9.04

There is no change to Hyundai's weighted-average margin percentage as a result of the correction of ministerial errors in this review period.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning the respondents directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon

publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of DRAMs from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) For the company named above, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results which covered that manufacturer or exporter; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent final results which covered that manufacturer; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 3.85 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until 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(b) 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 doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to 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 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.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with section 751(i) of the Act.

Dated: October 16, 1998.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-28500 Filed 10-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-201-822, A-412-818, A-427-814, A-428-825, A-475-824, A-588-845, A-580-834, A-583-831)

#### **Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip From Italy, France, Germany, Mexico, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and Taiwan; Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations in Antidumping Duty Investigations**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of postponement of preliminary determinations for antidumping duty investigations of stainless steel sheet and strip from Italy, France, Germany, Mexico, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and Taiwan

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is postponing the preliminary determinations of the antidumping duty investigations of stainless steel sheet and strip from Italy, France, Germany, Mexico, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and Taiwan. These investigations cover manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise during the period April 1, 1997 through March 31, 1998.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 23, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jim Doyle (Japan and France) at (202) 482-0159; Linda Ludwig (United Kingdom) at (202) 482-3833; Rick Johnson (South Korea) (202) 482-3818; John Kugelman (Germany and Mexico) at (202) 482-0649; and Maureen Flannery (Italy and Taiwan) at (202) 482-3020; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20230.

#### **Postponement of Preliminary Determinations**

On June 30, 1998, the Department initiated antidumping duty investigations of imports of stainless steel sheet and strip from Italy, France, Germany, Mexico, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and Taiwan. The notice of initiation stated that we would issue our preliminary

determinations by November 17, 1998 (63 FR 37521; July 13, 1998).

On October 6, 1998, petitioners made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e) of the Department's regulations for a 30 day postponement, pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. Petitioners stated that a postponement of the preliminary determinations is necessary in order to give the Department time to address the many issues raised by these investigations. For example, petitioners noted that seven of the eight investigations involve below-cost allegations. In addition to the cost allegations cited by petitioners, these cases involve complex issues, including those related to downstream sales, affiliation, limited reporting and country of origin.

Therefore, the Department is postponing the preliminary determinations of the aforementioned investigations 30 days, to December 17, 1998. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, which is on file in Room B-099 at the Main Commerce Building.

This notice is published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f).

Dated: October 16, 1998.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-28503 Filed 10-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-489-807]

#### **Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar From Turkey; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Time Limits**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limits of the preliminary results of the first antidumping duty administrative review of steel concrete reinforcing bar from Turkey. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period October 10, 1996, through March 31, 1998.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 23, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Shawn Thompson or Sergio Gonzalez,