

the merchandise in question, the boron-added material is sold to steel service centers, and is expected to be purchased by fabricators who would further process the steel. Petitioner maintains that consumers/fabricators of the product would not rely on or benefit from the presence of boron, and that the addition of the alloy into the carbon steel product offers no commercial advantage. In addition, petitioner notes that many fabricators, most of which are its own customers, are not aware of the presence of boron, and that it has never received any inquiry or request for boron-added carbon steel for any application. Finally, petitioner explains that in order to form the steel for specific uses, the product must have good ductility/formability characteristics. Thus, according to petitioner, the presence of high levels of boron would decrease the effectiveness of these characteristics, and would be counterproductive.

#### Use of the Merchandise

According to petitioner, there are two primary uses for the merchandise in question: (1) Hot-dipped galvanized steel sheet is used for metal studs, siding, roofing, decking, gutters, downspouts, culverts and other construction materials; (2) electrogalvanized sheet (primarily from Japan) and petitioner's hot-dipped sheet are used for computer chassis, frames and housing for gaming equipment. Petitioner maintains that there are no uses of hot-dipped or electrolytically coated low carbon steel sheet containing boron that cannot be fully met without boron. The addition of boron neither responds to a new need in the market nor improves the way existing technical needs are met.

#### Channels of Marketing

Petitioner states that it sells galvanized sheet without boron to virtually the same West Coast steel service centers that buy competing products from Japan with boron, and that since the boron-added and non-boron merchandise are used for precisely the same products on the West Coast, the sales channels in that region are the same. Petitioner also provided the names and addresses of service centers most likely to be involved in the distribution of the merchandise in question for the West Coast.

#### Cost of Modification

Petitioner alleges that the cost of adding boron to low carbon steel to attain a boron range of 0.0025 to 0.0045 percent by weight (similar to the sample examined by petitioner) is \$0.55 per net

ton, based on information obtained through one of its parent companies. This additional cost represents less than 0.1% of an approximate CIF value of \$600.

#### Analysis

Other interested parties, Nippon Steel Corporation, NKK Corporation, Kawasaki Steel Corporation, and Sumitomo Metal Industries, Ltd., submitted comments arguing: (1) that the Department cannot initiate a "minor alterations" anticircumvention inquiry on a type of merchandise which the Department has previously determined to be outside the scope of that order; and (2) that the petitioner, UPI, does not have standing as a "domestic interested party."

These interested parties base their first argument on the decision of the Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Hylsa, S.A. v. United States*, Slip Op. 98-10 (February 3, 1998), which upheld the earlier decision of the CIT in *Wheatland Tube Co. v. United States*, 973 F. Supp. 149 (CIT 1997). The Department maintains that a determination under 19 CFR 353.29(i)(1) that merchandise is outside the scope of the order does not preclude the initiation of a "minor alterations" anticircumvention inquiry on the same merchandise<sup>1</sup>. For the reasons discussed in *Memorandum from Joseph Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, Anticircumvention Inquiry, Carbon Steel Plate from Canada*, (May 20, 1998) the Department believes that it is not precluded in initiating a "minor alterations" anticircumvention inquiry in the instant case. The interested parties have also argued that petitioner, UPI, does not have standing as a "domestic interested party", since one of the company's parents is a South Korean steel producer. However, we disagree with the parties' conclusions. As defined by section 771(9)(C) of the Act, an "interested party" is a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States. Nippon Steel Corporation, et al. do not contest that UPI produces the subject merchandise in the United States. Therefore, the Department finds that UPI has standing under the statute. See also *Memorandum from Joseph Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa*, October 26, 1998, *Anticircumvention Inquiry, A-588-824, Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan*.

<sup>1</sup> See *Memorandum from Joseph Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa*, May 20, 1998, *Anticircumvention Inquiry, A-122-823, Carbon Steel Plate from Canada*, at 5 and 6.

Based on our evaluation of the application, we determine that a formal inquiry is warranted. Accordingly, we are initiating a circumvention inquiry concerning the antidumping duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan, pursuant to section 781(c) of the Tariff Act. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(l)(2), if we issue an affirmative preliminary determination, we will then instruct the Customs Service to suspend liquidation and require a cash deposit of estimated duties on the merchandise.

The Department will, following consultation with the interested parties, establish a schedule for questionnaires and comments on the issues. The Department intends to issue its final determination within 300 days of the date of publication of this initiation.

This notice is published in accordance with section 781(c) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1677j(c)) and 19 CFR 351.225.

Dated: October 23, 1998.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-29161 Filed 10-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-833]

#### Stainless Steel Bar from Japan: Notice of Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 30, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Minoo Hatten or Robin Gray, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1690 or (202) 482-4023, respectively.

#### The Applicable Statute

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.



### Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received a request to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Japan. On March 23, 1998, the Department initiated this administrative review covering the period February 1, 1997, through January 31, 1998.

Because of the complexity of certain issues in this case, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (see Memorandum from Richard Moreland to Robert LaRussa, Re: Extension of Time Limit for Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Bar from Japan, October 23, 1998). Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to February 28, 1999. The Department intends to issue the final results of review 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results. This extension of the time limit is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: October 26, 1998.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-29162 Filed 10-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

#### Stainless Steel Bar from India; Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce has received three requests to conduct a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d), we are initiating this administrative review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 30, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Zak Smith or Stephanie Hoffman, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230;

telephone (202) 482-0189 or (202) 482-4198, respectively.

### Applicable Statute and Regulations

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to section 351 of the regulations of the Department of Commerce ("the Department") are to the current regulations, as published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27296).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On August 18 and 31, 1998, the Department received requests from Jyoti Steel Industries ("Jyoti"), Shah Alloys Ltd. ("Shah"), and Parekh Bright Bars Pvt. Ltd. ("Parekh"), pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(b), for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. This order has an August semiannual anniversary month. On August 25 and 31 and September 1, 1998, we asked that the initial requests be supplemented. Jyoti submitted the requisite additional information on September 3, 1998; Shah and Parekh did so on October 9 and 22, 1998, respectively. Accordingly, we are initiating a new shipper review for Jyoti, Shah, and Parekh as requested. The period of review is February 1, 1998 through July 31, 1998.

#### Initiation of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2) Jyoti, Shah, and Parekh each provided certification that it did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation; certification that, since the investigation was initiated, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation, including those not individually examined during the investigation; documentation establishing: (i) the date on which its stainless steel bar was first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, or if the exporter or producer could not establish the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise for export to the United States; (ii) the volume of that and subsequent shipments; and (iii) the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. Therefore, in accordance

with section 751(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we are initiating a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. We intend to issue the final results of this review not later than 270 days after the day on which this new shipper review is initiated.

Antidumping duty proceeding	Period to be reviewed
India: Stainless Steel Bar, A-533-810:	
Jyoti Steel Industries .....	02/01/98-07/31/98
Shah Alloys Ltd ...	02/01/98-07/31/98
Parekh Bright Bars Pvt. Ltd ....	02/01/98-07/31/98

We will instruct the Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting, until the completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise exported by the above listed companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(e). Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: October 22, 1998.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-29163 Filed 10-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of