this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Japan that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates listed above, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, de minimis, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (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 in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (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 of review in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter or the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 15.92 percent, the ''all others'' rate based on the first review conducted by the Department in which a ''new shipper'' rate was established in the final results of antidumping finding administrative review (48 FR 51801, November 14, 1983). These requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

For duty assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates for roller chain. For CEP sales 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 estimated entered value of subject merchandise sold during the POR to that importer. We calculated the estimated entered value by subtracting international movement expenses and expenses incurred in the United States from the gross sales value. For assessment of EP sales, for each importer, we calculated a per unit importer-specific assessment amount by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of subject merchandise sold to that importer during the POR.

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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice serves as the only 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 regulation 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: November 4, 1998.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–30414 Filed 11–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–401–040]

Stainless Steel Plate From Sweden: 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 July 8, 1998, the Department of Commerce (The Department) published the preliminary results of review in the antidumping duty administrative review on stainless steel plate from Sweden. (63 FR 36877). The review covers two manufacturers/exporters (Avesta Sheffield AB (Avesta) and Uddeholm Tooling AB, Bohler-Uddeholm Corporation and Uddeholm Limited (collectively Uddeholm)) of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1996 through May 31, 1997.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Totaro or Nithya Nagarajan, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

The Department of the Treasury published an antidumping finding on stainless steel plate from Sweden on June 8, 1973 (38 FR 15079). On July 8, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of this antidumping finding (63 FR 36877) for the period June 1, 1996 through May 31, 1997. The Department has now completed this review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of stainless steel plate which is commonly used in scientific and industrial equipment because of its resistance to staining, rusting and pitting. Stainless steel plate is classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers 7219.11.00.00, 7219.12.00.05, 7209.12.00.15, 7219.12.00.45, 7219.12.00.65, 7219.12.00.70, 7219.12.00.80, 7219.21.00.05, 7219.21.00.50, 7219.22.00.05, 7219.22.00.10, 7219.22.00.30, 7219.22.00.60, 7219.31.00.10, 7219.31.00.50, 7220.11.00.00, 7222.30.00.00, and 7228.40.00.00. Although the subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

On November 21, 1997, Avesta and Avesta Sheffield NAD, Inc. requested clarification to determine whether stainless steel slabs that are manufactured in Great Britain and rolled into hot bands in Sweden are within the scope of the antidumping finding. On December 22, 1997, the Department determined that British slabs rolled into hot bands in Sweden are within the scope of the finding.

Analysis of Comments Received

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results of

this administrative review. We received timely comments from Uddeholm and Avesta. We received timely rebuttal comments from petitioners, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., G.O. Carlson, Inc., and Lukens, Inc.

Avesta

Comment 1: Avesta argues that the Department should establish the CEP profit ratio based on Avesta's consolidated annual financial statement. Respondent argues that the Department based the CEP profit ratio on the financial statements of Avesta Sheffield, NAD, Inc. (the North American Division) rather than the consolidated financial statements of the whole company. Avesta argues that section 772(d)(3) requires the Department to adjust CEP for an amount of profit allocable to U.S. sales and that the Department's practice has been to base this calculated profit on revenues and expenses associated with total sales of subject merchandise (both in the home market and in the United States). In addition, Avesta argues that under section 772(f)(2)(C), the Department has three alternatives for calculating CEP profit including relying on the respondent company's financial reports covering the production and sales of merchandise in all countries, and that in this case the only information available to the Department is the financial report for the consolidated company which indicates that Avesta incurred a loss during the period of review (POR). Therefore, respondent urges the Department to set the CEP profit ratio to zero.

Petitioners did not object to Avesta's comment.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with Avesta. Consistent with the provisions of sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f)(2)(C) of the Act, as amended, the Department is applying a CEP profit ratio of zero on all sales made in the United States due to the fact that Avesta incurred a loss during the POR.

Comment 2: Avesta argues that the Department should recalculate CEP profit applying the profit ratio only to U.S. selling expenses related to economic activities in the United States, excluding foreign and U.S. movement charges as well as indirect selling expenses and inventory carrying costs incurred in Sweden. Respondent argues that the Department incorrectly applied the profit ratio to foreign movement charges, U.S. movement charges, indirect selling expenses incurred in Sweden, and imputed inventory carrying costs incurred in Sweden prior to export to the U.S. Respondent argues that movement expenses are not classified as selling expenses within the meaning of section 772(d) of the Act, and therefore should not be included in the CEP profit calculation. In addition, Avesta argues that the expenses associated with economic activity in the U.S. do not include those indirect selling expenses and inventory costs incurred in the home market prior to exportation, and therefore the CEP profit ratio should not be applied to the expenses in calculating total CEP profit.

Petitioners offered no objections to respondent's comments.

Department's Position: The Department agrees in part with respondent. Both the SAA, at 823, and the Department's regulations, at 19 CFR 351.402(b), explain that, under section 772(d) of the Act, we only deduct from CEP the expenses associated with commercial activity in the United States which relate to the resale to an unaffiliated purchaser. *See also, Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 63 FR 33320, 33344 (June 18, 1998). The movement expenses and imputed expenses at issue are, by definition, not associated with economic activities in the United States, movement expenses have been deducted from CEP and, therefore, should not be included in ''total United States expenses'' for purposes of calculating the CEP profit ratio. These expenses are associated with the sale of the merchandise to the affiliated reseller. However, ''total United States expenses'' includes all selling expenses (direct and indirect) associated with the unaffiliated sale in the United States. Therefore, consistent with the Department's methodology, we have calculated total actual profit using total U.S. selling expenses, deducted from the U.S. starting price as directed by Section 772(d)(1) of the Act. *See, e.g., Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 13217 (March 18, 1998). For purposes of these final results of review, we have not included inventory carrying costs (DINVCARU) or U.S. movement expenses in total U.S. expenses as these expenses were not deducted from CEP. However, we have included in total U.S. expenses all selling expenses incurred in making the sale to the U.S. unaffiliated customer.

Comment 3: Avesta states that the Department erred by deducting the cost of brokerage and handling at the U.S. port of entry (USOTRE1U) twice in the calculation of net price. Petitioners have not objected to Avesta's requested correction.

Department's Position: We agree with Avesta and have adjusted the final margin calculation program to adjust for USOTRE1U only once.

Comment 4: Avesta contends that the Department erred in the preliminary results of review by matching U.S. sales of CONNUMU 2422151, 2423121, and 2423151 with home market sales of CONNUMH 2323152 rather than CONNUMH 2623152. Respondent states that CONNUMU 2422151, 2423121, and 2423151 are all heat resistant steels. Similarly, respondent argues that CONNUMH 2623152 and 2622152 are also a heat resistant steels whereas CONNUMH 2323152 is a ''general service and wet corrosion'' steel that has a different purpose and use than heat resistance steels and is therefore not comparable to the U.S. CONNUMs. Based on the chemical differences and uses of the home market CONNUMs, respondent urges the Department to compare CONNUMU 2422151, 2423121 to home market CONNUM 2622152, and U.S. CONNUM 2423151 to home market CONNUM 2623152.

Petitioner objected to the information in Avesta's case brief discussing the chemical and physical specifications of the home market and U.S. CONNUMs as new factual information. However, petitioner did not offer any objection to the proposed changes in the matching methodology utilized in the preliminary results of review.

Department's Position: We agree with respondent. The Department incorrectly matched CONNUMU 2422151, 2423121, and 2423151 with CONNUMH 2323152. For purposes of the final results of review, the Department has compared U.S. CONNUMs 2422151, 2423121 to home market CONNUM 2622152, and U.S. CONNUM 2423151 to home market CONNUM 2623152 due to the fact that these are the most similar products based on product specifications. In response to petitioner's comment, the Department has determined that Avesta's submission in its case brief does not constitute new factual information under § 351.301 of the Department's regulations. Consistent with the Department's request in the original questionnaire, Avesta provided detailed product specification and concordance information in its October 8, 1997, section A response in Exhibits A–36 and A–37. In conclusion, the Department is comparing the above

mentioned U.S. CONNUMs to home market CONNUMs 2622152 and 2623152.

Uddeholm

Comment 5: Uddeholm contends that the Department did not deduct further manufacturing expenses in its calculation of CEP and normal value. Uddeholm argues that it reported cutting and grinding expenses incurred in connection with its sales in the United States and Canada as further manufacturing expenses, but inconsistent with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, the Department did not adjust for these expenses in calculating CEP. Uddeholm also points out that the Department did adjust for further manufacturing expenses reported by the other respondent in the case, Avesta, but failed to make the same adjustment on Uddeholm sales. Further, Uddeholm contends that the Department should make a similar adjustment to normal value as a circumstance of sale adjustment as instructed by the statute.

Petitioners argue that the expenses Uddeholm reported as ''cutting and grinding expenses'' in fact included expenses both for cutting and grinding and for two other processing operations, milling and slitting. As such, petitioners allege that the ''cutting and grinding expenses'' reported by respondent are overly broad for purposes of utilizing these expenses as adjustments to U.S. price and normal value. In addition, petitioners argue that Uddeholm's Canadian customers were charged separately for cutting and grinding expenses, whereas only 50 percent of U.S. customers were charged separately for these same expenses. Petitioners therefore contend that Uddeholm's difference in pricing methodology is an indication that cutting and grinding costs were ''bundled'' with the end price and are distortive of actual U.S. price as these expenses were not recovered. Petitioners argue that the only accurate means of determining the true further manufacturing cost of cutting and grinding would be to create two sets of sales one where the customer was charged separately for these expenses and one where no charges were assessed. Absent this separation, petitioners argue that there is insufficient record evidence to warrant allowing adjustments for further manufacturing from U.S. price and normal value.

Department's Position: Pursuant to § 351.402 of its regulations, the Department adjusts U.S. price for expenses associated with commercial activities in the United States that relate to the sale to an unaffiliated purchaser. The Department will not make an adjustment for expenses related solely to the sale to an affiliated importer. Similarly, under § 351.410 of the Department's regulations, the Department is authorized to make circumstance of sale adjustments to normal value for differences in direct selling expenses. Direct selling expenses are defined as expenses such as commissions, credit expenses, guarantees, and warranties, that result from and bear a direct relationship to the particular sale in question. In the instant review, the cutting and grinding expenses incurred by Uddeholm in the U.S. market are expenses associated with economic activity in the United States and are properly deducted from CEP. However, the cutting and grinding expenses incurred in the comparison market are not direct selling expenses as defined in § 351.410 and have therefore not been deducted from normal value.

In response to petitioner's concern, the Department has reviewed the record to determine the manner in which cutting and grinding expenses are incurred and/or charged to the unaffiliated customer in both the U.S. and comparison markets. Upon review of the record the Department has determined that there is no evidence to indicate that Uddeholm's U.S. cutting and grinding costs are bundled with the U.S. end price, nor is there evidence to indicate that there is a dual pricing structure where cutting and grinding expenses are charged to customers in the comparison market and only charged 50 percent of the time to U.S. customers. The evidence on the record merely indicates that cutting and grinding expenses are incurred in both the U.S. market and the comparison market on sales to unaffiliated customers and these expenses are reported as a price adjustment. Therefore, for purposes of these final results of review, the Department is adjusting Uddeholm's U.S. price for the reported cutting and grinding expenses but is not applying a circumstance of sale adjustment to normal value for similar expenses incurred in the comparison market. This is consistent with the Department's treatment of Avesta's reported cutting and grinding expenses in both the preliminary and final results of review.

Comment 6: Uddeholm states that the Department did not compare U.S. sales to the weighted-average normal values for the calendar month in which the U.S. sale occurred. Respondent contends that the Department should have matched sales within the most contemporaneous month (*e.g.*, June 1996 to June 1996). However, the margin program has compared all U.S. sales to the weighted average normal value for June 1996 which is an error which should be corrected. Petitioners offered no objections to respondent's argument.

Department's Position: The Department has reviewed the margin program and has corrected this error for the final results of review.

Comment 7: Uddeholm states that the Department did not use contemporaneous weighted-average third country indirect expenses to calculate the CEP offset. Based upon an analysis of the margin program discussed in Comment 6, above, respondent argues that the CEP offset calculated for June 1996 was used for all CEP sales during the POR. Petitioners did not rebut respondent's argument.

Department's Position: The Department has reviewed the margin program and has corrected this error for the final results of review.

Comment 8: Uddeholm notes that the Department used the incorrect profit ratio to calculate CEP profit. The Department's analysis memo indicates that the calculated CEP profit ratio was the result of total operating profit divided by total actual expenses. However, in transcribing the result to the margin calculation program the Department used the incorrect number. Petitioners did not rebut respondent's requested change.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with respondent and has corrected the final margin calculation program consistent with respondent's comment.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that the following margins exist for the period June 1, 1996, through May 31, 1997:

Company	Margin percentage
Avesta Sheffield AB	25.05
Uddeholm Corporation	9.47

The Department shall determine, and the U. S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific 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 entered value of sales examined during the POR. Individual differences between U.S.

price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of stainless steel plate from Sweden entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be the rates stated above; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in these reviews, or the original LTFV investigations, 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 (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these reviews, the cash deposit rate for this case will continue to be 4.46 percent, which was the ''all others'' rate in the LTFV investigation. The deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 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 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 § 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.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 1677f(i)(1)).

Dated: November 5, 1998.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–30566 Filed 11–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Visiting Committee on advanced Technology; Meeting

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of partially closed meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), will meet Tuesday, December 8, 1998 from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. The Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology is composed of fifteen members appointed by the Director of NIST: who are eminent in such fields as business, research, new product development, engineering, labor, education, management consulting, environment, and international relations. The purpose of this meeting is to review and make recommendations regarding general policy for the Institute, its organization, its budget, and its programs within the framework of applicable national policies as set forth by the President and the Congress. The agenda will include an update on NIST programs; Applied Technology Program/Manufacturing Extension Partnership (ATP/MEP) Cooperation on Dissemination; Changes in ATP Procedures for the FY 1999 Competitions; NIST Diversity Initiatives; Chemical Science and Technology laboratory's Process for Setting Project Priorities; Update on Status of Advanced Encryption Standard; Measurements and Data for Aircraft Fire Suppression; and a tour of the Advanced Chemical Sciences Laboratory. Discussions scheduled to begin at 8:30 a.m. and to end at 9:10 a.m. on December 8, 1998, on staffing of management positions at NIST and the NIST budget, including funding levels of the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, will be closed.

DATES: The meeting will convene December 8, 1998, at 8:30 a.m. and will adjourn at 5 p.m. on December 8, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Employees' Lounge (seating capacity 80, includes 38 participants), Administration Building, at NIST, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Brian C. Belanger, Executive Director, Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–1004, telephone number (301) 975–4720.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel, formally determined on August 7, 1998, that portions of the meeting of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology which involve discussion of proposed funding of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and the Advanced Technology Program may be closed in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B), because those portions of the meetings will divulge matters the premature disclosure of which would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of proposed agency actions; and that portions of meetings which involve discussion of the staffing issues of management and other positions at NIST may be closed in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6), because divulging information discussed in those portions of the meetings is likely to reveal information of a personal nature where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Dated: November 10, 1998.

Robert E. Hebner,

Acting Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 98–30577 Filed 11–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–M

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of an Import Limit for Certain Cotton Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Egypt

November 10, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs increasing a limit.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 17, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Unger, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212. For information on the quota status of this limit, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927–5850. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482–3715.