

DOC Position: We agree with the petitioner and have revised our final calculations accordingly.

Comment 15: Hyundai maintains that three clerical errors are contained in the Department's model matching section of the preliminary calculations. Hyundai argues that these errors are as follows: (1) the calculations did not identify similar products where there was not an identical home market match for a U.S. sale, (2) the model matching calculations fail to include the 90/60 day rule for identifying contemporaneous matches, and (3) the calculations' matching hierarchy mistakenly ranks the month of sale above the level of trade.

DOC Position: We agree with Hyundai and have corrected the model matching of our calculations accordingly for the final results of review.

Comment 16: Hyundai maintains that the Department's preliminary calculations mistakenly double count certain U.S. sales due to a clerical error.

DOC Position: We agree and have revised our final calculations accordingly.

Comment 17: Hyundai maintains that the Department's preliminary calculations contained a clerical error in its calculation of Hyundai's ESP offset cap. Hyundai maintains that the preliminary calculations failed to include U.S. commissions in the ESP offset cap.

DOC Position: We agree and have revised the ESP offset cap portion of our final calculations to include U.S. commissions.

Comment 18: Hyundai and the petitioner maintain that the Department's preliminary calculations contained a clerical error in its calculation of profit for CV. Hyundai argues that the Department failed to recompute Hyundai's profit to account for the revisions the Department made to Hyundai's reported COP data for the preliminary results of review. The petitioner argues that the preliminary calculations automatically applied the statutory minimum profit percentage of eight percent for all sales of DRAMS without first testing to determine whether the actual profit was less than eight percent.

DOC Position: We agree and have recomputed Hyundai's profit for CV in our final calculations to reflect the increase in Hyundai's COP. We also revised the preliminary calculations to compare Hyundai's actual profit to the statutory minimum of eight percent in calculating CV for the non-further manufactured sales where this did not occur. For our final calculations, we used the statutory minimum in cases

where Hyundai's actual profit was below the statutory minimum.

Comment 19: Hyundai maintains that the Department's preliminary calculations contained a clerical error in the calculation of U.S. price. Hyundai argues that the Department failed to add duty drawback to USP in its net price calculations.

DOC Position: We agree and have revised our final results calculations accordingly.

Comment 20: Hyundai maintains that the Department's preliminary results calculations contained three clerical errors in its calculation of FMV. Hyundai maintains that these clerical errors were as follows: (1) the calculations failed to convert home market selling expenses incurred in U.S. dollars into Korean won, (2) the Department mistakenly added U.S. repacking expense to HEI's reported home market price, and (3) the Department failed to deduct indirect selling expenses from FMV for further-manufactured sales.

DOC Position: We agree and have revised our final results calculations accordingly.

Final Results of Review

Upon review of the comments submitted, the Department has determined that the following margins exist for the companies for the period October 29, 1992 through April 30, 1994:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
LG Semicon Co., Ltd	0.00
Hyundai Electronic Industries, Inc	0.06

The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning each respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed firms will be zero percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated 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 this review, a prior review, or in the original 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 (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 3.85%, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (Samsung), formerly a respondent in this administrative review, was excluded from the antidumping duty order on DRAMS from Korea on February 8, 1996. See *Final Court Decision and Partial Amended Final Determination: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit and Above From the Republic of Korea*, 61 FR 4765 (February 8, 1996).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as the 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 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Date: April 26, 1996.
 Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
 [FR Doc. 96-11246 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

[A-533-809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received requests to conduct two new shipper administrative reviews of an antidumping duty order with a February anniversary date. In accordance with the Department's Interim Regulations, we are initiating these administrative reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Holly A. Kuga, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4837.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 28 and February 29, 1996, the Department received timely requests, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and section 353.22(h) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25130, 25134 (May 11, 1995)) for new shipper reviews of an antidumping duty order with a February anniversary date.

Initiation of Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, and section 353.22(h) of the Department's interim regulations, we are initiating new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges from India. We intend to issue the final results of these reviews not later than 270 days from the date of publication of this notice.

Antidumping duty proceeding	Period to be reviewed
India: Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges A-533-809 Patheja Forgings, Ltd. Isibars, Ltd.	9/1/95-2/29/96

We will instruct the U.S. 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 in accordance with section 353.22(h)(4) of the Department's interim regulations.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b).

This initiation and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and section 353.22(h) of the Department's interim regulations.

Joseph A. Spetrini,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.
[FR Doc. 96-11123 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-588-005]

High Power Microwave Amplifiers and Components Thereof From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the petitioner, MCL, Inc., the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on high power microwave amplifiers and components thereof (HPMAs) from Japan. This review covers NEC Corporation (NEC), a manufacturer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States, and the period July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995. The firm failed to submit a response to our questionnaire. As a result, we have preliminarily determined to use facts otherwise available for cash deposit and appraisal purposes.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the arguments: (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the arguments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hermes Pinilla or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 (URAA).

Background

On July 31, 1995, the petitioner, MCL, Inc., requested in accordance with section 353.22(a) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22(a)) an administrative review of the antidumping duty order (47 FR 31413, July 20, 1982) on HPMAs from Japan with respect to NEC, a manufacturer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States, and covering the period July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995. We published a notice of initiation of the review on August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42500). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are high power microwave amplifiers and components thereof. High power microwave amplifiers are radio-frequency power amplifier assemblies, and components thereof, specifically designed for uplink transmission in C, X, and Ku bands from fixed earth stations to communications satellites and having a power output of one kilowatt or more. High power microwave amplifiers may be imported in subassembly form, as complete amplifiers, or as a component of higher level assemblies (generally earth stations). This merchandise is currently classifiable under item 8525.10.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers NEC and the period July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995 (POR).

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for NEC because it did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. We sent NEC a questionnaire seeking information necessary to conduct a review of NEC's sales of merchandise subject to this review. NEC did not respond to the questionnaire. Rather, NEC submitted a letter on January 18, 1996, stating that unrelated third parties