Final Results of Review

As a result of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in our preliminary results of review. Therefore, we determine that the following margins exist as a result of our review:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Jiangsu Rudong Grease Gun Factory, also known as China Nantong HuangHai Auto Parts Group Co., Ltd	09/01/93–08/31/94	5.93
China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp., Nantong Branch	09/01/93–08/31/94	[1]44.99
PRC Rate	09/01/93–08/31/94	44.99

[1] No shipments subject to this review. Rate is from the last relevant segment of the proceeding in which the firm had shipments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Individual differences between United States price and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) For Rudong and Nantong, which have separate rates, the cash deposit rates will be the company-specific rates indicated above; (2) for the companies named above which did not respond to our questionnaire (China National, Jiangsu, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai Automobile, and Tianjin) and for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate for the 1993–1994 period; (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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

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 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 orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the 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 section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: November 6, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–29242 Filed 11–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–808]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping administrative review.

SUMMARY: On July 9, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts (lug nuts) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (61 FR 36025). This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period September 1, 1994 through August 31, 1995. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tamara Underwood (202–482–0197), Elisabeth Urfer (202–482–4052), or Maureen Flannery (202–482–4733), Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, 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). In addition, unless otherwise stated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the regulations as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping duty order on lug nuts from the PRC on April 24, 1992 (57 FR 15052). On September 12, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 47349) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on lug nuts from the PRC covering the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995.

On September 28, 1995, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a), Consolidated International Automotive Inc. (Consolidated) requested that we conduct an administrative review of China National Automotive Industry I/E Corp. (China National); China National Machinery & Equipment Import and Export Corporation, Jiangsu Co., Ltd. (Jiangsu); Jiangsu Rudong Grease Gun Factory (Rudong); China National Automotive Industry I/E Corp., Nantong Branch (Nantong); China National Automotive Industry Shanghai Automobile Import & Export Corp. (Shanghai Automobile); Tianjin Automotive Import & Export Co. (Tianjin); China National Automobile Import and Export Corp., Yangzhou Branch (Yangzhou); and Ningbo Knives

& Scissors Factory (Ningbo). We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on October 12, 1995 (60 FR 53165).

On July 9, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on lug nuts from the PRC (61 FR 36025). There was no request for a hearing. The Department has now completed this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

On April 19, 1994, the Department issued its ''Final Scope Clarifications on Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from Taiwan and the PRC.'' The scope, as clarified, is described in the subsequent paragraph. All lug nuts covered by this review conform to the April 19, 1994 scope clarification.

Imports covered by this review are one-piece and two-piece chrome-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished. The subject merchandise includes chrome-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, which are more than 11/16 inches (17.45 millimeters) in height and which have a hexagonal (hx) size of at least 3/4 inches (19.05 millimeters) but not over one inch (25.4 millimeters), plus or minus 1/16 of an inch (1.59 millimeters). The term ''unfinished'' refers to unplated and/or unassembled chrome-plated lug nuts. The subject merchandise is used for securing wheels to cars, vans, trucks, utility vehicles, and trailers. Zinc-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, and stainless-steel capped lug nuts are not included in the scope of this review. Chrome-plated lock nuts are also not subject to this review.

Chrome-plated lug nuts are currently classified under subheadings 7318.16.00.15, 7318.16.00.45, and 7318.16.00.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers the period September 1, 1994 through August 31, 1995.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received case briefs from petitioner and Rudong. We received a rebuttal brief from Rudong.

Comment 1: Petitioner concurs with the Department's decision to use facts available (FA) for firms that refused to cooperate in the review. Petitioner argues that, where the Department must base the entire dumping margin for a respondent in an administrative review on the facts available for failure to cooperate, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use an inference adverse to the interests of the respondent in choosing FA.

For the seven non-responding firms, petitioner contends that the Department should continue to apply the highest antidumping duty rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 44.99 percent, based upon the final results of the second administrative review (1992–1993).

Department's Position: We agree with petitioner. In accordance with Section 776 of the Act, we have for these final results continued to use FA for Nantong, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Jiangsu, China National, Tianjin, and Shanghai Automobile. These firms did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. (See Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From The People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, July 9, 1996 (61 FR 36025).) Accordingly, we have continued to use adverse FA for these firms for the final results.

Comment 2: Petitioner asserts that the Department appropriately determined that the PRC lug nut industry was not a market-oriented industry (MOI) and properly applied factors of production to determine Rudong's normal value (NV). Petitioner contends that, although the Department assigned Rudong a separate rate based on lack of government control of its operations, this does not mean that the entire PRC lug nut industry is market-oriented. Petitioner cites the criteria applied in the Department's determination in Sulfur Dyes from China, Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value (58 FR 7537) (February 8, 1993):

(1) There must be virtually no involvement by the government in setting prices or amounts to be produced of the merchandise under investigation.

(2) The industry producing the merchandise under investigation should be characterized by private or collective ownership. There may be state-owned enterprises in the industry, but substantial state ownership weighs against a finding of market-oriented industry.

(3) Market-determined prices must be paid for all significant inputs, whether material or non-material, and for an all but insignificant portion of all the inputs accounting for the total value of the merchandise under investigation.

Petitioner maintains that, although Rudong asserts that it is the only PRC producer of lug nuts, it failed to provide objective corroboration of this claim. Petitioner further maintains that the Department's attempts to obtain further information on this point have been frustrated by lack of response from both the PRC government and the Chinese Chamber of Commerce for Imports & Exports of Machinery & Electronics (China Chamber). Petitioner claims that, in spite of its efforts, the Department has been unable to determine whether there are additional PRC producers of lug nuts. Petitioner argues that it is insufficient for the Department to rely upon Rudong's response alone to determine that it is an MOI. Petitioner contends that the Department must be certain that it has obtained responses from all PRC producers before determining whether the PRC industry is market-oriented.

Petitioner further argues that, before an industry is considered ''market oriented,'' it must demonstrate that it pays market-determined prices for all significant inputs and for all but an insignificant portion of all the inputs accounting for the total value of the merchandise under review. Petitioner states that, although Rudong claims its suppliers pay market-determined prices for all inputs, Rudong failed to produce information that would allow evaluation of this claim. Petitioner also contends that statements from Rudong's suppliers regarding the absence of government control over their industry are unsupported and unverified. Petitioner maintains that the suppliers of water and electricity to Rudong are ''All People-owned'' and the information supplied by Rudong on vendor ownership is contradictory.

Petitioner contends that Rudong's submission does not address the overarching question of the status of the Chinese steel and chemical industries. Petitioner argues that, regardless of purported ''independence'' of Rudong's suppliers, the Department properly recognized that the industries supplying materials must be market-driven. Petitioner further argues that Rudong has not provided any information concerning the steel and chemical industries nor evidence that costs for raw materials are not distorted by government control in the steel and chemical industries.

Rudong disagrees with petitioner regarding Rudong's MOI claim. Rudong argues that petitioner's argument ignores Rudong's repeated statements, certified and on the record, that, to its knowledge, it is the only producer of lug nuts in the PRC. Rudong asserts that the Chinese government would be able to certify this only if the government controlled the lug nut industry. Rudong maintains that the Department incorrectly presumes that other

producers exist because Rudong supplied no evidence to the contrary. Rudong argues that the petitioner failed to produce evidence that any other lug nut producers exist in the PRC.

Rudong argues that statements, certified and on record, from its suppliers corroborate the absence of government control and provide varying input prices that are sufficient evidence that Rudong purchases its inputs at market prices. Rudong claims that input prices vary from order to order and from supplier to supplier and that it has put on the record certified statements from suppliers that they are free from government control and interference. Rudong asserts that only unrelated sectors of the steel industry are government controlled. Rudong contends that it does not know what else it can provide to prove the negative.

Department's Position: Rudong submitted with its January 25, 1996 questionnaire response a request that we treat the lug nuts industry as an MOI. Rudong claims that it acquires material inputs at market prices and that, accordingly, we should find that the Chinese lug nuts industry is an MOI and use Rudong's home market sales and/or costs as the basis of NV.

Rudong's support of this argument is focused narrowly on certificates provided by its suppliers stating that they are free of government control; however, even if Rudong's suppliers are free of government control, this would not prove absence of government control in the suppliers' industries. We concluded in the Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order: Chrome-plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China, 57 FR 15052 (April 24, 1992) (*Amended Final*) that such a narrow focus on Rudong's suppliers is not sufficient for determining that an industry was an MOI. We stated:

> The absence of explicit government involvement in these transactions is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the prices for these inputs are market-driven. Instead, it is necessary to examine whether market forces are at work in determining the steel and chemical prices in general within the PRC. For example, it may be the case that the state purchases large quantities of the input in question. Where this is so, it is reasonable to assume that the state's purchases affect the quantity available to non-state consumers and the prices they would pay. Also, where the state owns many of the input producers and where the input is an important commodity fundamental to the operation of the larger economy, it is not at all clear that the pricing and production of those input producers would mirror those of privately-owned, profit maximizing enterprises.
>
> For the [sic] reasons, it is necessary to look beyond direct state involvement in the specific transactions between the manufacturer under investigation and its suppliers to ascertain whether market forces are actually at work in determining the input prices.

Amended Final, 15053. For this administrative review, Rudong has not demonstrated that there have been any changes to the industries from which it sources its materials that would compel us to reconsider the determination we made in the *Amended Final*. In addition, Rudong has argued that there have been only small quantities of government purchases in unrelated sectors of the steel industry, but has not put any information on the record to support this point.

We agree with petitioner's contention that the record lacks objective corroboration of Rudong's claim that it is the only PRC producer of lug nuts. We disagree with Rudong's deduction that the lack of response from the PRC government is indicative of the lack of government control in the industry. We do not know why the government failed to respond to our request for information.

Based on the foregoing, we determine the lug nuts industry in the PRC is not an MOI for this review.

Comment 3: Petitioner supports the Department's use of India as the surrogate market economy country to determine valuation in the factors of production. Petitioner submits that India meets both statutory criteria: India is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC, and India has significant production of lug nuts. Petitioner also supports the use of India as the surrogate country because there is a full set of surrogate data available to value factors of production. This eliminates the need to obtain and use valuation data from multiple surrogate countries.

Department's Position: Except for our valuation of the steel wire rod (*see* Comment 4 below), we have continued to rely on India as a surrogate country for factor valuation because India is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and has significant production of lug nuts.

Comment 4: Rudong objects to the Department's use of steel prices from the Government of India import statistics, stating that these prices are more than twice as high as all other available data, especially in light of the requirements for corroboration in the URAA, and that they should be changed for the final results.

Rudong alleges that the factor value for steel should be based on Indian market prices for steel wire rod published in *Steel Scenario*. Rudong contends that *Steel Scenario* is a reputable professional journal which publishes actual market prices in India. Rudong argues that prices from *Steel Scenario* are corroborated by their general agreement with the prices listed in other sources, while the surrogate prices chosen by the Department are completely out of line with any other source. Rudong maintains that prices from *Steel Scenario* are for a period contemporaneous to the period of review (POR), whereas Government of India import statistics are from a different period, and must be adjusted by a potentially distortive inflation factor. Additionally, Rudong states that *Steel Scenario* reports prices for the same input product as Rudong uses to produce lug nuts, whereas the import statistics are for a ''basket'' category. Rudong asserts that *Steel Scenario* reports actual market data collected by professionals knowledgeable in the industry and in the market; import statistics, Rudong claims, depend upon product classifications by the importer who may be guided more by the import duty level than the product characteristics. Finally, Rudong argues that *Steel Scenario* prices are the best information regarding such factors in the market economy country because they are actual market values in India, while, by contrast, import statistics reflect the customs value of imported merchandise.

Rudong asserts that the Department's choice of import statistics results in landed, duty-paid steel prices in India—a relatively poor developing country—that are not only over 100% higher than the free-market prices paid by Rudong, but also over 100% higher than the corresponding prices in the United States, a wealthy developed country. Rudong claims that there is no other available steel price anywhere that approaches the extraordinarily inflated surrogate prices imputed by the Department. Rudong suggests the Department use the Indian market prices listed in *Steel Scenario* because the prices are in the same range as those prices paid by Rudong and reflect the prevailing market prices for the exact months of the period under review.

Rudong states that the Department's surrogate number does not agree with any of the other available data by a wide margin. Rudong contends that this may be because the Department incorrectly used surrogate steel prices from a somewhat arbitrary ''basket'' HTS category comprising ''other'' bars and rods. Rudong argues that the steel included in this basket may be a special

and more expensive type used for particular purposes and not relevant to this case. Also, Rudong contends, the Department's surrogate prices may not agree with other available data due to simple misclassification under the HTS. Rudong argues that, in significant part, import statistics measure only the HTS category chosen by importers to classify merchandise and are therefore, not a precise measure. Rudong argues that, whatever the source of distortion, the import statistics are not an appropriate measure of the price of steel used by Rudong, and should not be used by the Department in the final results.

Rudong contends that the only potential distortion risked by using *Steel Scenario* is that prices therein include excise and sales taxes, and therefore may be overstated. Rudong argues that this distortion can be adjusted for by adjusting the price downwards. Rudong argues that the Department routinely adjusts for this tax factor when it uses prices published in Chemical Weekly, and cites, as an example, a memorandum to the file from the ''Bicycles Team'': ''Final Determination in the Antidumping Duty Investigation of Bicycles from the People's Republic of China: Factors Valuation'' (initialed April 22, 1996). Rudong maintains that even using unadjusted, overvalued steel prices from *Steel Scenario* would be more reasonable than using Indian import statistics.

Petitioner contends that the Department should rely on the same surrogate values from Indian import statistics for valuing raw materials and packing costs that were used in the preliminary results. Petitioner states that the tariff descriptions provide narrow coverage for nearly all raw materials and packing materials used by the Chinese producer, which avoids the problem of over inclusiveness.

Petitioner argues that the Department should continue to use Indian import statistics for steel valuation. Petitioner states that these data include material from which Rudong produced lug nuts during the period of review, and therefore are the most accurate information on this issue.

Petitioner argues that the Department should continue to decline use of steel price data submitted by Rudong as the Department did in the preliminary results, because they are for rounds and not steel wire rod. Petitioner asserts that steel rounds are not the raw material used in lug nut production. Petitioner contends that applying such data would distort the value of steel. Petitioner submits that the use of steel wire rods in the production of lug nuts was verified by the Department.

Additionally, petitioner asserts that the steel prices submitted by Rudong represent sales prices in two Indian cities and may not be representative of steel prices in India generally. Petitioner claims that the Indian import statistics provide nationwide average prices for steel in India.

Petitioner further contends that the steel scrap data used by the Department reflect that the production process of lug nuts begins with the steel wire rod, not the further-fabricated steel rounds. Petitioner notes that the respondent failed to point out that the Department would have to adjust the scrap calculations to eliminate scrap accounted for by the production of rounds from rod. Petitioner claims that other adjustments—to energy and labor—would also be necessary to pretend that the production process starts with rounds, instead of rod.

Rudong contends that petitioner's assertions are wrong, and that, even under petitioner's analysis, the Department should use the surrogate prices submitted by Rudong. Rudong states that it submitted prices for both wire rod and rounds because it is unclear why steel wire rod data is preferable to steel rounds data. In addition, Rudong contends that, although the broad category of product reported in Rudong's submission was for ''iron and steel,'' it is apparent that the category ''wire rod'' consists of steel and not iron.

Department's Position: We agree with Rudong, in part. We agree with Rudong that the information in *Steel Scenario* is more contemporaneous with the POR; however, the data submitted by Rudong do not indicate the grade and specifications of the metal. We noted in Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 60 FR 48687 (September 20, 1995), covering the 1991–1992 and 1992–1993 administrative review periods that the Indian import statistics are more specific in that they indicate the carbon content of the steel, whereas by contrast, *Steel Scenario* does not specify either the carbon content of the steel or other chemicals present in the steel. Carbon level is a more important determinant of price than size. We further note that *Steel Scenario* prices include taxes and levies, without indicating the amount of taxes and levies included. Our objective is to value steel at prices at which it is available in the surrogate country. Furthermore, we are not convinced that the prices shown in *Steel Scenario* are more representative of prices available in India than are import statistics. While Rudong has put on the record of this review data that would allow us to adjust for taxes, it has not assuaged our other concerns regarding the use of *Steel Scenario.*

However, in reviewing the Indian import data for steel wire rod, in comparison with prices of steel wire rod imported into other countries, we found that Indian import prices were significantly higher than prices of imports into other countries we examined. We compared the same ''basket'' HTS number for the United States, the European Union, Canada, and Indonesia and found that steel wire rod import prices to be relatively the same in these areas, and significantly lower than Indian steel wire rod import prices. Indonesia is also comparable to the PRC in terms of level of economic development and Indonesia has some lug nut production, albeit not as great as India. (See Memorandum to Laurie Parkhill from David Mueller, dated March 15, 1996, ''Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China: Non-market Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' and Memorandum to the File from Elisabeth Urfer, dated June 14, 1996, ''India: Significant Production of Comparable Merchandise,'' which are on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).) Therefore, for these final results we have used Indonesian steel wire rod import prices. These import prices are also for a basket category of steel wire rod imports, as are the Indian import prices, but are consistent with steel wire rod prices in other countries. They also do not include taxes. (*See* memorandum to the file from Tamara Underwood, ''Comparison of Steel Prices in the 1994–1995 Administrative Review on Lug Nuts from the PRC'' dated October 30, 1996.)

Comment 5: Petitioner submits that the Department should continue to use as the surrogate labor rate data from the Economist Intelligence Unit's Investing, Licensing, and Trading Conditions Abroad (*IL&T*), as the Department did for the preliminary results.

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioner with regard to the use of the *IL&T* data. For the final results, we have recalculated the labor rates, using data from the Yearbook of Labor Statistics (*YLS*). As we stated in the Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Bicycles From the People's Republic of China, 61 FR 19026, April 30, 1996, the *IL&T* reports estimates based not on actual wage rates, but on rates stipulated in various

Indian laws. See Memorandum to the File From Tamara Underwood, ''Labor Valuation Changes in Lug Nuts Final Calculation'', dated November 6, 1996. Therefore, we have not used *IL&T* data for the final results. The *YLS* provides wage rates on an industry-specific basis. We used the daily wage rate specified for SIC code 381, ''manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment,'' because the description of the various industries this category covers was the best match for the lug nut industry. Having found the *IL&T* data to be an inappropriate source for wage rates, it would be inappropriate to use the *IL&T* data to differentiate among skill levels. Because the *YLS* provides wage rates from 1990, we inflated the data for the review period, using the consumer price index, published in the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics.

Final Results of Review

As a result of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in our preliminary results of review. Therefore, we determine that the following margins exist as a result of our review:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Jiangsu Rudong Grease Gun Factory, also known as China Nantong HuangHai Auto Parts Group Co., Ltd.	09/01/94–08/31/95	2.70
China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp., Nantong Branch	09/01/93–08/31/94	44.99
PRC rate	09/01/94–08/31/95	44.99

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC 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) For Rudong and Nantong, which have separate rates, the cash deposit rates will be the company-specific rates stated above; (2) for the companies named above which did not respond to our questionnaire (China National, Jiangsu, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai Automobile, and Tianjin), and for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate stated above; (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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

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 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 orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the 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 section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: November 6, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–29243 Filed 11–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–427–811]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From France: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Jacques or Jean Kemp, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3434 or (202) 482–4037, respectively.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review are certain stainless steel wire rods (SSWR), products which are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed, and/or pickled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons, or other shapes, in coils. SSWR are made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are only manufactured by hot-rolling, are normally sold in coiled form, and are of solid cross section. The majority of SSWR sold in the United States is round in cross-sectional shape, annealed, and pickled. The most common size is 5.5 millimeters in diameter.

The SSWR subject to this review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7221.00.0005, 7221.00.0015, 7221.00.0020, 7221.00.0030, 7221.00.0040, 7221.00.0045, 7221.00.0060, 7221.00.0075, and 7221.00.0080 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Amendment of Final Results

On September 11, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from France (61 FR 47874). This review covered Imphy S.A., and Ugine-Savoie, two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is August 5, 1993, through December 31, 1994.

On September 17, 1996, counsel for the petitioning companies Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Armco Stainless &