Department will use the rate of exchange in the forward currency sale agreement.

Section 773A(a) also directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation existed, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice. Further, section 773A(b) directs the Department to allow a 60-day adjustment period when a currency has undergone a sustained movement. A sustained movement has occurred when the weekly average of actual daily rates exceeds the weekly average of benchmark rates by more than five percent for eight consecutive weeks. (For an explanation of this method, *see, Policy Bulletin 96–1: Currency Conversions,* 61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996.) Such an adjustment period is required only when a foreign currency is appreciating against the U.S. dollar. The use of an adjustment period was not warranted in this case because the Japanese yen did not undergo a sustained movement, nor were there any currency fluctuations during the POI.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information used in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of vector supercomputers from Japan, as defined in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. For these entries, the Customs Service will require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the normal value exceeds the export price as shown below.

The entries must be accompanied by documentation provided by both the foreign manufacturer/exporter and the U.S. importer which discloses the following information: (1) The vector supercomputer contract pursuant to which the merchandise is imported, (2) a description of the merchandise included in the entry, (3) the actual or estimated price (agreed to as of the time of importation) of the complete vector supercomputer system, and (4) a schedule of all shipments to be made pursuant to a particular vector supercomputer contract, if more than one shipment is involved. We will also request that the Japanese manufacturer/exporter(s) submit to the Department the contracts pursuant to which subject merchandise is imported. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

The scope of this investigation includes both complete and unassembled shipments. Given that vector supercomputer systems may be entered into the United States in different shipments, it is important to ensure that the subject merchandise, particularly parts, components, and subassemblies, be readily identifiable to the U.S. Customs Service and to the Department. To ensure that any antidumping order which may issue as a result of this investigation is clear, we are requesting interested parties to submit their comments on this subject to the Department by May 5, 1997. Reply comments will be due by May 19, 1997.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Fujitsu	27.17
NEC *	454.00
All Others	27.17

* Facts Available Rate.

Pursuant to section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the Department has excluded the margin determined entirely under section 776 of the Act from the calculation of the All Others rate.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than July 7, 1997, and rebuttal briefs, no later than July 10, 1997. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. The summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to give interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on July 14, 1997, time and room to be determined, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within ten days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by 135 days after the date of the preliminary determination.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act.

Dated: March 28, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–8766 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–489–501]

Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube From Turkey

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Stagner at (202) 482–1673 or Gabriel Adler at (202) 482–1442, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, 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 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). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Amended Final Results

On December 31, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube (pipe and tube) from Turkey (61 FR 69067). The period of review (POR) is May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995.

In January 1997, the petitioners and the Borusan Group (Borusan) filed timely allegations, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28, of ministerial and clerical errors with regard to the final results in the 1994–95 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pipe and tube from Turkey.

We determine, in accordance with section 735(e) of the Act, that ministerial errors were made in our margin calculation for Borusan. Specifically, Borusan alleged that (1) the verified costs upon which the Department relied for its final results did not include inventory holdings gains; (2) the concordance program (*i.e.*, matching) selected inappropriate matches; and (3) the computer program incorrectly applied the weight savings adjustment to all costs, rather than only to costs based on the weight of coil. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c), we are amending the final results of the administrative review of steel pipe and tube from Turkey to correct these ministerial errors. For a detailed discussion and the Department's analysis, see Memorandum from Case Analysts to Richard W. Moreland, dated March 24, 1997.

Additionally, Borusan alleged that (1) the Department's calculation of cost of production is improperly based on an average of the production costs for the period July 1994 to April 1995, and erroneously ignores reported costs for the period July 1993 through June 1994; and (2) the Department erroneously based its level of trade price analysis on the POR rather than on a monthly basis since Turkey experienced hyperinflation during the POR. We determine that these allegations are not ministerial errors pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28(d) because it is a substantive argument for a new methodology. *Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.* v. *United States*, No. 97–2, Slip Op. at 20 (CIT January 8, 1997). Accordingly, we have not considered these issues because they are outside the scope of permissible corrections under 19 CFR 353.28(d). *Id.* For a detailed discussion and the Department's analysis, see Memorandum from Case Analysts to Richard W. Moreland, dated February 27, 1997.

The petitioners alleged that the Department incorrectly relied on the exchange rates for investigations, rather than those for administrative reviews. They state that the Department did not follow its policy outlined in *Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversion* (61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996) (*Change in Policy*). We determine that this allegation is not a ministerial error pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28(d) because it was the Department's intention to limit the application of the *Change in Policy*. *See Final Results*, at 69071.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube products with an outside diameter of 0.375 inch or more but not over 16 inches, of any wall thickness. These products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90. These products, commonly referred to in the industry as standard pipe and tube, are produced to various American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) specifications, most notably A–120, A–53 or A–135.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Amended Final Results of Review

Upon correction of the ministerial errors, we have determined that the following margins exist for the period indicated:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin percent
Borusan	5/1/94–4/30/95	3.37

The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the 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 certain circular welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Borusan will be the rate established above; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original investigation, 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 the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review, the cash deposit rate will be 14.74 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 also serves as final reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

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 C.F.R. 353.28.

Dated: March 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–8769 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Arizona; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made 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). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 96–129. *Applicant:* University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. *Instrument:* Surface Forces Apparatus, Model Mark 4. *Manufacturer:* Australian National University, Australia. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 4032, January 28, 1997.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides measurement of the forces between two surfaces in vapor or liquid with a sensitivity of 10 nN and a distance resolution of about 0.1 nm with a positioning accuracy to 50 nm. This capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97–8768 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–401–401]

Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On December 3, 1996, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 (61 FR 64062; December 3, 1996). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. For information on the net subsidy for the reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest or Lorenza Olivas, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(a), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers SSAB Svenskt Stal AB (''SSAB''), the sole known producer/exporter of the subject merchandise during the review period. This review also covers the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, and 10 programs.

We published the preliminary results on December 3, 1996 (61 FR 64062). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments from any of the parties.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA'') effective January 1, 1995 (''the Act''). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain carbon steel products from Sweden. These products include cold-rolled carbon steel, flat-rolled products, whether or not corrugated, or crimped: whether or not pickled, not cut, not pressed and not stamped to non-rectangular shape; not coated or pleated with metal and not clad; over 12 inches in width and of any thickness; whether or not in coils. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7209.11.0000, 7209.12.0000, 7209.13.0000, 7209.21.0000, 7209.22.0000, 7209.23.0000, 7209.24.5000, 7209.31.0000, 7209.32.0000, 7209.33.0000, 7209.34.0000, 7209.41.0000, 7209.43.0000, 7209.44.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7211.30.5000, 7211.41.7000 and 7211.49.5000. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Allocation Methodology

In the past, the Department has relied upon information from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service on the industry-specific average useful life (''AUL'') of assets in determining the allocation period for nonrecurring grant benefits. See General Issues Appendix appended to Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from Austria, 58 FR 37217, 37226 (July 9, 1993) (''General Issues Appendix''). However, in *British Steel plc.* v. *United States,* 879 F. Supp. 1254 (CIT 1995) (''*British Steel*''), the U.S. Court of International Trade (''the Court'') ruled against this allocation methodology. In accordance with the Court's remand order, the Department calculated a company-specific allocation period for nonrecurring subsidies based on the AUL of non-renewable physical assets. This remand determination was affirmed by the Court on June 4, 1996. *British Steel,* 929 F. Supp. 426, 439 (CIT 1996).

The Department has decided to acquiesce to the Court's decision and, as such, we intend to determine the allocation period for nonrecurring subsidies using company-specific AUL data where reasonable and practicable. In the preliminary results (61 FR 64062), the Department preliminarily determined that it is reasonable and practicable to allocate all new nonrecurring subsidies (*i.e.,* subsidies that have not yet been assigned an allocation period) based on a company-specific AUL. However, if a subsidy has already been countervailed based on an allocation period established in an earlier segment of the proceeding, it does not appear reasonable or