affiliated parties is insufficient to establish the reimbursement of antidumping duties, absent other evidence. CEMEX also cites *Torrington Co.* v. *United States,* in which the Court of International Trade ruled that the Department properly decided not to make a deduction to U.S. price, absent any evidence of a link between intra-corporate transfers and the reimbursement of antidumping duties. Second, CEMEX claims that petitioners' argument is without merit on factual grounds. CEMEX, in their rebuttal brief, provides a detailed analysis of Sunbelt's cash flow (or earnings before income taxes, depreciation, and amortization), which it claims is more than sufficient to cover antidumping duty liabilities.

Department's Position: We agree with CEMEX. At verification, the Department inquired into Sunbelt's financial situation and its antidumping duty liability, and found no evidence that Sunbelt was reimbursed by CEMEX for the payment of dumping duties (see verification report dated July 22, 1996). Therefore, we are not assessing double the amount of antidumping duty for purposes of this final results of review.

Other Issues

Comment 36: Respondents claim that the Department made the following errors in the computer program: 1) The Department should convert U.S. sales information, which was reported per short ton of cement, should be converted to the same unit of measure as the home market sales reported in metric tons; 2) the semicolon at line 1505 should be removed so that USOTREU and INDIRS2U are included in the calculation of USMOVEU and INDEXUS; and 3) the Department should correct the arm's length test such that sales are assigned the appropriate customer code. In addition, DIFMER should be converted to the same unit of measure as the normal value.

Department's Position: The Department has corrected these errors in the final results.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that the following margins exist for the period August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995:

Company	Margin percentage
CEMEX, S.A.	103.82
All Other	61.85

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.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of gray portland cement and clinker from Mexico, 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) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates will be the rates for those firms as stated above; (2) for previously 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 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 61.85 percent, which was the ''all others'' rates in the LTFV investigations. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Gray Portland Cement and Clinker from Mexico,* 55 FR 29244, (1990).

The deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

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.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and § 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: April 2, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–9123 Filed 4–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–429–601]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Solid Urea From the Former German Democratic Republic

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping order on Solid Urea from the Former German Democratic Republic, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, ''the Act'').

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Presing, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482–0194.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the statutory time limit. *See* Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa (March 24, 1997).

Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Act (245 days from the last day of the anniversary month for preliminary results, 120 days after publication of the preliminary determination for final results), in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limits as follows:

Product	Country	Review period	Initiation date	Prelm due date	Final due date*
Solid Urea (A–429–601)	Germany	95/96	08/15/96	06/02/97	09/30/97

*The Department shall issue the final determination 120 days after the publication of the preliminary determination. This final due date is estimated based on publication of the preliminary notice five business days after signature.

Dated: April 2, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–9115 Filed 4–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–811]

Steel Wire Rope From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order.

SUMMARY: On December 3, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1995–96 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea and intent to revoke in part (61 FR 64058). The review covers 12 manufacturers/exporters for the period March 1, 1995, through February 29, 1996 (the POR). We have analyzed the comments received on our preliminary results and have determined that no changes in the margin calculations are required. The final weighted-average dumping margins for each of the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Rosenbaum or Thomas O. Barlow, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The 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 to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

On December 12, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its 1995–96 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea and intent to revoke in part (61 FR 64058) (Preliminary Results). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received case briefs from the petitioner, the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Specialty Cable Manufacturers (the Committee), and rebuttal briefs from six respondents, including Chung-Woo Rope Co., Ltd. (Chung Woo), Chun Kee Steel & Wire Rope Co., Ltd. (Chun Kee), Manho Rope & Wire Ltd. (Manho), Kumho Wire Rope Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Kumho), Ssang Yong Steel Wire Co., Inc. (Ssang Yong), and Sungjin Company (Sungjin). There was no request for a hearing.

We have conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 353.22.

Revocation In Part

We are revoking the order for Chun Kee and Manho. Chun Kee and Manho have sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (NV) for three consecutive review periods, including this review. Further, on the basis of no sales at less than NV for these periods and the lack of any indication that such sales are likely in the future, we have determined that Chun Kee and Manho are not likely to sell the merchandise at less than NV in the future. Chun Kee and Manho have also submitted certifications that they will not sell at less than NV in the future, along with an agreement for immediate reinstatement of the order if such sales occur. See our discussion in response to Comment 1 below.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is steel wire rope. Steel wire rope encompasses ropes, cables, and cordage of iron or carbon steel, other than stranded wire, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, and not made up of brass-plated wire. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090. Excluded from this review is stainless steel wire rope, *i.e.*, ropes, cables and cordage other than stranded wire, of stainless steel, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, which is classifiable under HTS subheading 7312.10.6000. Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our own written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We have determined, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for Boo Kook Corporation (Boo Kook), Dong-Il Steel Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Dong-Il), and Yeonsin Metal (Yeonsin) because they did not respond to our antidumping questionnaire. We find that these firms have not provided ''information that has been requested by the administering authority.'' Furthermore, we determine that, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, it is appropriate to make an inference adverse to the interests of these companies because they failed to cooperate by not responding to our questionnaire.

Where the Department must base the entire dumping margin for a respondent in an administrative review on facts otherwise available because that respondent failed to cooperate, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the use of an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing the facts available. Section 776(b) of the Act also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record.