

programming language accordingly for these final results.

Comment 10: Petitioner argues that the Department inadvertently used the field MONTHU to establish the year for a concordance entry.

Department's Position: We agree with petitioner. Accordingly, for these final results, we have revised our computer

programming language to make the appropriate clerical error correction.

Correction of Clerical Error

For the preliminary results, we failed to include direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses, and U.S. packing expenses in the amount by which the profit ratio was multiplied in

calculating CV profit. For these final results, we have included these expenses in the calculation of CV profit.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period of review	Margin (per-cent)
British Steel Engineering Steels Limited (BSES)(formerly United Engineering Steels Limited)	3/1/95–2/29/96	4.56

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and normal value may vary from the percentage stated above. Because there is a concurrent review of the countervailing duty order on the subject merchandise, final assessments for BSES will reflect the final results of the countervailing duty administrative review in accordance with 19 CFR 353.41(d)(iv). The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (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 the original less-than-fair-value (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) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 25.82 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (58 FR 6207, January 27, 1993). These deposit requirements 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 subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

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 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 section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 9, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-9971 Filed 4-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-357-810]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Argentina; Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On September 17, 1996, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 48882) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods ("OCTG") from Argentina. This review covered the period June 29, 1995 through July 31, 1996 (for OCTG other than drill pipe) and August 11, 1995 through July 31, 1996 (for drill pipe). This review has now been rescinded as a result of the absence of entries into the United States of subject merchandise during the period of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alain Letort or John Kugelman, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4243 or (202) 482-0649, respectively, or fax (202) 482-1388.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 30, 1996, petitioners requested an administrative review of Siderca S.A.I.C., an Argentine producer and exporter of OCTG, and Siderca Corporation, a U.S. importer and reseller of such merchandise (collectively, "Siderca"), with respect to the antidumping duty order published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1995 (60 FR 41055). We initiated this review on September 17, 1996 (61 FR 48882).

On October 4, 1996, Siderca filed a letter with the Department certifying that it did not export, directly or indirectly, subject merchandise that was entered for consumption into the United States during the period of review ("POR"). Siderca also certified that its U.S. affiliate, Siderca Corporation, did not import for U.S. consumption any of the subject merchandise during the POR.

On October 25, 1996, petitioners claimed that publicly available import data contradicted Siderca's claims. Petitioners contended these data showed that Siderca was the shipper of a substantial quantity of OCTG (drill pipe and green tubing) during the period August through December, 1995, and that Siderca was listed as the consignee of each entry. Petitioners noted that none of these entries appeared in official U.S. import statistics. Petitioners also claimed those statistics showed that a very small quantity of seamless casing entered the United States from Argentina in December 1995, and requested that Siderca be asked to explain the exact nature, timing, and details of this shipment.

On October 30, 1996, we sent a no-shipment inquiry regarding Siderca to the U.S. Customs Service ("Customs"). Customs did not indicate that there were records of any consumption entries of OCTG by Siderca during the POR. On November 13, 1996, Siderca asserted in a letter to the Department that none of the six entries of drill pipe and green tubing referenced by petitioners was a consumption entry; rather, Siderca claimed, two of these entries were temporary importation in-bond ("TIB") entries and four were entries into a foreign-trade zone ("FTZ"). Siderca argued that none of these entries could serve as the basis for an administrative review since they were not imported into the United States for consumption. Siderca also stated that it had no knowledge of, or involvement with, the very small shipment of seamless casing that allegedly entered the United States in December 1995. Siderca surmised that this shipment involved parties other than itself. There is no evidence on the record that would lead us to question this claim by Siderca.

On April 8, 1997, we received official confirmation from Customs that two of the entries of drill pipe and green tubing in question were TIB entries and that the remaining four were FTZ entries. Customs also confirmed that none of these six entries entered the customs territory of the United States during the POR for consumption.

Because the only firm for which a review was requested made no entries into the customs territory of the United States during the POR, we are rescinding this review in accordance with the Department's practice. See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 61 FR 7308, 7317, 7365 (February 27, 1996) (section 351.213(d)(3)). The cash deposit rate for this firm will continue

to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. § 1675 (1995)), and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR § 353.22 (1996)).

Dated: April 10, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-9967 Filed 4-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A489-807]

Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shawn Thompson, Cameron Werker, or Fabian Rivelis, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1776, (202) 482-3874, or (202) 482-3853; respectively.

Scope of Order

The merchandise covered by this order is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar. Deformed rebar is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7213.10.000 and 7214.20.000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Antidumping Duty Order

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department made its final determination that rebar from Turkey is being sold at less than fair value (62 FR 9737, March 4, 1997). On April 10, 1997, the International Trade

Commission (ITC) notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that a regional industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of the subject merchandise from Turkey.

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct Customs officers to assess, upon further advice by the administering authority, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the export price (or the constructed export price) of the merchandise for all entries of rebar from Turkey. These antidumping duties will be assessed on all unliquidated entries of rebar from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 10, 1996, the date on which the Department published its preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 53203). On or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The "All Others" rate applies to all exporters of rebar not specifically listed below.

The ad valorem weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. or Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (Colakoglu)	9.84
Ekinçiler Demir Celik or Ekinçiler Dis Ticaret (Ekinçiler)	18.68
Habas Sinai Ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas)	18.54
Izmir Demir Celik Sanayi A.S. (IDC)	41.80
Izmir Metalurji Fabrikasi Turk A.S. (Metas)	30.16
All Others	16.06

In the final determination, the Department found that critical circumstances exist with respect to exports of rebar from Turkey by all exporters except Colakoglu. However, on April 10, 1997, the ITC notified the Department of its negative determination regarding critical circumstances. As a result of the ITC's determination, pursuant to section 735(c)(3) of the Act, we shall order Customs to terminate the retroactive suspension of liquidation and to release any bond or other security and refund