

by any other PRC manufacturers and exported by any of these companies is 43.32 percent (the PRC-wide rate).

Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act.

Dated: April 9, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-9963 Filed 4-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-609]

#### Color Picture Tubes From Japan; Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On March 3, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 9413) the notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on color picture tubes from Japan, for the period of January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996. This review has now been terminated as a result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the interested parties that requested the review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 17, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Riggle, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On January 31, 1997, we received a timely request from the petitioners, (the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine & Furniture Workers, the AFL-CIO; and the Industrial Union Department, AFL-

CIO) to conduct an administrative review of sales by Mitsubishi Electronics Industries Inc. (Mitsubishi) subject to the antidumping duty order on color picture tubes from Japan. No other interested party requested an administrative review of this order. On March 3, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 9413) the notice of initiation of administrative review for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996.

#### Termination of Review

On March 31, 1997, we received a timely request for withdrawal of the request for administrative review from the petitioners. Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department may allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review.

Because petitioners' request for withdrawal was submitted within the 90-day time limit and there were no requests for review from other interested parties, we are terminating this review.

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation. We will issue appraisal instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675) and 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5).

Dated: April 9, 1997.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I.*

[FR Doc. 97-9966 Filed 4-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-580-812]

#### Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors From the Republic of Korea; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On January 7, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMs) from the Republic of Korea (62 FR 964). Subsequent to the publication of these final results, the petitioner, Micron Technology, Inc. (Micron) filed suit with the Court of International Trade (CIT) with respect to the Department's methodology used in calculating the dumping margin of one respondent, LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LGS). No suit was filed by any parties to this proceeding with respect to the dumping calculations pertaining to the other respondent in this review, Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co., Ltd. (Hyundai). We have corrected two ministerial errors with respect to sales of subject merchandise by Hyundai. The errors were present in our final results of review. The review covers the period May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995. We are publishing this amendment to the final results of review in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 17, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas F. Futtner, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 4, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3814.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of DRAMs from the Republic of Korea (Korea): Hyundai and LGS, and the period May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995. The Department published the preliminary results of review on July 9, 1996 (61 FR 36029), and the final results of review on January 7, 1997 (62 FR 964).

### 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).

### Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of DRAMs of one megabit and above from the Republic of Korea (Korea). For purposes of this review, DRAMs are all one megabit and above, whether assembled or unassembled. Assembled DRAMs include all package types. Unassembled DRAMs include processed wafers, uncut die and cut die. Processed wafers produced in Korea, but packaged, or assembled into memory modules in a third country, are included in the scope; wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea are not included in the scope of this review.

The scope of this review includes memory modules. A memory module is a collection of DRAMs, the sole function of which is memory. Modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs), single in-line memory modules (SIMMs), or other collections of DRAMs, whether unmounted or mounted on a circuit board. Modules that contain other parts that are needed to support the function of memory are covered. Only those modules which contain additional items which alter the function of the module to something other than memory, such as video graphics adapter (VGA) boards and cards, are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review also includes video random access memory semiconductors (VRAMs), as well as any future packaging and assembling of DRAMs.

The scope of this review also includes removable memory modules placed on motherboards, with or without a central processing unit (CPU), unless the importer of motherboards certifies with the Customs Service that neither it, nor a party related to it or under contract to it, will remove the modules from the motherboards after importation. The scope of this review does not include DRAMs or memory modules that are reimported for repair or replacement.

The DRAMs subject to this review are classifiable under subheadings

8542.11.0001, 8542.11.0024, 8542.11.0026, and 8542.11.0034 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Also included in the scope are those removable Korean DRAMs contained on or within products classifiable under subheadings 8471.91.0000 and 8473.30.4000 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive.

The period of review (POR) covers from May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995 for all respondents.

### Ministerial Errors in Final Results of Review

After reviewing allegations of ministerial errors submitted by Hyundai, the Department determined that it should correct two clerical errors pertaining to Hyundai. The Department corrected the following clerical errors in the final results pertaining to Hyundai:

In the margin calculations in the final results of review, we did not correctly revise our final calculations to correct for double counted interest expense in our preliminary calculation of CEP profit. To correct this double counting of interest expense, we intended to deduct U.S. credit expense from total U.S. expenses, but instead inadvertently added U.S. credit expense to Hyundai's U.S. direct selling expenses. We also inadvertently deducted Korean inventory carrying costs from U.S. price. We corrected the final calculations by deducting U.S. credit expense and not Korean inventory carrying costs from U.S. price (see memorandum *Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) from the Republic of Korea (A-580-812); Second Administrative Review—Clerical Errors in the Final Results of Review*).

### Amended Final Results of Review

Upon correction of the ministerial errors listed above, the Department has determined that the following margin exists for the periods indicated:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995:	
Hyundai Electronics Industries ....	0.09

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 Hyundai 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.

Dated: April 9, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-9972 Filed 4-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-412-810]

#### Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review; certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom.

**SUMMARY:** On December 10, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period March 1, 1995 through February 29, 1996.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, and the correction of certain clerical errors, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 17, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** G. Leon McNeill or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

#### *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). 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).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On December 10, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 65022) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom (58 FR 15324, March 22, 1993). The Department has now completed the review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

##### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of nonalloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined by the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1(f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead, or 0.1 percent or more of bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00, 60.00; 7213.39.00.30, 00.60, 00.90; 7214.40.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.50.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.60.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; and 7228.30.80.00. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth steel products, British Steel Engineering Steels limited (BSES), formerly United Engineering Steels Limited (UES), and the period March 1, 1995 through February 29, 1996.

##### Duty Absorption

As part of this review, we are considering, in accordance with section 751(a)(4) of the Act, whether BSES absorbed antidumping duties. See the preliminary results of this review (61 FR 65022, December 10, 1996). For these

final results of review, we find that antidumping duties have been absorbed by BSES. For a further discussion of this issue, see comments 1 and 2 below.

#### Analysis of the Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received comments and rebuttal comments from the petitioner, Inland Steel Bar Co., and BSES.

*Comment 1:* BSES contends that the Department lacks the authority to conduct a duty absorption inquiry in this, the third administrative review of this case, because the Act only permits such inquiries to be made in the second and fourth administrative reviews after the order is published.

Petitioner maintains that the Department was correct in conducting this duty absorption inquiry. Petitioner contends that BSES ignores the fact that, because this order was in effect on January 1, 1995, it is a transition order under the Act. Petitioner argues that the issue date for transition orders, as prescribed by the Act for the interpretation of sunset-related deadlines, is not the date of the original **Federal Register** publication, but rather the effective date of the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement, January 1, 1995. As support for its argument, petitioner cites the URAA, Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) in H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2nd Sess. (1994) at 882.

Petitioner also contends that section 351.213(j) of the Department's proposed antidumping regulations follows this timing interpretation and provides that for transition orders, if requested, the Department will make an absorption inquiry for administrative reviews initiated in 1996. According to petitioner, the preamble to the proposed antidumping regulations states explicitly that, for transition orders, "reviews initiated in 1996 will be considered initiated in the second year and reviews initiated in 1998 will be considered initiated in the fourth year."

*Department's Position:* We disagree with BSES that the Department lacks the authority to conduct a duty absorption inquiry in this review. Because the order for the subject merchandise was in existence as of the date the WTO agreement entered into force with respect to the United States, it is deemed to be a transition order. See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act. See also the SAA at 882. With respect to transition orders, section 351.213(j)(2) of the Department's proposed antidumping regulations explains that the Department will conduct a duty