in the original LTFV investigation by the Department.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 the only 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 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: May 5, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–12396 Filed 5–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[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: May 12, 1997.

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, NW., 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 February 18, 1997, 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 (62 FR 7206). 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 January 1, 1995, through December 31, 1995.

On February 19, 1997, we received submissions from Imphy, S.A. and Ugine-Savoie, and their affiliated United States entities, Metalimphy Alloys Corp. and Techalloy Company (''respondents'') alleging of clerical errors with regard to the final results in the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order of certain stainless steel wire rods from France. On February 25, 1997, counsel for the petitioning companies, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Armco Stainless & Alloy Products, Carpenter Technology Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Talley Metals Technology, Inc., United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO/CLC (''petitioners'') filed allegations of clerical errors. Respondents submitted rebuttal comments on March 4, 1997 and petitioners submitted their rebuttal comments on February 26, 1997. The allegations and rebuttal comments of both parties were filed in a timely fashion.

Respondents allege that the Department made four ministerial errors in the final results. First, respondents contend that the Department neglected to use the revised general and administrative expense (GNA) and interest expense (INTEX) in the calculation of CEP profit. Second, respondents allege that in calculating the CEP profit rate, the Department's margin calculation program failed to include foreign indirect selling expenses in total expenses, as required by section 772(f)(2) of the antidumping law. Third, respondents allege that the Department omitted to correct a typographical error in the product code for a home market control number. Fourth, respondents assert that the Department did not correctly revise respondents' cost of manufacture (COM) for constructed value (CV) for certain remelting services.

Petitioners agree with respondents concerning errors 1, 3 and 4. However, concerning the issue of failing to include foreign indirect selling expenses in total expenses for the calculation of CEP profit, petitioners disagree that the Department erred in this respect. Petitioners contend that respondents' allegation does not constitute a ministerial issue. Petitioners note that the only revisions to the final calculations that the Department may make after issuance of a final results are ''ministerial error'' corrections (see 19 CFR 353.28). Petitioners note that the question of which types of expenses are proper deductions from CEP profit is a substantive question that respondents failed to address in their case brief or otherwise prior to issuance of these final results. Consequently, petitioners argue that it would be inappropriate for the Department to consider as a ministerial error the substantive merits of the CEP profit calculation.

After a review of respondents' allegations, we agree with respondents and have corrected these errors for the amended final results. For the computer code we used to correct these ministerial errors, please see the Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa dated May 5, 1997 (''Memorandum''), a public version of which is in the file in Central Records, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce building, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW., Washington, DC. We disagree with petitioners that respondents' error allegation regarding the calculation of CEP profit is not a ministerial error. The Department includes foreign indirect expenses in total expenses for purposes of

calculating CEP profit and did not do so in this case. Consequently, we have corrected it for the amended final.

Petitioners also alleged that the Department made several ministerial errors. First, petitioners alleged that the Department's programming language for the final results incorrectly revised the computer language concerning payment dates. Petitioners contend that the Department's original computer language in the preliminary results correctly set the date of the final results. However, petitioners contend that the computer programming revised the methodology used by the Department despite the statement in the Department's final results notice that it made no changes to the computer program.

Respondents contend that petitioners are wrong and are confusing two different issues raised in briefing with respect to the calculation of U.S. credit expense. Respondents note that the Department disagreed with respondents' claim that the Department incorrectly set the payment date for every U.S. sale to the projected final results date and the Department stated in the final results that it did not change the computer program (see Comment 1 of Final Results). However, respondents note that the Department agreed with respondents that the formula used to calculate U.S. credit expense contained two errors. The Department corrected the error in the Final Results (see Comment 2 of Final Results). Consequently, respondents contend that petitioners are misreading the Department's statement in Comment 1 that it made no changes to the computer program to correct the error in the credit calculation. Respondents contend that the Department made the necessary corrections for the final results and there are no ministerial errors to correct.

We agree with respondents. The Department stated in Comment 1 of the final results that it disagreed with respondents' argument that we incorrectly set the payment date for all sales to the date of the final results. Consequently, for that comment, we stated we did not change the computer program. However, we agreed with respondents in Comment 2 of the final results that the Department incorrectly calculated respondents' credit expense. Consequently, we changed the computer coding in the margin calculation program to reflect the corrected credit expense. Since the calculation of credit expense was corrected for the final results, there is no ministerial error.

Second, petitioners also contend that the Department failed to exclude home market sales that failed the arm's length test from the CV profit calculation. Respondents did not submit a rebuttal argument concerning this issue. We agree with petitioners that this is a clerical error and have corrected the error for the amended final results.

Third, petitioners assert that the Department failed to adjust COM for CV for remelting services. Respondents did not object to petitioners' ministerial allegations but argued that certain computer coding suggested by petitioners was incorrect. We agree that this is a clerical error and have corrected the error for the amended final results using respondents' computer code. Petitioners also requested that the Department correct a certain typographical error by inserting a comma between two control numbers. We also agree that this is a clerical error and have corrected the error for the amended final results.

Fourth, petitioners allege that the Department erroneously deducted the same indirect home market expenses from normal value twice, once in the form of a commission offset and then again in the form of a CEP offset for sales where commissions were paid on respondents' CEP sales, but no commissions were paid for the comparison home market sales.

Respondents contend that this is a methodological issue and not a ministerial error. Respondents note that petitioners failed to address this matter in their case brief or otherwise prior to issuance of the final results. Furthermore, respondents note that petitioners stated in their rebuttal comments for the amended final that a substantive question embodied in the preliminary results but not raised in briefing is not a ministerial error following the final results. Respondents state that applying petitioners' own principle, consideration of this methodological matter is untimely and the Department should dismiss petitioners' comment.

We agree with petitioners that the Department's computer program incorrectly double deducted the same indirect home market expenses from normal value twice. It was not the Department's intention to deduct these expenses twice. Consequently, we consider this to be a ministerial error and have corrected it for the amended final.

Last, petitioners contend that the Department should deduct inventory carrying costs incurred after exportation in calculating CEP. Petitioners note that the Department stated in the final results that it agreed with petitioners that inventory carrying costs incurred after import relate to respondents' economic activity in the United States and are properly deducted as indirect selling expenses. Consequently, petitioners argue that if the Department agreed with petitioners' argument regarding the deduction of post-exportation inventory carrying costs, the Department's failure to deduct such expenses constitutes a ministerial error.

Respondents note that in the final results, the Department disagreed with petitioners, stating that ''the Department does not deduct indirect expenses incurred in selling to the affiliated U.S. importer under section 772(d) of the Act.'' Respondents assert that petitioners misconstrued the Department's position in the final results. Respondents contend that inventory carrying costs incurred from the date of exportation from France to the date the affiliate MAC received the subject merchandise in the United States relate to selling to MAC (respondents' U.S. affiliate), not to selling to an unaffiliated U.S. customer. Consequently, respondents argue that these expenses were properly not deducted in the calculation of CEP and there is no ministerial error to correct.

We agree with respondents. The inventory carrying costs relate to selling to MAC respondents' U.S. subsidiary, and not to the final unaffiliated customer. Thus these costs should not be deducted from CEP.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our review and the correction of the ministerial errors described above, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Imphy/Ugine-Savoie	1/1/95–12/31/95	7.29

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market 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 stainless steel wire rods from France 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) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies 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 this review, or the original 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 24.51 percent for stainless steel wire rods, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigations. See *Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France*, (59 FR 4022, January 28, 1994).

These deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 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.

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: May 5, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–12389 Filed 5–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[A–570–815]

Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China. The review covers exports of this merchandise to the United States for the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996, and thirteen firms: China National Chemical Import and Export Corporation, Hebei Branch (Sinochem Hebei); China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Beijing Branch; China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Qingdao Branch; Sinochem Qingdao; Sinochem Shandong; Baoding No. 3 Chemical Factory; Jinxing Chemical Factory; Zhenxing Chemical Factory; Mancheng Zinyu Chemical Factory, Shijiazhuang; Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Bejing; Hainan Garden Trading Company; Yude Chemical Company and Shunping Lile. The preliminary results of this review indicate that there were no dumping margins for the two responding parties: Yude Chemical Company (Yude) and Zhenxing Chemical Factory (Zhenxing).

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) A statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Smith or Kristen Stevens, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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).

Background

On August 12, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 41768) a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' for the August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996, period of review (POR) of the antidumping duty order on Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China (57 FR 37524). In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22, Sinochem Hebei, Yude Chemical Industry Co. (Yude), Zhenxing Chemical Industry Co. (Zhenxing), PHT International and the petitioners, Nation Ford Chemical Company, requested a review for the aforementioned period. On September 17, 1996, the Department published a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping Review.'' 61 FR 48882. The Department is now conducting a review pursuant to section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid, classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.24 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS), contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid, also classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.24 of the HTS, contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt, classifiable under the HTS subheading 2921.42.79, is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline based on the