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 this 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: July 8, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–18582 Filed 7–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–821–802]

Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 7, 1997.

ACTION: Notice of Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Doyle or Karla Whalen, Office of Antidumping Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Group III, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0159 or (202) 482–0408, respectively.

SUMMARY: On May 7, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) and the Ministry of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation (MINATOM) signed an amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation, as amended (the Suspension Agreement). This amendment doubles the amount of Russian-origin uranium which may be imported into the United States for further processing prior to re-exportation. In addition, it lengthens the period of time uranium may remain in the United States for such processing to up to three years.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 16, 1992, the Department and MINATOM signed the Suspension Agreement on uranium and, on October 30, 1992, the Suspension Agreement was published in the **Federal Register** (57 FR 49220, 49235). On March 11, 1994, the Department and MINATOM signed an amendment to the Suspension Agreement on uranium and, on April 1, 1994, this amendment was published in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 15373). This amendment provided for entry of Russian uranium into the United States based on a concept of matched sales between the United States and Russian producers.

On October 3, 1996, the Department and MINATOM signed two amendments to the Suspension Agreement. One amendment provided for the sale in the United States of feed associated with imports of low-enriched uranium (LEU) derived from high-enriched uranium (HEU) which made the Suspension Agreement consistent with the USEC Privatization Act. The second amendment restored previously unused quota for separative work units (SWU), and covered Russian uranium which had been enriched in a third country within the terms of the Suspension Agreement, for a period of two years from the effective date of the amendment. On November 6, 1996, both amendments were published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 56665).

On August 16, 1996, the Department and MINATOM initialed a proposed amendment regarding the re-export provision of the Suspension Agreement. The amendment extended the 12 month limitation up to 36 months and increased the amount of Russian Federation uranium which could enter the United States for further processing from 3 million pounds U3O8 to 6 million pounds U3O8. The Department subsequently released the proposed amendment to interested parties for comment. After careful consideration by the Department of the comments submitted and further consultations between the two parties, the Department and MINATOM signed the final amendment in its initialed form in Moscow on May 7, 1997. The text of this amendment follows in the Annex to this notice.

Dated: June 12, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation

Consistent with the requirement of Section 734(l) of the U.S. Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to prevent the suppression or undercutting of price levels of domestic products in the United States, Section IV of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation, as amended on March 11, 1994, (the Agreement) is amended as set forth below. All other provisions of the Agreement, particularly Section VII, remain in force and apply to this Amendment.

1. The following paragraphs replace Section IV.H:

For purposes of permitting processing in the United States of uranium products from the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation may issue re-export certificates for import into the United States of Russian uranium products only where such imports to the United States are not for sale or ultimate consumption in the United States and where re-exports will take place within 12 months or within 36 months of entry into the United States as indicated by the importer or record at the time of entry.

In no event shall an export certificate be endorsed by the Russian Federation for uranium products previously imported into the United States under such re-export certificate. Such re-export certificates will in no event be issued in amounts greater than one million pounds U3O8 equivalent per re-export certificate.

The importer of record must specify at the time of entry whether it will re-export the entered material under the 12 month limitation or under the 36 month limitation (which requires additional certifications as noted below).

Re-export certificates issued under the 12 month limitation shall not exceed three million pounds U3O8 equivalent at any one time.

Additional re-export certificates may be issued under the 36 month limitation as long as the total amount of uranium products entered pursuant to re-export certificates issued (under both the 12 month and 36 month limitations) does not exceed six million pounds U3O8 equivalent at any one time.

For re-exports entered under the 36 month limitation, the importer of record must provide the Department with the following at the time of entry: 1) certification that it will ensure re-exportation within 36 months of entry into the United States; 2) certification from the end-user that the uranium products will not be sold, loaned, swapped, used as loan repayments, or utilized other than for re-export in accordance with Section IV.H of the suspension agreement; and 3) certification from the U.S. convertor and/or enricher and/or fabricator, as applicable, that the uranium products will not be sold, loaned, swapped, used as loan repayments, or utilized other than for re-export in accordance with Section IV.H of the suspension agreement while held at the respective entity's facility. Liquidation will be suspended for all such entries of uranium products which are covered by the 36 month re-export certificates. Suspension of liquidation will be continued for each such entry until all uranium products covered by the respective entries are re-exported and the Department of Commerce has notified Customs that the relevant entries may be liquidated.

If uranium products from the Russian Federation are: (A) If subject to the 12 month limitation, not re-exported within 12 months; (B) if subject to the 36 month limitation, not re-exported within 36 months, or (C) if subject to the 36 month limitation, sold, loaned, swapped, used as loan repayments, or utilized other than for re-export in accordance with Section IV.H of the Agreement, the Department will refer the matter to Customs or the Department of Justice for further action and the United States will promptly notify the Government of the Russian Federation and the two governments shall enter into consultations. If the uranium products are not re-exported within 3 months of the referral to Customs or the Department of Justice and the problem has not been resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both the United States and the Russian Federation, the volume of the uranium products entered pursuant to the re-export certificate may be counted against the export limit in effect at such time, or, if there is insufficient quota, the first available quota. This volume may be restored to the export limit if the product is subsequently re-exported.

The Parties agree that this Amendment constitutes an integral part of the Agreement.

The English language version of this Amendment shall be controlling.

Signed on this 7th day of May, 1997.

For the Ministry of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation:

N.N. Yegorov,

Deputy Minister, Ministry of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation.

For the United States Department of Commerce:

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–18449 Filed 7–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–423–806]

Amended Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations; Certain Carbon Steel Products From Belgium

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

SUMMARY: The appeal of the court decision in *Geneva Steel et al.* v. *United States,* 937 F. Supp. 946 (CIT 1996) (*Geneva II*) has been dismissed. *Geneva Steel et al.* v. *United States,* Appeal No. 97–1123 (Fed. Cir., Feb. 27, 1997). On April 18, 1997, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) vacated that part of its decision in *Geneva II* which pertained to Sidmar, N.V. (Sidmar). Therefore, Commerce is amending its final affirmative determinations in the countervailing duty investigations of certain steel products from Belgium in accordance with *Geneva II,* subject to the order of vacatur.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Kane at (202) 482–2815, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., 20230, or Duane Layton at (202) 482–5285, Office of the Chief Counsel for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 15, 1997.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In *Geneva II,* the CIT affirmed Commerce's redetermination on remand of the final affirmative determinations in the countervailing duty investigations of certain steel products from Belgium (58 FR 37273, July 9, 1993, as amended by 58 FR 43749, August 17, 1993). In that redetermination, Commerce addressed six issues, which had been remanded to it by the court in *Geneva Steel et al.* v. *United States,* 914 F. Supp. 563 (CIT 1996) (*Geneva I*).

The first issue concerned an interest rate reduction on a loan received by Forge de Clabecq (Clabecq). In the final determinations, Commerce calculated a benefit for the favorable interest rate on the loan but failed to take into account an interest rate reduction. In the redetermination, Commerce recalculated the subsidy rate for Clabecq to take into account the interest rate reduction on the loan.

The second issue concerned Commerce's calculation of the benefit realized by Clabecq in converting debt to equity. Commerce's normal practice in calculating the benefit from debt-to-equity conversions is to select a benchmark price for the equity on the date on which the equity is issued. In the final determinations, contrary to its normal practice, Commerce calculated the benefit based on the date of the agreement to convert debt to equity. In the redetermination on remand, Commerce recalculated the benefit based on the date of issuance of the equity.

The third issue concerned Commerce's decision in the final determinations to use the price of Cockerill Sambre's (Cockerill's) and Clabecq's publicly traded common shares as a benchmark in determining whether, and to what extent, the companies benefited from selling *parts beneficiaries* (PBs) to the Government of Belgium (GOB). In the final determinations, Commerce gave no explanation for its selection of the common shares of these companies as the next most similar publicly traded shares to the PBs. In the remand determination, Commerce demonstrated from evidence on the record that the publicly traded shares were the next most similar publicly traded shares.

The fourth issue concerned whether Sidmar's conversion of convertible debentures (OCPCs) to PBs was on terms consistent with commercial considerations. In the final determinations, Commerce did not view Sidmar to be unequityworthy and, therefore, did not consider whether the company's conversion of OCPCs to PBs was on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations. In *Aimcor, Alabama Silicon, Inc.* v. *United States,* 871 F. Supp. 447, 454 (CIT 1994) and in *Geneva I,* 914 F. Supp. at 582, the CIT held that investment in a company may be on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations, despite the fact that the company is not unequityworthy. Therefore, the court instructed Commerce to determine