of KISCO's data and found that the variable cost of manufacturing and the total cost of manufacturing reported in KISCO's U.S. sales data set were also misread. Therefore, we also have corrected these fields for the final results.

Comment 3: KISCO argues that the Department failed to adjust USP for the interest revenue it earned as a result of the charges its U.S. subsidiary made to late-paying customers. KISCO maintains that it is the Department's long-standing practice to offset interest income earned on sales of subject merchandise against imputed credit costs in calculating the credit expense adjustment to USP.

Department's Position: We agree with KISCO and have corrected our USP calculations to account for interest revenue.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period April 28, 1992, through October 31, 1993:

Company	Margin (percent)
Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd	1.71
Korea Iron & Steel Co., Ltd./Union Steel Co., Ltd	1.53
Korea Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	3.15
Pusan Steel Pipe Co., Ltd	6.00

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Because the inability to link sales with specific entries prevents entry-by-entry assessments, we will calculate wherever possible an exporter/importer-specific assessment value.

With respect to assessment for ESP, purchase price, and IPP transactions, for the reasons explained in the ''General Issues'' section of this notice, we calculated a per-unit dollar amount of dumping duty by dividing the total dumping duties due for each importer/customer by the corresponding number of units used to determine the duties due. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-ton dollar amount against each ton of merchandise on each of the importers'/customers' subject entries during the review period.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates outlined 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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 4.80 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the amended final determination of the LTFV investigation published on November 3, 1995. *See Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Determination,* 60 FR 55833 (November 3, 1995).

This notice also serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under § 353.26 of the Department's regulations 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) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return/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 violation which is subject to sanction.

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

Dated: October 20, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–28408 Filed 10–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–357–403]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Argentina; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

SUMMARY: On June 13, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its 1991 administrative review of the countervailing duty order on oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from Argentina. We have now completed this review and determine the total net subsidy to be 0.49 percent *ad valorem,* which is *de minimis.* For further information, see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 27, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Herring, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; *Telephone:* (202) 482–4149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 13, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 32307) the preliminary results of its 1991 administrative review of the countervailing duty order on OCTG from Argentina (49 FR 46564; November 27, 1984). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). This review involves one producer/exporter, Siderca, which accounts for all exports of the subject merchandise during the review period and 19 programs.

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. On July 14, 1997, a case brief was submitted by Siderca.

On August 1, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the final results of changed circumstances countervailing duty reviews covering the orders on leather, wool, oil country tubular goods, and cold-rolled steel from Argentina (*see Leather From*

Argentina, Wool From Argentina, Oil Country Tubular Goods From Argentina, and Carbon Steel Cold-Rolled Flat Products From Argentina; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Reviews (62 FR 41361)). In these changed circumstances reviews, the Department determined that, based upon the ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Ceramica Regiomontana* v. *United States,* 64 F.3d 1579, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1995), it does not have the authority to assess countervailing duties on entries of merchandise covered by this order occurring on or after September 20, 1991. As a result, the countervailing duty order on OCTG was revoked effective September 20, 1991. Therefore, the results of this administrative review will only apply to entries of the subject merchandise made between January 1, 1991 and September 19, 1991. (*See Final Results of Review* section of this notice).

Applicable Statute

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of Argentine oil country tubular goods. These products include finished and unfinished oil country tubular goods, which are hollow steel products of circular cross section intended for use in the drilling of oil or gas, and oil well casing, tubing and drill pipe of carbon or alloy steel, whether welded or seamless, manufactured to either American Petroleum Institute (API) or proprietary specifications. During the review period this merchandise was classifiable under item numbers 7304.20.20, 7304.20.40, 7304.20.50, 7304.20.60, 7304.20.70, 7304.20.80, 7304.39.00, 7304.51.50, 7304.59.60, 7304.59.80, 7304.90.70, 7305.20.40, 7305.20.60, 7305.20.80, 7305.31.40, 7305.31.60, 7305.39.10, 7305.39.50, 7305.90.10, 7305.90.50, 7306.20.20, 7306.20.30, 7306.20.40, 7306.20.60, 7306.20.80, 7306.30.50, 7306.50.50, 7306.60.70, and 7306.90.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope remains dispositive.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Cash Deposit Purposes

Because Siderca accounted for virtually all exports of OCTG from Argentina during the period of review, the subsidy calculated for Siderca constitutes the country-wide rate.

Analysis of Programs

I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

A. Programs Previously Determined To Confer Subsidies

1. Government Counterguarantees. In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. We did not receive any comments on this program from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results. Accordingly, the net subsidy for this program is:

Manufacturer/exporter	Rate percent
Program Rate	0.05

2. Pre-shipment Export Financing. In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. We did not receive any comments on this program from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results. Accordingly, the net subsidy for this program is:

Manufacturer/exporter	Rate percent
Program Rate	0.18

3. Rebate of Indirect Taxes (Reembolso/Reintegro). In the preliminary results, we found that there was no benefit from this program during the review period. Our analysis of the comments submitted by the interested parties, summarized below, has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results.

B. New Program Found To Confer Subsidies Preferential Electricity Tariff Rates

In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. We did not receive any comments on this program from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results. Accordingly, the net subsidy for this program is:

Manufacturer/exporter	Rate percent
Program rate	0.26

II. Program Found Not To Confer Subsidies

In the preliminary results, we found the following program to be non-countervailable:

Preferential Natural Gas Tariffs

We did not receive any comments on this program from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results.

III. Programs Found To Be Not Used

In the preliminary results, we found that the producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise did not apply for or receive benefits under the following programs:

1. Medium-And Long-Term Loans
2. Capital Grants
3. Income and Capital Tax Exemptions
4. Government Trade Promotion Programs
5. Exemption from Stamp Taxes Under Decree 186/74
6. Incentives for Trade (Stamp Tax Exemption Under Decree 716)
7. Incentive for Export
8. Export Financing Under OPRAC 1, Circular RF–21
9. Pre-Financing of Exports Under Circular RF–153
10. Loan Guarantees
11. Post-Export Financing Under OPRAC 1–9
12. Debt Forgiveness
13. Tax Deduction Under Decree 173/85

We did not receive any comments on these programs from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results.

IV. Program Found Not To Exist

In the preliminary results, we found the following program not to exist:

Tax Concessions for the Steel Industry

We did not receive any comments on this program from the interested parties, and our review of the record has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment

The respondent argues that, in calculating the allowable tax rebate under the Reembolso/Reintegro program, the Department failed to exclude the taxes on gas used in the direct reduction process. It claims that,

while the Department correctly recognized in its preliminary determination and supporting documents that Siderca consumes gas at its production plant for general use in the plant and for use in the direct reduction of iron ore, the Commerce Department incorrectly excluded the taxes on the portion of the gas used for the direct reduction process. This, according to the respondent, is contrary to the Department's finding in the previous administrative reviews.

Department's Position

We determined that this program did not provide a countervailable benefit during this review period. Thus, the issue of whether the Department should exclude taxes on the portion of gas that Siderca used for the direct reduction process would have no impact on the Department's determination. As such, the issue is moot.

Final Results of Review

As discussed above in the **BACKGROUND** section , the Department has revoked this countervailing duty order on OCTG effective September 20, 1991. Therefore, the results of this administrative review will only apply to entries of the subject merchandise made between January 1, 1991 and September 19, 1991. Since the net subsidy of 0.49 percent *ad valorem* for this review is *de minimis* (*see* 19 CFR 355.7), the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all entries of subject merchandise made between January 1, 1991 and September 19, 1991. Separate instructions regarding entries made on or after September 20, 1991 have already been sent to Customs. Because this countervailing duty order has been revoked, no further instructions will be sent to Customs regarding cash deposits.

This notice 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 355.34(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 355.22.

Dated: October 16, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–28309 Filed 10–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Secretarial Business Development Mission to India

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice serves to inform the public of a Secretarial Business Development Mission to India, December 6–13, 1997, and the opportunity to apply for participation in the mission; sets forth objectives, procedures, and participation criteria for the mission; and requests applications.

DATES: Applications should be submitted to Cheryl Bruner by November 14, 1997, in order to ensure sufficient time to obtain in-country appointments for applicants selected to participate in the mission. Applications received after that date will be considered only if space and scheduling constraints permit. The mission is scheduled for: New Delhi, December 6–9; Calcutta, December 10, Chennai, December- 11; and Mumbai, December 12–13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Request for and submission of applications—Applications are available from: Cheryl Bruner, Director of the Office of Business Liaison or Jennifer Johnson at (202) 482–1360 or via facsimile at (202) 482–4054. Numbers listed in this notice are not toll-free. An original and two copies of the required application materials should be sent to the Project Officer noted above. Applications sent by facsimile must be immediately followed by submission of the original application to Ms. Bruner at the following address: Office of Business Liaison, Room 5062, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Constitution, Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cheryl Bruner or Jennifer Johnson at 202 482–1360. Information is also available via the International Trade Administration's (ITA) Internet home page at ''http://www.ita.doc.gov/uscs/doctm''.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Trade Mission Description

Secretary of Commerce William M. Daley, will lead a business development trade mission to India, one of Asia's most significant emerging markets, to promote expanded trade opportunities, advocate U.S. business interests, advance significant commercial policy objectives, and support the efforts of the U.S.-India Commercial Alliance (USICA) and the U.S.-India Business Council. The Secretary's mission will include U.S. companies whose interests range from assessing the opportunities in the Indian market to expanding existing business relationships. With stops in New Delhi, Calcutta, Chennai, and Mumbai, the Secretary's mission will meet with government and business leaders in the dynamic commercial centers of four distinctly different regions of this large market.

The itinerary of the India Mission will be as follows:

December 5 (Fri.) Leave United States
December 6 (Sat.) Arrive New Delhi
December 7 (Sun.) New Delhi
December 8 (Mon.) New Delhi
December 9 (Tues) New Delhi
December 10 (Wed) New Delhi depart for Calcutta/Arrive Calcutta
December 11 (Thurs.) Depart Calcutta, Arrive Chennai
December 12 (Fri) Depart Chennai, Arrive Mumbai
December 13 (Sat) Depart Mumbai, return to USA
December 14 (Sun) Arrive USA

The goals for the Mission are:

- Reaffirm the U.S. Government's commitment and support for India's program of economic reform and heighten U.S. private sector participation in India's economic growth. Emphasize how India and the U.S. can benefit from continued liberalization and privatization in India, and convey in public and private sector fora during the mission's stay in the country the U.S. Government's interest in seeing that the reforms undertaken by the Indian Government proceed.
- Seek resolution of outstanding bilateral commercial issues and advocate U.S. interests regarding specific problems and opportunities. Key areas of focus: (1) Intellectual property rights; (2) banking and other financial services; (3) economic reforms; (4) power generation; and (5) broadcasting.

A full description of the mission is set forth in the Mission Statement, which is available from Cheryl Bruner, Director of the Office of Business Liaison, at the above address or at website.