

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 951]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status; Seaway Pipeline Company (Crude Oil Transshipment Terminal), Brazoria County, Texas

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act "To provide for the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes," as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, an application from the Brazoria River Harbor Navigation District, grantee of FTZ 149, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the crude oil transshipment terminal of Seaway Pipeline Company, in Brazoria County, Texas, was filed by the Board on March 19, 1997, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 19-97, 62 FR 15461, 4/1/97); and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby grants authority for subzone status at the crude oil transshipment terminal of Seaway Pipeline Company, located in Brazoria County, Texas (Subzone 149D), at the location described in the application, and subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23d day of January 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-2480 Filed 1-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 952]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status; Seaway Pipeline Company (Crude Oil Transshipment Terminal), Texas City, Texas

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act "To provide for the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes," as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, an application from the Texas City Foreign Trade Zone Corporation, grantee of FTZ 199, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the crude oil transshipment terminal of Seaway Pipeline Company, in Texas City, Texas, was filed by the Board on March 19, 1997, and notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (FTZ Docket 20-97, 62 FR 15462, 4/1/97); and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby grants authority for subzone status at the crude oil transshipment terminal of Seaway Pipeline Company, located in

Texas City, Texas (Subzone 199D), at the location described in the application, and subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of January 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-2481 Filed 1-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-301-602]

Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Preliminary Results and Partial Termination 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: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia for the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the normal value by various companies subject to this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price or constructed export price and the normal value (NV). For certain companies who have requested that we rescind their requests for review, we have granted that request.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The deadlines for submission of argument are listed at the end of this notice. All memoranda referred to in this notice can be found in the public reading room, located in the Central

Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 2, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosa Jeong or Marian Wells, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1278 or 482-6309, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 353 (April 1997).

Background

On March 7, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" with respect to the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia. See 62 FR 10521. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c), on April 15, 1997, we initiated an administrative review of this order. See 62 FR 18312. On October 15, 1997, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we extended the deadline for these preliminary results until January 26, 1998. See 62 FR 53593. From December 8 through December 16, 1997, we verified the responses of one respondent, the Caicedo Group. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The scope of the order under review is shipments of certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (standard carnations, miniature (spray) carnations, standard chrysanthemums and pompon chrysanthemums). These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 0603.10.30.00, 0603.10.70.10, 0603.10.70.20, and 0603.10.70.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

Respondent Selection

Section 777A(c)(2) of the Act provides the Department with the authority to determine margins by limiting its examination to a statistically valid sample of exporters or exporters accounting for the largest volume of the subject merchandise that can reasonably be examined. This subparagraph is formulated as an exception to the general requirement of the Act that each company for which a review is requested will be individually examined and receive a calculated margin. In this administrative review, 424 companies were either named in the initiation notice or have been identified as being affiliated with a company named in the initiation notice.

Because of the large number of companies involved in the review and the limited resources available to the Department, we determined that it was administratively necessary to restrict the number of respondents selected for examination. This enabled us to conduct thorough and accurate analyses of the responses to our questionnaires and other relevant issues within the statutory deadlines. Restricting the number of respondents for examination is consistent with the most recent administrative review of this order and other past cases involving large numbers of potential respondents, statutory deadlines and limited resources. See, e.g., *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 16772 (April 8, 1997) (*Flowers Ninth Review*); *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pasta from Italy*, 61 FR 1344 (January 19, 1996); *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brake Drums and Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China*, 61 FR 53190 (October 10, 1996).

The Department limited its examination in the present review to ten groups of exporters and producers accounting for the largest volume of flowers, in accordance with section 777A(c)(2)(B) of the Act. These exporters accounted for over 30 percent by volume of the total exports made during the POR to the United States from Colombia. Therefore, respondents are the following ten parties: the Agrodex Group (Agrodex); Caicedo Group (Caicedo); Claveles Colombianos Group (Clavecol); Cultivos Miramonte Group (Cultivos Miramonte); Floraterra Group (Floraterra); Florex Group (Florex); Guacatay Group (Guacatay); Queens Flowers Group (Queens);

Tinzuque Group (Tinzuque); and Tuchany Group (Tuchany).

Non-Selected Respondents

Consistent with our practice in *Flowers Ninth Review*, we have assigned the non-selected respondents a weighted-average margin based on the calculated margins of selected respondents, excluding any *de minimis* margins and margins based on facts available. The firms in question are listed under "Non-Selected Respondents" in the *Preliminary Results of Review* section below.

Terminations

On July 9, 1997, Flexport de Colombia & Cia S.A. (Flexport), Flores Silvestres S.A. (Silvestres), Vegaflor, and Agropecuaria Sierra Loma S.A. (Sierra Loma) withdrew their requests for review. Silvestres, Sierra Loma, and Vegaflor were included in the Department's initiation notice, but Flexport was inadvertently omitted from the initiation notice. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5), we are terminating this review with respect to Sierra Loma and Vegaflor because these companies have filed timely requests for withdrawal and no other interested party requested that they be reviewed. The cash deposit rates for Sierra Loma and Vegaflor will continue to be the rates established for them in the most recently completed final results. Because Flexport was inadvertently omitted from the initiation notice and because no other party requested a review of it, Flexport continues not to be included in this review.

With respect to Silvestres, a request for review was received for this company from the petitioner, the Floral Trade Council (FTC), on March 3, 1997. Because of the FTC's request, we are not terminating our review for this company.

Verification

All ten selected respondents were verified during the two immediately preceding reviews. With the exception of one respondent, Caicedo, the verifications of all selected respondents during the two preceding reviews were successful. Therefore, Caicedo was the only respondent verified in the present review. We verified information provided by Caicedo using standard verification procedures, including on-site examination of relevant sales and financial records, and inspection of original documentation containing relevant information.

Use of Facts Available

Tuchany

In *Flowers Ninth Review* and during the POR of the present review, the Tuchany group consisted of five growers. The group has since dissolved with three of the companies now out of business and the remaining two growers sold to different, unaffiliated owners. While Tuchany was able to report sales data for all subject merchandise sold by the group during the POR, it was not able to report the cost data for the three growers no longer in existence. The questionnaire response, therefore, contained only the costs of the two operational farms.

Section 776(a)(1) of the Act requires, *inter alia*, that if necessary information is not available on the record, the Department shall use facts available (FA). Pursuant to the Act, if the Department "finds that an interested party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information," the Department may use an adverse inference in selecting from among FA.

Based on the circumstances described by Tuchany, we find it reasonable that the company would have difficulty compiling a complete response. Tuchany indicated that it acted to the best of its ability to locate the missing data and provided a detailed explanation of its efforts. Tuchany explained that cost data, unlike sales records, were maintained individually by each company and Tuchany's exhaustive efforts at locating the former employees and accounting records of the three defunct companies were futile. Accordingly, we believe the use of adverse FA is not warranted in this case. Therefore, for purposes of these preliminary results, we have used the cost data of the two operational farms as FA for the margin calculations of the entire Tuchany group, including the three companies dissolved shortly after the POR. Where cost data for a flower type was unavailable because that flower type was not grown by one of the growers for which cost information was reported, we have applied to those sales, as FA, the margin calculated for the flower type for which cost data was available. See Memorandum from Team to Richard W. Moreland, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, re: Constructed Value Data for Tuchany Group Companies, dated January 26, 1998.

Fair Value Comparisons

United States Price

Consistent with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act and *Flowers Ninth Review*, we determined that it was appropriate to average U.S. prices on a monthly basis in order (1) to use actual price information that is often available only on a monthly basis, (2) to account for large sales volumes, and (3) to account for perishable-product pricing practices.

For the price to the United States, we used export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) as defined in sections 772(a) and 772(b) of the Act, as appropriate. CEP was used for consignment sales through unaffiliated U.S. consignees and sales (consignment or otherwise) made through affiliated importers.

We calculated EP based on the packed price, consisting of invoice price (either f.o.b. Bogota, c.i.f. Miami or c.i.f. Chicago) plus certain additional charges, e.g., box charges and antidumping duties paid, to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts and rebates, foreign inland freight, international (air) freight, brokerage and handling, U.S. customs fees, and return credits.

For sales made on consignment, CEP was calculated based on the packed price consisting of invoice price plus certain additional charges by the consignee, e.g., box charges and antidumping duty deposits paid, to the unaffiliated purchaser. For sales made through affiliated parties, CEP was based on the packed price, consisting of invoice price plus certain additional charges, e.g., box charges and antidumping duty deposits paid, to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made adjustments to these prices, where appropriate, for box charges, discounts and rebates, foreign inland freight, international (air) freight, freight charges incurred in the United States, brokerage and handling, U.S. customs fees, direct selling expenses (credit expense and contributions to the Colombian Flower Council) relating to commercial activity in the United States, return credits, royalties and indirect selling expenses incurred in the home market that related to commercial activity in the United States. Finally, consistent with our practice in *Flowers Ninth Review*, we made adjustments for either commissions paid to unrelated U.S. consignees or the indirect U.S. selling expenses of related consignees.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP for sales made through affiliated parties.

The CEP profit rate was calculated using the expenses incurred by the responding companies on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and of the like product in the home market (for those companies that had home market sales) and the profit associated with those sales.

Normal Value

Section 773 of the Act provides that the normal value (NV) of the subject merchandise shall be (1) the price at which the foreign like product is first sold (or, in the absence of a sale, offered for sale) for consumption in the exporting country (home market (HM) sales), in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the export price or constructed export price, (2) the price at which the foreign like product is so sold (or offered for sale) for consumption in a country other than the exporting country or the United States (third country (TC) sales) or (3) the constructed value of that merchandise.

Some companies selected to respond in this review have sales in the home market of export quality flowers exceeding 5 percent of the sales to the U.S. market, *i.e.*, have a viable home market. However, most companies report no selling expenses on these sales and report them as being incidental to their real purpose of business, the production and exportation of flowers. They also state that export quality sales in the home market are not planned on and generally are the result of excess production. Consistent with our practice in previous reviews of this order and based on information provided by respondents, we have determined that these sales are not within the ordinary course of trade.

Section 773(a)(4) of the Act states that if the administering authority determines that the NV of the subject merchandise cannot be determined using home market prices, then, notwithstanding the possible use of third country prices, the NV of the subject merchandise may be the constructed value (CV) of that merchandise. We received comments and factual information concerning this issue from petitioners on October 10, 1997 and January 9, 1998, and from respondents on December 15, 1997.

During this POR, certain companies selected to respond had viable third country markets in Europe, Japan, and Canada. In prior reviews, we have rejected using prices to Europe because the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison. See *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers from Colombia; Final*

Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 53287 at 53296 (October 14, 1997). Information submitted by respondents shows that this market situation has continued. Therefore, we are not basing NV on sales to European markets.

With respect to Japan and Canada, because these are not significant export markets for Colombia, we have determined that, under the facts of this case, prices to Canada or Japan are not representative within the meaning of section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(I) of the Act. As discussed above in the section on "Respondent Selection," we have limited our analysis to a subset of the Colombian companies exporting to the United States and we are basing the antidumping duty assessments for the non-selected companies on the margins calculated for the selected companies. Given this, we want to make our analysis as representative as possible of the companies that were not selected to respond to our questionnaire.

It is clear that neither Japan nor Canada is an important export market for Colombian flower growers. Evidence on the record indicates that Canada represents less than three percent of flower exports from Colombia and Japan represents less than one percent of flower exports from Colombia. Thus, to use sales to Japan or Canada as the basis of our margin calculations for the few exporters that have viable markets in Japan and Canada and then include those results in calculating the rate used for assessing duties on the non-selected respondents would be inappropriate for the vast majority of growers. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we are basing NV on CV. As an alternative method for ensuring that NV was representative, we considered using third country sales for those companies with a viable third country market, but excluding those companies from the calculation of the assessment rate for non-selected exporters. However, that methodology would substantially reduce the percentage of exports during the POR that would form the basis of the assessment calculation for non-selected exporters. Therefore, we determine that the use of CV is a more reasonable means of establishing a representative NV for purposes of calculating the assessment rates for all exporters under review.

We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, and the selling, general and administrative expenses reported by respondents. Consistent with the methodology used in the Final Results of *Flowers Ninth Review* to calculate a

per-unit CV, see 62 FR 53287 (October 14, 1997), we first converted each month's CVs from pesos to dollars using the corresponding month's exchange rate. We totaled the monthly CV expressed in dollars over the POR and divided by the quantity of export quality flowers sold by the grower/exporter to arrive at the per-stem CV in U.S. dollars. The dollar per-stem CV was then converted to pesos using the period-end exchange rate and then deflated these peso-denominated amounts to the value of Colombian peso in each month of the POR. Next, we converted the peso per-stem CV to dollars based on the date of the U.S. sale, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act.

We consider non-export quality flowers (culls) that are produced in conjunction with export quality flowers to be by-products. Therefore, revenue from the sales of culls was offset against the cost of producing the export quality flowers.

We based selling, general and administrative expenses on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondents in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product for consumption in the home market. Where respondents had no home market sales, we used the general and administrative expenses associated with their sales to all other markets. Regarding selling expenses, with the exception of Floraterra, all respondents reporting sales of export quality flowers in the home market stated they had no selling expenses in that market. Therefore, we did not include selling expenses for those respondents. For Floraterra, we included the actual selling expenses incurred.

With respect to profit, we preliminarily determine that the conditions that led to the use of FA for the profit rate in *Flowers Ninth Review* continue to exist in the current POR. We find that home market sales of culls and/or export quality flowers were outside the ordinary course of trade because the record indicates that they were made at below cost prices. Consequently, we are unable to apply the methods specified in section 773(e)(2)(A) or 773(e)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act for calculating profit. Also, none of the respondents realized a profit on merchandise in the same general category as flowers produced for sale in Colombia. Therefore, we are also not able to apply the profit methodology described in section 773(e)(2)(B)(i) of the Act.

Section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) permits the Department to use "any other reasonable method" to compute an amount for profit, provided that the

amount "may not exceed the amount normally realized by exporters or producers . . . in connection with the sale, for consumption in the foreign country, of merchandise that is in the same general category of products as the subject merchandise." Despite our efforts, we have not been able to find any information on the profits earned in Colombia by producers of merchandise that is in the same general category of products as flowers. Therefore, we cannot determine a "profit cap" as described in section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii). Consistent with our practice in *Flowers Ninth Review*, we have applied section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) on the basis of facts available and have developed a profit figure from the financial statements of a Colombian producer of agricultural and processed agricultural goods. See Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) at 841. We preliminarily determine that it is appropriate to use the profit rate for that company, 4.47 percent of cost of production, for all respondents.

We added U.S. packing to constructed value. In addition, for EP sales, we made circumstance of sale adjustments for direct expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. Finally, we adjusted for commissions paid in the U.S. market by deducting any indirect selling expenses included in CV up to the amount of the U.S. commissions.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. See *Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions*, 61 FR 9434 (March 8, 1996). Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a "fluctuation." In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined as a general matter that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. See *Notice of Final Determination of Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61971 (November 19, 1997). The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine that a fluctuation exists, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of EP and CEP with NV, we preliminarily determine that there are margins in the amounts listed below for the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

Selected Respondents

The following 10 groups of firms (composed of 86 companies) were selected as respondents and received individual rates, as indicated below:

	Percent
Agrodex Group	0.88
Agricola de las Mercedes S.A.	
Agricola el Retiro Ltda.	
Agrodex Ltda.	
Degaflores Ltda.	
Flores Camino Real Ltda.	
Flores Cuatro Esquinas Ltda.	
Flores de la Comuna Ltda.	
Flores de Los Amigos Ltda.	
Flores de los Arrayanes Ltda.	
Flores de Mayo Ltda.	
Flores del Gallinero Ltda.	
Flores del Potrero Ltda.	
Flores dos Hectareas Ltda.	
Flores de Pueblo Viejo Ltda.	
Flores el Trentino Ltda.	
Flores la Conejera Ltda.	
Flores Manare Ltda.	
Florlinda Ltda.	
Horticola el Triunfo Ltda.	
Horticola Montecarlo Ltda.	
Caicedo Group	3.71
Agrobosque S.A.	
Andalucia S.A.	
Aranjuez S.A.	
Consorcio Agroindustrial Colombiano S.A. "CAICO"	
Exportaciones Bochica S.A.	
Floral Ltda.	
Flores del Cauca S.A.	
Productos el Rosal S.A.	
Productos el Zorro S.A.	
Claveles Colombianos Group ...	0.90
Claveles Colombianos Ltda.	
Elegant Flowers Ltda.	
Fantasia Flowers Ltda.	
Splendid Flowers Ltda.	
Sun Flowers Ltda.	
Cultivos Miramonte Group	0.61
C.I. Colombiana de Bouquets S.A.	
Cultivos Miramonte S.A.	
Flores Mocari S.A.	
Floraterra Group	6.10
Floraterra S.A.	
Flores Casablanca S.A.	
Flores Novaterra Ltda.	
Flores San Mateo S.A.	
Siete Flores S.A.	
Flores Group	1.17
Agricola Guacari S.A.	
Agricola el Castillo	
Flores San Joaquin	
Flores Altamira S.A.	
Flores de Exportacion S.A.	
Flores Primavera S.A.	
Guacatay Group	2.49

	Percent	
Agricola Cunday S.A.		Agricola las Cuadras Ltda.
Agricola Guacatay S.A.		Flores de Hacaritama
Agricola Ventura		Agricola Megaflores Ltda.
Jardines Bacata Ltda.		Agricola Yuldama
Multiflora Comercializadora Internacional S.A.		Agrocaribu Ltda.
Queens Flowers Group	0.11	Agro de Narino
Agroindustrial del Rio Frio		Agroindustrial Don Eusebio Ltda. Group
Cultivos General Ltda.		Agroindustrial Don Eusebio Ltda.
Flora Nova		Celia Flowers
Flora Atlas Ltda.		Passion Flowers
Flores Calima S.A.		Primo Flowers
Flores Canelon Ltda.		Temptation Flowers
Flores de Bojaca		Agroindustrial Madonna S.A.
Flores del Cacique		Agroindustrias de Narino Ltda.
Flores del Hato		Agromonte Ltda.
Flores el Aljibe Ltda.		Agropecuria Cuernavaca Ltda.
Flores el Cipres		Agropecuaria la Marcela
Flores El Pino Ltda.		Agropecuaria Mauricio
Flores el Tandil		Agrososas
Flores la Mana		Agrotabio Kent
Flores las Acacias Ltda.		Aguacarga
Flores la Valvanera Ltda.		Alcala
Flores Jayvana		Alstroflores Ltda.
Flores Ubate Ltda.		Amoret
Jardines de Chia Ltda.		Ancas Ltda.
Jardines Fredonia Ltda.		Andalucia
M.G. Consultores Ltda.		Andes Group
Mountain Roses		Cultivos Buenavista Ltda.
Queens Flowers de Colombia Ltda.		Flores de los Andes Ltda.
Quality Flowers S.A.		Flores Horizonte Ltda.
Florval S.A. (Floval)		Inversiones Penas Blancas Ltda.
Jardines del Rosal.		A.Q.
Tinzuque Group	1.23	Arboles Azules Ltda.
Tinzuque Ltda.		Aspen Gardens Ltda.
Catu S.A.		Astro Ltda.
Tuchany Group	9.21	Becerra Castellanos y Cia.
Tuchany S.A.		Bojaca Group
Flores Sibate		Agricola Bojaca
Flores Tikaya		Universal Flowers
Flores Munya		Flores y Plantas Tropicales
Flores Xue S.A.		Flores del Neusa Nove Ltda.
		Tropiflora
		Cantarrana Group
		Cantarrana Ltda.
		Agricola los Venados Ltda.
		Carcol Ltda.
		Cienfuegos Group
		Cienfuegos Ltda.
		Flores la Conchita
		Cigarral Group
		Flores Cigarral
		Flores Tayrona
		Classic
		Claveles de los Alpes Ltda.
		Clavelez
		Coexflor
		Colibri Flowers Ltda.
		Color Explosion
		Combiflor
		Consorcio Agroindustrial
		Cota
		Crest D'or
		Crop S.A.
		Cultiflores Ltda.
		Cultivos Guameru
		Cultivos Medellin Ltda.
		Cultivos Tahami Ltda.
		Cypress Valley
		Daflor Ltda.

Non-Selected Respondents

The following 338 companies were not selected as respondents and will receive a rate of 2.55 percent, calculated as discussed above in the section on "Non-Selected Respondents":

Abaco Tulipanex de Colombia
Achalay
Aga Group
Agricola la Celestina
Agricola la Maria
Agricola Benilda Ltda.
Agrex de Oriente
Agricola Acevedo Ltda.
Agricola Altiplano
Agricola Arenales Ltda.
Agricola Bonanza Ltda.
Agricola Circasia Ltda.
Agricola de Occident
Agricola del Monte
Agricola el Cactus S.A.
Agricola el Redil
Agricola Guali S.A.
Agricola la Corsaria Ltda.
Agricola la Siberia
Agricola Las Cuadras Group

Degafflor
 De La Pava Guevara E. Hijos Ltda.
 Del Monte
 Del Tropico Ltda.
 Diantica Colombiana Ltda.
 Disagro
 Diveragricola
 Dynasty Roses Ltda.
 El Antelio S.A.
 Elite Flowers (The Elite Flower/Rosen
 Tantau)
 El Milaro
 El Tambo
 El Timbul Ltda.
 Envy Farms Group
 Envy Farms
 Flores Marandua Ltda.
 Euroflora
 Exoticas
 Exotic Flowers
 Exotico
 Expoflora Ltda.
 Exportadora
 Falcon Farms de Colombia S.A.
 (formerly Flores de Cajibío Ltda.)
 Farm Fresh Flowers Group
 Agricola de la Fontana
 Flores de Hunza
 Flores Tibati
 Inversiones Cubivan
 Ferson Trading
 Flamingo Flowers
 Flor Colombiana S.A.
 Flora Bellisima
 Flora Intercontinental
 Floralex Ltda..
 Floralex Ltda.
 Flores el Puente Ltda.
 Agricola Los Gaques Ltda.
 Florandia Herrera Camacho & Cia.
 Floreales Group
 Floreales Ltda.
 Kimbaya
 Florenal (Flores el Arenal) Ltda.
 Flores Abaco S.A.
 Flores Acuarela S.A.
 Flores Agromonte
 Flores Aguila
 Flores Colon Ltda.
 Flores de la Sabana S.A.
 Flores de Serrezuela S.A.
 Flores de Suesca S.A.
 Flores del Rio Group
 Agricola Cardenal S.A.
 Flores del Rio S.A.
 Indigo S.A.
 Flores El Molino S.A.
 Flores El Zorro Ltda.
 Flores la Cabanuela
 Flores la Fragrancia
 Flores la Gioconda
 Flores la Lucerna
 Flores la Macarena
 Flores la Pampa
 Flores la Union/Gomez Arango & Cia.
 Group
 Santana
 Flores las Caicas
 Flores las Mesitas
 Flores los Sauces
 Flores Monserrate Ltda.
 Flores Montecarlo
 Flores Monteverde
 Flores Palimana
 Flores Ramo Ltda.
 Flores S.A.
 Flores Sagaro
 Flores Saint Valentine
 Flores Sairam Ltda.
 Flores San Andres
 Flores San Carlos
 Flores San Juan S.A.
 Flores Santa Fe Ltda.
 Flores Santana
 Flores Sausalito
 Flores Selectas
 Flores Silvestres
 Flores Sindamanoi
 Flores Suasque
 Flores Tenerife Ltda.
 Flores Tiba S.A.
 Flores Tocarinda
 Flores Tomine Ltda.
 Flores Tropicales (Happy Candy) Group
 Flores Tropicales Ltda.
 Happy Candy Ltda.
 Mercedes Ltda.
 Rosas Colombianos Ltda.
 Flores Urimaco
 Flores Violette
 Florexp
 Floricola
 Floricola la Gaitana S.A.
 Florimex Colombia Ltda.
 Florisol
 Florpacifico
 Flor y Color
 Flowers of the World/Rosa
 Four Seasons
 Fracolsa
 Fresh Flowers
 F. Salazar
 Funza Group
 Flores Alborada
 Flores de Funza S.A.
 Flores del Bosque Ltda.
 Garden and Flowers Ltda.
 German Ocampo
 Granja
 Green Flowers
 Grupo el Jardin
 Agricola el Jardin Ltda.
 La Marotte S.A.
 Orquideas Acatayma Ltda.
 Gyppo Flowers
 Hacienda la Embarrada
 Hacienda Matute
 Hana/Hisa Group
 Flores Hana Ichi de Colombia Ltda.
 Flores Tokai Hisa
 Hernando Monroy
 Horticultra Montecarlo
 Horticultura de la Sasan
 Horticultura El Molino
 Hosa Group
 Horticultura de la Sabana S.A.
 HOSA Ltda.
 Innovacion Andina S.A.
 Minispray S.A.
 Prohosa Ltda.
 Illusion Flowers
 Industria Santa Clara
 Industrial Agricola
 Industrial Terwengel Ltda.
 Ingro Ltda.
 Inverpalmas
 Inversiones Almer Ltda.
 Inversiones Bucarelia
 Inversiones Cota
 Inversiones el Bambu Ltda.
 Inversiones Flores del Alto
 Inversiones Maya, Ltda.
 Inversiones Morcote
 Inversiones Morrosquillo
 Inversiones Playa
 Inversiones & Producciones Tecnica
 Inversiones Santa Rita Ltda.
 Inversiones Silma
 Inversiones Sima
 Inversiones Supala S.A.
 Inversiones Valley Flowers Ltda.
 Iturrama S.A.
 Jardin de Carolina
 Jardines Choconta
 Jardines Darpu
 Jardines Natalia Ltda.
 Jardines Tocarema
 Jardines de America
 Jardines de Timana
 J.M. Torres
 Karla Flowers
 Kingdom S.A.
 La Colina
 La Embairada
 La Flores Ltda.
 La Floresta
 La Plazoleta Ltda.
 Las Amalias Group
 Las Amalias S.A.
 Pompones Ltda.
 La Fleurette de Colombia Ltda.
 Ramiflora Ltda.
 Las Flores
 Laura Flowers
 L.H.
 Linda Colombiana Ltda.
 Loma Linda
 Loreana Flowers
 Los Geranios Ltda.
 Luisa Flowers
 Luisiana Farms
 M. Alejandra
 Manjui Ltda.
 Mauricio Uribe
 Maxima Farms Group
 Agricola los Arboles S.A.
 Colombian D.C. Flowers
 Polo Flowers
 Rainbow Flowers
 Maxima Farms Inc.
 Merastec
 Monteverde Ltda.
 Morcoto
 Nasino
 Natuflora Ltda./San Martin Bloque B
 Olga Rincon
 Oro Verde Group

Inversiones Miraflores S.A.
 Inversiones Oro Verde S.A.
 Otono (Agroindustrial Otono)
 Papagayo Group
 Agricola Papagayo Ltda.
 Inversiones Calypso S.A.
 Petalos de Colombia Ltda.
 Pinar Guameru
 Piracania
 Pischago Ltda.
 Plantaciones Delta Ltda.
 Plantas S.A.
 Prismaflor
 Propagar Plantas S.A.
 Reme Salamanca
 Rosa Bella
 Rosaflor
 Rosales de Colombia Ltda.
 Rosales de Suba Ltda.
 Rosas Sabanilla Group
 Flores la Colmena Ltda.
 Rosas Sabanilla Ltda.
 Inversiones la Serena
 Agricola la Capilla
 Rosas y Jardines
 Rose
 Rosex Ltda.
 Roselandia
 San Ernesto
 San Valentine
 Sansa Flowers
 Santa Rosa Group
 Flores Santa Rosa Ltda.
 Floricola La Ramada Ltda.
 Santana Flowers Group
 Santana Flowers Ltda.
 Hacienda Curibital Ltda.
 Inversiones Istra Ltda.
 Sarena
 Select Pro
 Senda Brava Ltda.
 Shasta Flowers y Compania Ltda.
 Shila
 Siempreviva
 Soagro Group
 Agricola el Mortino Ltda.
 Flores Aguacalara Ltda.
 Flores del Monte Ltda.
 Flores la Estancia
 Jaramillo y Daza
 Solor Flores Ltda.
 Starlight
 Superflora Ltda.
 Susca
 Sweet Farms
 Flores Santa Rosa Ltda.
 Floricola la Ramada Ltda.
 Tag Ltda.
 The Beall Company
 The Rose
 Tomino
 Toto Flowers Group
 Flores de Suesca S.A.
 Toto Flowers
 Tropical Garden
 Uniflor Ltda.
 Velez de Monchaux Group
 Velez De Monchaux e Hijos y Cia S.
 en C.

Agroteusa
 Victoria Flowers
 Villa Cultivos Ltda.
 Villa Diana
 Vuelven Ltda.
 Zipa Flowers

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice. Interested parties may request a hearing not later than ten days after publication of this notice. Interested parties may also submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(e).

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including a discussion of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated an importer-specific per-stem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the quantity of subject merchandise entered during the POR. We have used the number of stems entered during the POR, rather than entered values, because respondents reported average monthly prices and, moreover, the entered values were not associated with particular importers. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisal instructions on each exporter directly to the 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 the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established in the final results of this review; (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 3.10 percent, the adjusted "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. These 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 preliminary 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 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(c)(5).

Dated: January 26, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-2482 Filed 1-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-337-804, A-533-813, A-560-802, and A-570-851]

Initiation of Antidumping Investigations: Certain Preserved Mushrooms From Chile, India, Indonesia, and the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 2, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger, Office 5, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Import Administration-Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.,