Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 63, No. 173
Tuesday, September 8, 1998

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

Special Provision for Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice Under the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act

AGENCY: Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of determination of termination of existence of price conditions necessary for imposition of temporary duty on frozen concentrated orange juice from Mexico.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 309(a) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1993 (''NAFTA Implementation Act''), this is a notification that for 56 consecutive business days the daily price for frozen concentrated orange juice has exceeded the trigger price.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph Somers, Horticultural and Tropical Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250–1000 or telephone at (202) 720–3423.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NAFTA Implementation Act authorizes the imposition of a temporary duty (snapback) for Mexican frozen concentrated orange juice when certain conditions exist. Mexican articles falling under subheading 2009.11.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the Untied States (HTS) are subject to the snapback duty provision.

Under Section 309(a) of the NAFTA Implementation Act, certain price conditions must exist before the United States can apply a snapback duty on imports of Mexican frozen concentrated orange juice. In addition, such imports must exceed specified amounts before the snapback duty can be applied. The price conditions exist when for each period of 5 consecutive business days the daily price for frozen concentrated orange juice is less than the trigger price.

For the purpose of this provision, the term ''daily price'' means the daily closing price of the New York Cotton Exchange, or any successor as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture (the ''Exchange''), for the closest month in which contracts for frozen concentrated orange juice are being traded on the Exchange. The term ''business day'' means a day in which contracts for frozen concentrated orange juice are being traded on the Exchange.

The term ''trigger price'' means the average daily closing price of the Exchange for the corresponding month during the previous 5-year period, excluding the year with the highest average price for the corresponding month and the year with the lowest average price for the corresponding month.

Price conditions no longer exist when the Secretary determines that for a period of 5 consecutive business days the daily price for frozen concentrated orange juice has exceeded the trigger price. Whenever the price conditions are determined to exist or to cease to exist the Secretary is required to immediately notify the Commissioner of Customs of such determination. Whenever the determination is that the price conditions exist and the quantity of Mexican articles of frozen concentrated orange juice entered exceeds (1) 264,978,000 liters (single strength equivalent) in any of calendar years 1994 through 2002, or (2) 340,560,000 liters (single strength equivalent) in any calendar years 2003 through 2007, the rate of duty on Mexican articles of frozen concentrated orange juice that are entered after the date on which the applicable quantity limitation is reached and before the date of publication in **Federal Register** of the determination that the price conditions have ceased to exist shall be the lower of—(1) the column 1—General rate of duty in effect for such articles on July 1, 1991; or (2) the column 1—General rate of duty in effect on that day. For the purpose of this provision, the term ''entered'' means entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption in the customs territory of the United States.

In accordance with section 309(a) of the NAFTA Implementation Act, it has been determined that for the period August 14–20, 1998, the daily price for frozen concentrated orange juice has exceeded the trigger price.

Issued at Washington, D.C. the 27th day of August 1998.

Lon Hatamiya,

Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service.

[FR Doc. 98–23650 Filed 9–4–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–824]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. This review covers one manufacturer of the subject merchandise. The period of review (''POR'') is August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales subject to this review have been made below normal value (''NV''). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of these administrative reviews, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the export price (''EP'') and the NV.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 8, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doreen Chen, Stephen Jacques, or Rick Johnson, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0413, 482–1391, or 482–3818, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are 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's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27379, May 19, 1997).

Background

On July 19, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 37154) the antidumping duty orders on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan.(''*Final Determination*''). On August 13, 1997, Nippon Steel Corporation (''NSC'') requested a review of its exports of corrosion-resistant steel. On September 25, 1997, in accordance with section 751 of the Act, we published a notice of initiation of administrative review of this order for the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997 (62 FR 50292).

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. On February 9, 1998 the Department published a notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in the review to July 2, 1998. *See Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 26144 (February 9, 1998). On May 12, 1998, the Department published a notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in the review to August 31, 1998. *See Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 26144 (May 12, 1998). The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of Reviews

This review of ''certain corrosion-resistant steel flat products'' covers flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel-or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7210.30.0030, 7210.30.0060, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030, 7210.49.0090, 7210.61.0000, 7210.69.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.20.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.3000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.20.1500, 7217.30.1530, 7217.30.1560, 7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030, 7217.90.5060, and 7217.90.5090. Included are flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been worked after rolling)—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (''terne plate''), or both chromium and chromium oxides (''tin-free steel''), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%-60%-20% ratio. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive of the scope of this review.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified cost and sales information provided by NSC, using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities and the examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file with the Department in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099.

Transactions Reviewed

In accordance with section 751 of the Act, the Department is required to determine the EP (or CEP) and NV of each entry of subject merchandise. On November 18, 1997, respondent requested that it be relieved from reporting certain information, *e.g.* price adjustments for sales by NSC's affiliated manufacturers. Respondent argued that it should not be required to report such information on sales by affiliated manufacturers because these sales were not exported to the United States and would not provide the most similar product matches to the subject merchandise under review. *See* November 18, 1997 letter. Therefore, respondent reported only matching characteristics, date of sale, quantity and price for these sales.

The Department directed respondent to report sales by affiliated resellers. *See* Department's September 19, 1997 antidumping questionnaire and supplemental questionnaire dated January 15, 1998 at p.1. In the response to the questionnaire, respondent stated that it was unable to collect sales data from all affiliated resellers. *See* Questionnaire Response, dated November 25, 1997 at p. B–6; Supplemental Questionnaire Response dated February 12, 1998 at p. S–1–3. Respondent only reported sales by one affiliated reseller. *Id.* The Department asked respondent to further explain its inability to report sales by affiliated resellers. *See* Second Supplemental Questionnaire dated April 14, 1998 at p. 1–2. Respondent elaborated concerning its inability to report sales, its methodology in reporting certain transactions and the impact of reporting resales on the dumping margin. *See* Second Supplemental Questionnaire Response dated May 13, 1998 at pp. 1–14. The Department preliminarily allowed this limited reporting for downstream sales since we found adequate home market matches to U.S. sales. As this issue involves proprietary information, please see the Department's *Decision Memorandum: Fourth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan* for a complete explanation of this issue.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the ''Scope of the Review'' section of this notice, (*supra*), and sold in the home market during the period of review (POR), to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in Appendix V of the Department's September 19, 1997 antidumping questionnaire. In making product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondent and verified by the Department.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the EP to the NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transaction prices.

United States Price

For calculation of the price to the United States, we used EP when the subject merchandise was sold directly or indirectly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and when constructed export price (CEP) was not otherwise warranted, based on facts on the record.

The Department calculated EP for NSC based on packed, prepaid or delivered prices to customers in the United States. We made adjustments to the starting price, net of billing adjustments, for movement expenses (foreign and U.S. movement, brokerage and handling, and U.S. Customs duties), in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act.

It is the Department's current practice normally to use the invoice date as the date of sale; we may, however, use a date other than the invoice date if we are satisfied that a different date better reflects the date on which the exporter or producer establishes the material terms of sale. *See* 19 CFR 351.401(i) (62 FR at 27411).

Accordingly, as allowed by the exception set forth in section 351.401(i) of the regulations, we used the date of order confirmation as date of sale for all of NSC's sales in both the U.S. market and the home market. Because in this review the date of order better reflects the date on which the material terms of sale are established, we will not use the date of invoice as the new regulations prescribe. We did not use date of shipment as the date of sale, as reported by respondent, because, we determined that date of shipment did not represent the date on which the material terms of sale are established. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule,* 62 FR at 27349.

Normal Value

The Department determines the viability of the home market as the comparison market by comparing the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales. We found that respondent's quantity of sales in its home market exceeded five percent of its sales to the United States for the relevant class or kind of merchandise. Therefore, we have determined that respondent's home market sales are viable. Moreover, there is no evidence on the record supporting a particular market situation in the exporting country that would not permit a proper comparison of home market and U.S. prices. Therefore, we used home market sales for purposes of comparison with sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, at the same level of trade as the EP sale.

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used CV as the basis for NV when there were no above-cost contemporaneous sales of identical or similar merchandise in the comparison market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, SG&A expenses, and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses.

We used sales to affiliated customers only where we determined such sales were made at arm's-length prices, *i.e.*, at prices comparable to prices at which the firm sold identical merchandise to unaffiliated customers.

For the class or kind of merchandise under review, the Department disregarded sales below the cost of production (''COP'') in the last completed review as of the date of the issuance of the antidumping questionnaire (*see Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value,* 58 FR 37154 (July 9, 1993)). We therefore had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review may have been made at prices below the COP. Pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we initiated COP investigations of sales by respondent in the home market.

We compared sales of the foreign like product in the home market with the model-specific cost of production figure for the POR (''COP''). In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product plus selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and all costs and expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed and ready for shipment. We revised respondent's reported G & A expense ratio to include certain non-operating income and expense items. We revised the reported transfer price of electricity obtained from affiliates to reflect the market value paid to non-affiliates. The market price was higher than the transfer price. *See Memorandum to the File: OA Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Review*, August 31, 1998. In our COP analysis, we used home market sales and COP information provided by the respondent in its questionnaire responses.

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of subject merchandise were made at prices below COP and, if so, whether the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and at prices that did not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Because each individual price was compared against the POR-long average COP, any sales that were below cost were also not at prices which permitted cost recovery within a reasonable period of time. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported home market prices less any applicable

movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given model during the POR were at prices less than the weighted-average COPs for the POR, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, and were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, where possible, we based NV on sales at the same level of trade (''LOT'') as the U.S. price. *See* the Level of Trade Section below.

The Department determined in the final determination of the most recently completed segment of this proceeding in which NSC has participated (*Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Final Determinations of Sales at Less than Fair Value*, 58 FR 37154, July 9, 1993) that it would be inappropriate to resort directly to constructed value (CV), in lieu of foreign market sales, as the basis for NV if the Department finds foreign market sales of merchandise identical or most similar to that sold in the United States to be outside the ''ordinary course of trade.'' Therefore, we will match a given U.S. sale to foreign market sales of the next most similar model when all sales of the most comparable model are below cost. The Department will use CV as the basis for NV only when there are no above-cost sales that are otherwise suitable for comparison. Therefore, in this proceeding, when making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the ''Scope of Review'' section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in Sections B and C of our antidumping questionnaire. This methodology is pursuant to the ruling of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *CEMEX* v. *United States*, 133 F.3d 1098 (Fed Cir. 1998), and has been implemented to the extent that the data on the record permitted.

For those models for which there was a sufficient quantity of sales at prices above COP, we based NV on home market prices to unaffiliated purchasers, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.403. Home market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the home market.

We calculated the starting price net of discounts, rebates, and post-sale adjustments, where applicable. We treated rebates that were granted after the date of sale as post-sale price adjustments. The Department allows post-sale price adjustments that reflect the respondent's normal business practice. *See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al. (AFBs); Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Termination of Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 60 FR 10900, 10930 (Feb. 28, 1995); *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 13815, 13823 (March 28, 1996). At verification, we examined documentation which adequately demonstrated that the adjustments to rebates reflect respondent's normal course of trade of conducting ongoing price negotiations with its HM customers. In addition, we preliminarily determine that respondent has reported rebates on a transaction-specific basis.

Although it is our general policy to allow rebates only when the terms of sale are predetermined, the purpose of requiring respondent to prove that the buyer was aware of the conditions to be fulfilled and the approximate amount of the rebates at the time of the sale is to protect against manipulation of the dumping margins by a respondent once it learns that certain sales will be subject to review. *See AFB's* at 10930; *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada* at 13823. In the instant case, because we found that adjustments to rebates are part of respondent's normal business practice, we are satisfied that respondent is not engaged in the manipulation of dumping margins through the use of rebates. For a further description of the Department's treatment of these expenses, *see* the *Analysis Memo*, dated August 31 at p. 3.

We made adjustments, where applicable, for packing and movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and for differences in circumstances of sale (''COS'') in accordance with 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparison to EP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses (credit, royalties and warranty expenses) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit and warranty expenses). When comparisons were made to EP sales on which commissions were paid, but no commissions were paid on the foreign market sales, we made adjustments for home market indirect selling expenses and inventory carrying costs to offset these U.S. commissions pursuant to 19 CFR section 351.410(b) or 351.410(e).

Level of Trade (''LOT'')

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (''LOT'') as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on constructed value (''CV''), that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (''SG&A'') expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

In the present review, respondent claimed that only one LOT existed and did not request a LOT adjustment. To evaluate LOTs, we examined information regarding the distribution systems in both the U.S. and home market, including the selling functions, classes of customer, and selling expenses.

Respondent reported one LOT in the home market based on two classes of customers: trading companies and end users. We examined the reported selling functions and found that NSC provides the same selling functions to its home market customers regardless of channel of distribution. We preliminarily determine that the selling functions between the reported channels are sufficiently similar to consider them as one LOT in the comparison market.

NSC stated that it sells to one LOT in the United States: trading companies. We compared the selling functions performed at the home market LOT and the LOT in the United States and found them substantially similar. Of the thirteen selling functions reported for home market sales, twelve of the selling functions were identical to U.S. sales. For a further discussion of the Department's LOT analysis, *see Memorandum to the File: Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Review*, August, 31 1998.

Preliminary Results of Reviews

As a result of our reviews, we preliminarily determine the weighted-average dumping margins for NSC for the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997 is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
NSC	8/1/96–7/31/97	1.93

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in those briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we calculated an importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer during the POR.

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, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for NSC will be that established in the final results of review (except that no deposit will be required for a firm with a zero or de minimis margin, *i.e.*, a margin less than 0.5 percent); (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the LTFV investigation or previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent segment; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous 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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rates established in the LTFV investigations, which was 40.19 percent for corrosion-resistant steel products (see *Final Determination*, 58 FR 37154 (July 9, 1993)). These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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.

These results of the administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1)of the Act.

Dated: August 31, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–24069 Filed 9–4–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–825]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Oil Country Tubular Goods From Korea.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from SeAH Steel Corporation (''SeAH''), the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods from Korea. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, SeAH, and the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997, which is the second period of review (''POR'').

We have preliminarily determined that SeAH made sales below normal value (''NV''). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the constructed export price (''CEP'') and the NV.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 8, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doug Campau, Steve Bezirganian, or Steven Presing, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0409, -0162, or -0194, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are 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's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27379, May 19, 1997).