Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by January 10, 1999.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 27, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29547 Filed 11–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–791–805]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From South Africa

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert James at (202) 482–5222 or John Kugelman at (202) 482–0649, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1, 1998).

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that stainless steel plate in coil (SSPC) from South Africa is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the ''Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

On April 20, 1998, the Department initiated antidumping duty investigations of imports of stainless steel plate in coils from Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Republic of South Africa (South Africa), South Korea, and Taiwan. *See Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, Republic of South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan,* 63 FR 20580, (April 27, 1998). Since the initiation of this investigation the following events have occurred:

The Department set aside a period for all interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. On May 8, 1998, Armco Inc., J & L Specialty Steel, Inc., Lukens, Inc., North American Stainless, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO/CLC, Butler Armco Independent Union, and Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. (petitioners)[1] filed comments aimed at clarifying the scope of these investigations.

During May 1998, the Department requested information from the U.S. Embassy in Pretoria to identify producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. On May 15, 1998, the Department also requested comments from petitioners, a potential respondent, Columbus Stainless (Columbus), and the Embassy of South Africa regarding the criteria to be used for model matching purposes. Petitioners submitted comments on our proposed model matching criteria on May 21, 1998.

Also on May 21, 1998, the United States International Trade Commission (the Commission) notified the Department of its affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case.

The Department subsequently issued its antidumping questionnaire to Columbus on May 27, 1998. The questionnaire is divided into five parts; we requested that Columbus respond to section A (general information, corporate structure, sales practices, and merchandise produced), section B (home market or third-country sales), and section C (U.S. sales). Columbus submitted its response to section A of the questionnaire on June 24, 1998; Columbus's responses to sections B and C followed on July 20, 1998.

Petitioners filed comments on Columbus's questionnaire responses in July and August 1998. We issued a supplemental questionnaire for Sections A, B, and C to Columbus on August 18, 1998, to which Columbus responded on September 8, 1998.

On July 29, 1998, petitioners made a timely request for a thirty-day postponement of the preliminary determination pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act. The Department determined that these concurrent investigations are extraordinarily complicated and that additional time would be required beyond the thirty days requested by petitioners for the Department to make its preliminary determinations. On August 14, 1998, we postponed the preliminary determination until no later than October 27, 1998. *See Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan; Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations in Antidumping Duty Investigations,* 63 FR 44840 (August 21, 1998).

On August 7, 1998, petitioners timely filed an allegation that Columbus's sales of the foreign like product were at prices below its cost of production. After analyzing petitioner's allegation and soliciting additional clarification from petitioners, on August 24, 1998, we requested that Columbus respond to section D (cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV)) of our original questionnaire. Columbus filed its response on September 30, 1998. We solicited additional information on Columbus's COP in a supplemental questionnaire issued October 6, 1998. Columbus timely filed its response on October 19, 1998.

The Department issued an additional supplemental sales questionnaire on October 15, 1998; Columbus's response to this questionnaire is due October 30, 1998.

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, the product covered is certain stainless steel plate in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject plate products are flat-rolled products, 254 mm or over in width and 4.75 mm or more in thickness, in coils, and

[1] On August 28, 1998, petitioners amended the antidumping duty petitions to include Allegheny Ludlum Corporation as an additional petitioner.

annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject plate may also be further processed (e.g., cold-rolled, polished, etc.) provided that it maintains the specified dimensions of plate following such processing. Excluded from the scope of this petition are the following: (1) Plate not in coils, (2) plate that is not annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled, (3) sheet and strip, and (4) flat bars.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is currently classifiable in the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTS) at subheadings: 7219.11.00.30, 7219.11.00.60, 7219.12.00.05, 7219.12.00.20, 7219.12.00.25, 7219.12.00.50, 7219.12.00.55, 7219.12.00.65, 7219.12.00.70, 7219.12.00.80, 7219.31.00.10, 7219.90.00.10, 7219.90.00.20, 7219.90.00.25, 7219.90.00.60, 7219.90.00.80, 7220.11.00.00, 7220.20.10.10, 7220.20.10.15, 7220.20.10.60, 7220.20.10.80, 7220.20.60.05, 7220.20.60.10, 7220.20.60.15, 7220.20.60.60, 7220.20.60.80, 7220.90.00.10, 7220.90.00.15, 7220.90.00.60, and 7220.90.00.80. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) is January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of SSPC from South Africa to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared export price (EP) to the normal value (NV), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice, below. In accordance with section 777A(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Tariff Act, we calculated weighted-average EPs for comparison to weighted-average NVs or CVs.

Transactions Investigated

For its home market and U.S. sales Columbus reported the date of invoice as the date of sale, in keeping with the Department's stated preference for using the invoice date as the date of sale. Columbus further stated that the invoice date represented the date when the essential terms of sales, i.e., price and quantity, are definitively set, and that up to the invoice date, these terms were subject to change. However, petitioners have alleged that the sales documentation provided by Columbus does not appear to support Columbus's claims that price and quantity may change at any time between the order acceptance date and the final invoice date. On August 18, 1998, the Department requested that Columbus provide additional information concerning the nature and frequency of price and quantity changes occurring between the date of order and date of invoice. Based on our analysis of the information submitted by Columbus, we found that we required additional information to determine if date of invoice is the appropriate date of sale. On October 15, 1998, the Department sent an additional questionnaire to Columbus, requesting that it report sales during the POI for which Columbus had issued an order acceptance, in addition to those sales invoiced during the POI. However, Columbus's response to this supplemental request for information is not due until October 30, 1998; therefore for the preliminary determination, the Department is using the invoice date as the date of sale for both home market and U.S. sales. We intend to revisit this issue upon receiving Columbus's supplemental response, and we will incorporate and verify the revised data, as appropriate, in our analysis for the final determination.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act, we considered all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the ''Scope of the Investigation'' section, above, and sold in the home market during the POI, 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 next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics and reporting instructions listed in the Department's questionnaire.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff 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 transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit. For EP it is the level of the sale from the exporter to the importer. If the sales being compared are at different LOTs, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and the U.S. sales being compared, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act.

To determine whether home market sales are at a different LOT than U.S. sales we apply a two-part test. First, we examine whether the home market sales are at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales. The marketing process in both markets begins with goods being sold by the producer and extends to the sale to the final end user. The chain of distribution between the producer and the final user may have many or few links, and each respondent's sales occur at some point along this chain. For sales to the United States, the respondent's sales are generally to an importer, whether affiliated or unaffiliated. We review and compare the distribution chains in the home market and the United States, including the selling functions, classes of customers, and the level of selling expenses incurred at each claimed LOT. Unless sales being compared are at different stages in the marketing process, the Department will not find a difference in LOT even if selling functions are different.

Second, we examine the selling functions performed at the different LOTs. If the LOTs in the two markets are different, the selling functions performed in selling to each LOT should also be different. Therefore, unless we find that there are different selling functions and different stages in the marketing process for the sales to the U.S. and home markets, we will not determine that there are, in fact, separate LOTs. Different LOTs necessarily involve different selling functions; however, differences in selling functions, even substantial ones, are not alone sufficient to establish that different LOTs exist. Differences in LOTs are characterized by purchasers at different stages of marketing and by sellers performing qualitatively different functions in selling to these purchasers.

If we compare U.S. sales to home market sales made at a different LOT, we will make an adjustment to NV if the difference in LOTs affects price comparability. In turn, we determine any effect on price comparability by examining sales at different LOTs in the comparison market. Any effect on price comparability must be manifested by a pattern of consistent price differences between the home market sales used for comparison and the sales at the LOT of the export transaction. *See, e.g.,*

Polytetraflourethylene Resin From Italy; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 26285 (May 13, 1997). To quantify the price differences, we calculate the difference in the average of the net prices of the same merchandise sold at different LOTs. We use the average percentage difference between these net prices to adjust NV when the LOT of the NV sale is different from that of the export sale. If there is no pattern of price differences, then no LOT adjustment is necessary. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV LOT is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act (the CEP offset provision). *See, e.g., 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 this case Columbus stated that its selling activities differ very little between home market and export sales, noting that it does not ''maintain a distribution network of our own, nor do we maintain an inventory in any market * * *. The only difference between our home market sales and our exports is the physical delivery distance, and the fact that we use agents to solicit and administer our customers' orders in our export markets.'' Columbus's June 24, 1998 Section A response at 12 and 13. In order to confirm independently the absence of separate LOTs within or between the U.S. and home markets, we examined Columbus's questionnaire responses for indications that Columbus's sales functions differed qualitatively or quantitatively among customer categories. Where possible, we further examined whether each selling function was performed for a substantial portion of sales.

In the home market Columbus sold to distributors and end users, and claims a single LOT existed. Based upon our examination of information supplied by Columbus in its original and supplemental questionnaire responses, we agree that only one LOT existed for Columbus in the home market. Columbus provided no strategic or economic planning services, market research, business development services, personnel training, procurement, or inventory maintenance services for either end-user or distributor customers. Both categories of customers received similar degrees of packing, after-sales services, and freight and delivery arrangements. Finally, Columbus provided a limited degree of advertising directed at its customers' customers, primarily in the form of advertising in industry journals.

For its U.S. sales Columbus reported sales through its agents to two customer categories, i.e., distributors and end-users. To determine whether, in fact, a single stage of marketing existed, we examined the selling functions as reflected in the starting price to the unaffiliated U.S. customer. Columbus provided delivery services to the U.S. port designated by the customer for all of its U.S. sales. Columbus also provided technical assistance, as needed. For certain sales of grade 3Cr12 stainless steel, Columbus provided a higher degree of these technical services due to the specialized applications to which 3Cr12 stainless steel is aimed. We find preliminarily that Columbus provided the same level of selling functions, with the sole exception being the additional technical services offered for sales of 3Cr12 steel. This single exception, however, is not sufficient to warrant a finding that Columbus sells at two distinct LOTs in the United States. Accordingly, we preliminarily agree with Columbus that its EP sales constitute a single LOT.

When comparing Columbus's sales at its EP LOT to its home market LOT, we found that Columbus provided little or no strategic or economic planning, market research, engineering services, or post-sale warehousing at either the EP or home market LOT. Columbus provided limited advertising services in the home market while providing none at the EP level. All packing expenses at either LOT were borne by Columbus, and freight arrangements were similar (in the activities performed) in both markets. Columbus provided similar degrees of after-sales and technical support at both the EP and home market LOT, with the exception noted above for sales of 3Cr12 steel. Our analysis of the selling functions performed by Columbus in both markets leads us to conclude that sales within or between the markets were made at the same LOT. We have not, therefore, made a LOT adjustment because all price comparisons are at the same LOT and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act is not appropriate.

Export Price

We calculated the price of United States sales based on EP, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Tariff Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to the first unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to the date of importation and because record evidence did not support basing price on CEP. We calculated EP based upon packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, foreign handling, marine insurance, foreign warehousing expenses, and U.S. customs duties. We also made adjustments for credit and, where appropriate, credit insurance costs.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (i.e., the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales) we compared the respondent's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Tariff Act. As Columbus's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

Cost of Production Analysis

A timely allegation filed by petitioners provided the Department with reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Columbus's sales of the foreign like product were made at prices which represent less than the cost of production. See section 773(b)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act. Accordingly, on August 24, 1998, the Department initiated a COP investigation to determine whether Columbus's sales in South Africa were made at prices less than the COP. In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Tariff Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of Columbus's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus an amount for G&A, interest expenses, and packing costs.

We used the information from Columbus's section D supplemental questionnaire response to calculate COP. However, while the Department's questionnaire instructed Columbus to submit a single COP for each product sold (i.e., each CONNUM), weighted by quantity produced during the POI, Columbus instead provided simple average COPs based on quarterly costs. In addition, Columbus reported multiple COPs (i.e., different amounts) for the same CONNUM. To conduct our

cost test for this preliminary determination we have calculated a single average COP for each CONNUM, weighted by sales quantity, as this is the only information currently available on the record. We have requested additional data from Columbus, including COPs weighted by production quantity, and will analyze these new data for our final determination.

We compared the weighted-average COP for Columbus to home market sales prices of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Tariff Act. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices less than the COP, we examined whether such sales were made (i) in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, and (ii) at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product-specific basis, we compared COP to home market prices, less any applicable movement charges, early payment and other discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Tariff Act, where less than twenty percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where twenty percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POI were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in substantial quantities, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Tariff Act. In addition, we determined that such below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act. In such cases, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Tariff Act, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, we disregarded the below-cost sales. Where all sales of a specific product were at prices below the COP, we disregarded all sales of that product.

Our cost test for Columbus revealed that less than twenty percent of Columbus's home market sales of certain products were at prices below Columbus's COP. We retained all such sales in our analysis. For other products, more than twenty percent of Columbus's sales were at below-cost prices. In such cases we disregarded the below-cost sales, while retaining the above-cost sales for our analysis. See Preliminary Determination Analysis Memorandum, October 27, 1998, a public version of which is on file in room B–099 of the main Commerce building.

Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Tariff Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A, interest expenses, and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by Columbus in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. We used the CV data Columbus supplied in its section D supplemental questionnaire response. However, while the Department's questionnaire instructed Columbus to submit a single CV for each product sold (i.e., each CONNUM), weighted by quantity produced during the POI, Columbus provided simple average COPs based on quarterly costs. In addition, Columbus reported multiple CVs (i.e., different amounts) for the same CONNUM. To calculate CV for this preliminary determination we have calculated a single average CV for each CONNUM, weighted by sales quantity, as this is the only information currently available on the record. We have requested additional data from Columbus, including CVs weighted by production quantity, and will analyze these data for our final determination.

Price-to-Price Comparisons

For those sales at prices which were at or above the COP, we based NV on Columbus's sales to unaffiliated home market customers. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Tariff Act.

Columbus's home market prices were reported net of certain volume discounts. We made additional deductions for early payment discounts, inland freight, and inland insurance and packing. Furthermore, we made circumstance-of-sale (COS) adjustments in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Tariff Act. We deducted credit expenses and mandatory assessments of the South African Stainless Steel Development Association. Finally, we increased NV by adding U.S. direct selling expenses and packing costs incurred in the home market for U.S. sales, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Tariff Act.

Price-to-CV Comparisons

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act, we based NV on CV if we were unable to find a home market match of such or similar merchandise. We calculated CV based on the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, SG&A, and profit. In accordance with section 773(a)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A expense and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in South Africa. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Tariff Act. For comparisons to EP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Tariff Act.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Tariff Act, we will verify all information relied upon in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Tariff Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the export price, as indicated below. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/Manufacturer	Weighted-average margin
Columbus Stainless	31.79
All Others	31.79

Commission Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Tariff Act, we have notified the Commission of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the Commission will determine before the

later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether imports of stainless steel plate in coils are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than fifty days after the date of publication of this notice, and rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, no later than fifty-five days after the date of publication of this preliminary determination. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. This summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Tariff Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, any hearing will be held fifty-seven days after publication of this notice at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, at a time and location to be determined. Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. At the hearing, each party may make an affirmative presentation only on issues raised in that party's case brief, and may make rebuttal presentations only on arguments included in that party's rebuttal brief. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). We intend to issue our final determination in this investigation no later than January 10, 1999.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: October 27, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29550 Filed 11–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Notice of Scope Rulings

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

ACTION: Notice of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce hereby publishes a list of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed by Import Administration between July 1, 1998 and September 30, 1998. In conjunction with this list, the Department of Commerce is also publishing a list of pending requests for scope clarifications and anticircumvention inquiries. We intend to publish future lists within 30 days of the end of each quarter.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald M. Trentham, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4793.

Background

The regulations of the Department of Commerce (the Department) (19 CFR 351.22(o)) provide that on a quarterly basis the Secretary will publish in the **Federal Register** a list of scope rulings completed within the last three months.

This notice lists scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed by Import Administration, between July 1, 1998, and September 30, 1998, and pending scope clarification and anticircumvention inquiry requests. The Department intends to publish in January 1999 a notice of scope rulings and anticircumvention inquiries completed between October 1, 1998, and December 31, 1998, as well as pending scope clarification and anticircumvention inquiry requests.

The following lists provide the country, case reference number, requester(s), a brief description of either the ruling or product subject to the request, and the date of rulings made.

I. Scope Rulings Completed Between

July 1, 1998 and September 30, 1998:

Country: Italy

C–475–819 *Certain Pasta*

A–475–818 Joseph A. Sidari Company, Inc.—a shrink wrapped package containing six one-pound packages, each of which would first be individually packaged in a cellophane wrapper (cello) with ''Not Labeled for Retail Sale'' written across the entire length of each of the individual packages on both sides, is within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. 7/30/98

Country: People's Republic of China

A–570–504 *Petroleum Wax Candles*—Et Al Imports—Paraffin Wax Bamboo Candles are outside the scope of the order. 7/2/98.

Kohl's Department Stores—star-shaped, tree-shaped, and snowflake-shaped wax-filled containers are within the scope of the order. Also, two gold candles with rope designs, one ivory candle with gold flower and vine designs, and one ivory candle with gold cherubs and rope designs are within the scope of the order and one white wax-filled container with carolers and a Christmas scene is outside the scope of the order. 8/24/98.

Leader Light Ltd.—3″×3″ square, 3″×6″ square, and 3″×6″ round candles are within the scope of the order. 8/31/98

A–570–808 *Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts*—Wheel Plus, Inc.—imported zinc-plated lug nuts which are chrome-plated in the United States are within the scope of the order. 9/22/98

Country: Japan

A–588–804 *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings), and Parts Thereof*—Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd.—a cylindrical roller bearing for use as an axle bearing in cars and trucks is within the scope of the order. 8/10/98

A–588–837 *Large Newspaper Printing Presses*—Nireco Corporation—Calagraph Systems that are not imported and sold pursuant to a contract for a LNPP system, addition, or component, but rather imported and sold only as an upgrade or add-on to a pre-existing installed and operating LNPP are outside the scope of the order. 8/4/98

Komori American Corporation—the System 20 is outside the scope of the order. 8/4/98

II. Anticircumvention Rulings Completed Between July 1, 1998 and September 30, 1998

None.

III. Scope Inquiries Terminated Between July 1, 1998 and September 30, 1998

Country: Canada

A–122–506 *Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG)*—Regency Resources