discipline were removed. In the instant proceeding, a dumping margin above a *de minimis* level continues to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from all Chinese producers/exporters.[5]

The Department also considered the volume of imports before and after issuance of the order, consistent with section 752(c) of the Act. The Department examined U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports and data from our original investigation and subsequent administrative reviews and finds that imports of the subject merchandise have existed throughout most of the life of the order.[6]

For the period from 1984 through 1987, the Department can, as noted in *Griege Polyester Cotton Printcloth: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke*, 57 FR 1254 (January 13, 1992), confirm two shipments of subject merchandise to the United States. From 1988 through 1989, the Department knows of no shipments of the subject merchandise to the United States. Lastly, U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports show annual imports of merchandise within the covered HTSUS item number have existed almost continuously from 1990 through 1998.

Upon consideration of the argument and evidence on the record, the Department determines that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Specifically, a deposit rate above a *de minimis* level continues in effect for exports of the subject merchandise by all known Chinese manufacturers/exporters. Given that dumping has continued over the life of the order, respondent interested parties waived participation in the sunset review, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the order were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the ''all others'' rate from the investigation. (*See* section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (*See* sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.)

The Department, in its final determination of sales at less than fair value, published a weighted-average dumping margin for all imports of greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China (48 FR 34312, July 28, 1983). We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, ATMI, citing the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, argues that the Department should report to the Commission the weighted-averaged dumping margin from the original investigation for China National Textiles Import and Export Corporation (''Chinatex''). Chinatex was the only producer/exporter of the subject merchandise identified in the original investigation. Quoting the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, ATMI argues that the Department should report this margin to the Commission as it is ''* * * the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters * * * without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place''.

The Department agrees with ATMI's argument concerning the choice of the margin rate to report to the Commission. In the original investigation, the Department calculated a country-wide weighted-averaged margin for all companies, including Chinatex. Therefore, the Department finds that the country-wide weighted-averaged margin calculated in the original investigation is probative of how Chinese producers and exporters of greige polyester cotton printcloth would act if the order were revoked. As such, the Department will report to the Commission as the dumping margin for all companies, the country-wide rate from the original investigation as contained in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margin listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
All Chinese Manufacturers/Exporters	22.4

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year (''sunset'') review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 11, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–6536 Filed 3–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–822]

Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China in the **Federal Register** on November 9, 1998 (63 FR 60299). This review covers sales of this merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes to the margin calculations presented in the preliminary results of the review. The final weighted-average dumping margins are listed below in the section entitled *Final Results of Review*.

[5] *See Greige Polyester cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Order;* 57 FR 31353, July 15, 1992.

[6] From the Department's original investigation and its subsequent administrative reviews, the Department can confirm that shipments of the subject merchandise occurred in 1982, the year prior to the imposition of the order, and 1983, the year of the issuance of the antidumping duty order.

We have determined that sales have been made below normal value during the period of review. Accordingly, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between export price and normal value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 18, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or Vince Kane, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3464 or (202) 482–2815, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Background

The Department published the preliminary results of this review of the antidumping duty order on Helical Spring Lock Washers (HSLWs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in the **Federal Register** on November 9, 1998 (63 FR 60299). On December 9, 1998, the petitioner, Shakeproof Assembly Components Division of Illinois Tool Works, submitted comments on the Department's preliminary results and on December 18, 1998, the respondent, Zhejiang Wanxin Group, Co., Ltd. (ZWG), submitted a rebuttal to the petitioner's comments. We held a hearing on January 13, 1999. The Department has now completed this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are HSLWs of carbon steel, of carbon alloy steel, or of stainless steel, heat-treated or non-heat-treated, plated or non-plated, with ends that are off-line. HSLWs are designed to: (1) Function as a spring to compensate for developed looseness between the component parts of a fastened assembly; (2) distribute the load over the larger area for screws or bolts; and, (3) provide a hardened bearing surface. The scope does not include internal or external tooth washers, nor does it include spring lock washers made of other metals, such as copper.

HSLWs subject to this review are currently classifiable under subheading 7318.21.0030 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers one exporter of HSLWs from the PRC, ZWG, and the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997.

Comparisons

We calculated export price and normal value (NV) based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results,* with the following exceptions:

(1) Based on the petitioner's comments, we have recalculated factory overhead (FOH), selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit in plating costs as in the second and third administrative reviews of this case, and revised the inland freight expense for imported steel (*see* Comments 2 and 3, respectively.);

(2) We have updated the surrogate value for brokerage and handling based on a submission in *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India* for the POR 97–98 dated May 12, 1998;

(3) At verification, we learned of a recalculation of a supplier distance which resulted in a change in freight expenses (*see* Factors Memorandum dated March 9, 1999 and verification exhibit 14).

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: Use of Market Economy Import Prices to Value Non-Imported Steel Wire Rod

The petitioner argues that the Department's use of imported steel prices to value ZWG's domestically sourced steel wire rod (SWR) is contrary to the statute. In addition, the petitioner contends that the decision in *Lasko Metal Products, Inc.* v. *United States,* 810 F.Supp. 314, 316 (1992), *aff'd* 43 F.3d 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (*Lasko*) does not apply to materials obtained in a nonmarket economy (NME) country from a NME supplier. Therefore, the petitioner reasons that the Department should have used Indian surrogate values to value ZWG's domestically sourced steel.

Though the petitioner recognizes and cites section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations, which states that:

> The Secretary normally will use publicly available information to value factors. However, where a factor is purchased from a market economy supplier and paid for in a market economy currency, the Secretary normally will use the price paid to a market economy supplier. In those instances where a portion of the factor is purchased from a market economy supplier and the remainder from a nonmarket economy supplier, the Secretary normally will value the factor using the price paid to the market economy supplier.

as governing the information used to value factors of production (FOP) in NME cases, the petitioner states that neither the antidumping statute nor court precedent(s) sanctions the Department's use of import prices to value inputs obtained from a NME supplier in NME currency.

The petitioner argues that Congress has addressed the issue of factor valuation in the instant case. In addition, the petitioner quotes the Act which states that ''when insufficient information exists to determine dumping margins by normal methods, * * * (1) normal value shall be determined on the basis of the value of the FOP utilized and (2) the valuation of the FOP shall be based on the best available information regarding the values of such factors in a market economy country or countries to be considered appropriate.'' (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)(1)). *See Lasko* at 1445.

The petitioner notes that only if the Department determines that ''available information is inadequate for the purpose of determining NV on the basis of FOP,'' does the statute allow the Department to rely on market economy prices. Moreover, citing the legislative history of the NME section of the statute, the petitioner asserts that Congress rejected the use of market prices in favor of FOPs and intended that the Department should avoid using prices ''which it has reason to believe or suspect may be dumped or subsidized'' when determining FOPs. *See* Conference Report, Omnibus Trade & Competitiveness Act of 1998, H.R. 3 at 590 (HR Rep. 100–576).

The petitioner acknowledges that *Lasko* allows the Department to use market economy prices to value an input when the NME manufacturer directly obtains the input from a market economy country, pays for it in market economy currency, and uses the input in the production of subject merchandise. However, the petitioner states that *Lasko* does not apply to materials obtained in a NME from NME suppliers and cannot be used to give the Department unbridled discretion to use the import prices of a factor as a ''short-cut'' to determine the value of all non-imported materials. The petitioner alleges that this short-cut methodology conflicts with the statute and Congressional intent. Congress has

expressed a preference for surrogate country values methodology and that preference will be eviscerated by the imputation of import prices even if it advances the goal of accuracy.

The petitioner also argues that, even assuming that the Act and the Department's regulations grant the Department discretion to use the prices of imports to value non-imported inputs, the Department has abused its discretion in this case. The petitioner asserts that accuracy is not gained by the use of import prices and prices of small quantities of imported goods may be aberrational. The petitioner argues that the Department is required to examine the criteria adopted in *Olympia Industrial Inc.* v. *United States (Olympia),* Slip Op. 98–49 (April 17, 1998), wherein the Department examined ''(1) the volume and value of steel imports, (2) the type and quality of the imported steel, and (3) consumption of imported steel by the NME producers' to determine the reliability of steel import prices as alternative surrogate values. The petitioner asserts that the Department's failure to apply the *Olympia* criteria constitutes an abuse of discretion.

The respondent, on the other hand, argues that the Department correctly used ZWG's imported SWR prices to value all of its SWR production inputs in the preliminary results. Moreover, the respondent states that this valuation methodology is supported by the Department's prior practice, the Department's regulations, court decisions and the Act. The respondent also states that ZWG's purchase of imported SWR satisfies all the conditions of section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations. Thus, the respondent asserts that the Department is obligated by that provision of the regulations to use the price paid for imported SWR to value all the SWR consumed by ZWG. The respondent adds that this regulation codifies the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Lasko,* and Departmental practice in a number of recent NME cases such as *Collated Roofing Nails from the PRC,* 62 FR 51410, 51416 (October 1, 1997), *Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC,* 62 FR 61794, 61795 (November 19, 1997) and *Melamine Institutional Dinnerware from the PRC,* 62 FR 1707, 1710 (January 13, 1997). In support of this argument, the respondent cited the following section from *Lasko:*

> [T]he purpose of the Act is to prevent dumping, an activity defined in terms of the market-place. The Act sets forth procedures in an effort to determine margins ''as accurately as possible.'' * * * Where we can determine that an NME producer's input prices are market determined accuracy, fairness and predictability are enhanced by using those prices. Therefore, using surrogate values when market-based values are available would, in fact be contrary to the intent of the law.

Id. at 1446. The CAFC in *Lasko* also stated that the Departmental practice is a legitimate policy choice in interpreting and applying the statute. *Id.*

The respondent asserts that it demonstrated at verification that the price it paid for the SWR imported from the United Kingdom through a market economy trading company was paid for in a market economy currency (U.S. dollars). These purchases accounted for almost one-half of its total SWR purchases during the period of review (POR). Thus, the amount of imported SWR purchased during the POR was not insignificant. (The respondent notes that the Department considered the amount of imported SWR purchased by ZWG during the third administrative review to be meaningful. This amount was less than that imported by ZWG during the current POR.) Moreover, based on the Department's verification report and exhibits, the respondent states that the imported SWR is the same, and has the same range of sizes, as the SWR sourced domestically by ZWG. In addition, the respondent argues that because the prices paid by ZWG (for imported SWR) deviated from the average price by less than one percent, they cannot be considered aberrational.

With regard to *Olympia,* the respondent asserts that the case is distinguishable from the situation in this review. In *Olympia,* the issue was whether the prices charged by a NME (PRC) trading company, which imported market economy steel and resold it to PRC producers in renmimbi, were reliable. The respondent argues that even if *Olympia* was applicable, the Department should determine that ZWG's import prices are reliable because verification demonstrated that (1) ZWG imported SWR from market economy suppliers and paid for the SWR in a market economy currency, (2) the imported SWR was used in the production of HSLWs, and (3) the deviation in price among the producers of imported SWR was not more than one percent.

Department's Position: We have continued to use the price of the imported input to value SWR for ZWG in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(1). In our view, this is consistent with the purpose of the antidumping statute identified in *Rhone Poulenc, Inc.* v. *United States,* 899 F.2d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1991), *i.e.,* to determine antidumping margins as accurately as possible. It is also consistent with the CAFC's ruling in *Lasko.* As discussed in *Lasko,* the Department has developed practices which emphasize accuracy, fairness, and predictability in establishing NV for NME producers. Clearly, because the input imported by ZWG is the same material as that domestically purchased by ZWG and ZWG's imports of this input were not insignificant, the import price is the most accurate price for valuing this factor. Moreover, because use of this import price does not involve selecting among several possible surrogate values for the input in question, it also enhances the predictability of the valuation methodology.

We disagree with the petitioner that use of import prices for valuing domestically sourced inputs in this situation is inconsistent with the Act. First, although we agree that *Lasko* addressed the use of import prices only for the portion of the input that was imported, *Lasko* did not prohibit the Department from using the import prices for the remaining domestically sourced portion. Indeed, for the reasons discussed above, we believe the use of the import price for the SWR domestically sourced by ZWG achieves the goals articulated in *Lasko.* We also believe that reliable import prices for the same input are a better means of valuing an input than surrogate values. This position is reflected in section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations acknowledged by the petitioner. Second, there is no information in the instant case that the imports were dumped or subsidized and, hence, to be avoided as the legislative history of section 773(c) of the Act directs. (*Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988,* H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 100–576, at 590 (1988), *reprinted* in 1988 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1547, 1623–1624.)

Further, we disagree with the petitioner's characterization that import data can only be used when ''available information is inadequate'' for valuing a factor. When ''available information is inadequate'' for using the factors methodology, section 773(c)(2) of the Act directs the Department to base NV on the price of merchandise that is comparable to the subject merchandise and is sold by a market economy country at a comparable level of economic development. In deciding to use the import price of the NME input rather than a surrogate value for the input, the Department relies instead upon the language in section 773(c)(1) of the Act regarding the use of ''best available information'' to value factors

of production. *See Lasko,* 43 F. 3d at 1446.

Regarding the petitioner's argument that the Department has abused its authority in this case even if it has the discretion to use import prices, we disagree. The quantity of imported SWR is not small in relation to ZWG's requirements for production of the subject merchandise. As ZWG has noted, imported SWR supplied nearly one-half of the company's SWR requirements for producing the subject merchandise. In addition, the petitioner has not pointed to any other fact surrounding the importation of SWR which would lead us to question the import transactions.

Finally, we agree with the respondent's characterization of *Olympia* and find that it is not applicable in this review. In the instant case, SWR was purchased from a market economy supplier through a market economy trading company and paid for in a market economy currency. In *Olympia,* the imports in question were made through an NME trading company. In a remand, the Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Olympia* requested the Department to explain why the prices paid by the NME trading company could not be used instead of resorting to a value in a surrogate country. In that case, the CIT simply required the Department to test the reliability of the prices paid due to the involvement of an NME trading company. (*Olympia,* Slip Op. 99–18 (February 17, 1999).) Because we are not dealing with an NME trading company in this case, there is no need to test the reliability of the price actually paid for the SWR used by ZWG.

Therefore, in accordance with section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations and Department's practice, we continue to use the actual imported steel prices to value ZWG's steel inputs because these prices represent the actual market-based prices incurred by ZWG in producing the subject merchandise and, as such, are the most accurate and appropriate values for this particular factor for the purpose of calculating NV.

Comment 2: Factory Overhead, SG&A Expenses In Plating Costs

The petitioner asserts that the Department erred in the preliminary results by failing to include FOH, SG&A, and profit for the plating operation. The Department's calculations for NV should reflect that the plating company and lock washer facility are separate, non-integrated entities. The petitioner argues that because the Department did not use a surrogate value for plating, but rather calculated surrogate values for the factor inputs used in plating, the Department is required to value separately the plating company's FOP and to include FOH, SG&A, and profit for plating. This CV should then be included as a ''cost'' to the lock washer producer. Moreover, the petitioner alleges that the Department included these costs separately in previous proceedings and did not explain its change in methodology in its preliminary results of review.

ZWG contends that the Department correctly calculated NV by computing FOH, SG&A and profit for total factors to produce HSLWs. ZWG states that the petitioner's suggestion to include FOH, SG&A, and profit in the calculation of ZWG's plating costs and then to calculate FOH, SG&A, and profit again for total factors to produce HSLWs, (including the plating materials, plating energy and plating labor) would double-count FOH, SG&A, and profit for the plating portion of production. To illustrate that point, the respondent notes that, although ZWG does not have plating equipment, the cost of depreciation for plating equipment would be included in NV twice: once as a part of plating operations and again as part of total production.

ZWG disagrees with the petitioner that the Department has changed its methodology from earlier reviews. Although the calculation was set up differently, the respondent states that the methodology used in the preliminary results of this review is mathematically identical to the methodology used in all previous reviews.

Department's Position: The respondent is correct that the methodology used for calculating NV in the preliminary results is mathematically identical with the result that would have been obtained had we applied the methodology used in previous reviews. Nevertheless, we have decided, for purposes of clarity, to set up the calculation in the same manner as in the second (1994–95) and third (1995–96) reviews of this case. Thus, in these final results, we have calculated NV in the following manner: (1) we added ZWG's costs of direct materials (including transportation), labor, and factory overhead in order to obtain ZWG's cost of manufacturing; (2) we calculated ZWG's SG&A and profit and added these to the cost of manufacturing in order to obtain ZWG's cost of production; (3) we performed the same calculation to obtain the plating company's cost of production; and, (4) we calculated the NV of the subject merchandise by adding ZWG's and the plating company's costs of production.

This calculation does not result in treating the cost of production for plating as an input into ZWG's production process, in the sense that the SG&A and profit calculated for ZWG does not include SG&A and profit calculated for the plating activity. Since the Department does not accord any significance to transactions between NME enterprises (*e.g.*, we do not consider using prices between NME producers and NME trading companies), we do not attempt to construct the price that would exist between an NME supplier (the plating company) and the NME producer of the subject merchandise (the HSLW producer).

Comment 3: Inland Freight Expense for Imported Steel

The petitioner argues that the Department incorrectly calculated freight expenses for domestically sourced SWR. The petitioner acknowledges that under *Sigma Corporation* v. *United States,* 117 F.3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (*Sigma*), where surrogate values are based on CIF imports in the surrogate country, the Department must not ''double count'' in determining the freight amount assigned to the FOP. However, the petitioner argues that in this case *Sigma* does not apply because the Department is using the price at which the PRC producer actually imports SWR. Thus, for domestically sourced SWR, the Department should use the distance between the supplier and ZWG. This does not violate the principles of the *Sigma* case because ZWG had a choice between domestic and foreign sourcing of its SWR and made a voluntary business decision to purchase SWR from both sources.

The respondent asserts that *Sigma* should apply to all situations where the Department uses actual CIF import prices to value domestically sourced inputs. The respondent contends that the Department's methodology reflects the reasoning of the CAFC in *Sigma* as it recognizes that market economy producers would tend to purchase inputs from the closer of an import source or domestic source and treats the actual CIF price of SWR as a ''surrogate value'' for SWR in determining freight costs. Thus, because surrogate values are merely the best approximation of what a PRC producer would pay if the producer were operating in a market economy, the respondent states that the Department should continue to apply *Sigma* to all distances to ZWG's material input suppliers in China.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioner that *Sigma* does not apply in a situation where the Department

values an input using the price actually paid by the NME producer. However, we do not agree that we should assign a freight value based on the distance to the NME supplier for that portion of the input that is domestically sourced. Because we are using an actual import value and have the actual distance that the imported merchandise had to be shipped, we are using that import value and that freight amount to value SWR, whether the SWR is imported or not.

Comment 4: Surrogate Truck Value

The petitioner contends that the Department incorrectly used a rate for foreign inland truck freight from a Times of India article published on April 20, 1994 (*Times of India* rate). Instead, the petitioner suggests that the Department use the truck freight rates listed in the U.S. Embassy cable dated August, 1993. The petitioner argues that the Times of India rate applies only to company-owned trucks and, since the Department has found that the trucks used by the respondent ZWG during the POR were not company-owned, the Department should use a different freight rate. The petitioner states that the Embassy cable rate was used as the truck rate by the Department in both the final determination of the HSLWs investigation and the most recent HSLWs administrative review. Furthermore, in *Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 62 FR 60684, (November 12, 1997), (*Hand Tools*), the Department distinguished between company and non-company owned trucks. In Hand Tools, the non-company-owned trucks were assigned a truck rate based on the Embassy cable.

The respondent maintains that the petitioner has misread the Times of India article and that the freight rates quoted therein do not apply only to company-owned trucks. The respondent believes that a distinction between freight rates incurred by company-owned and non-company-owned trucks is irrelevant and urges the Department to continue to use the rates published in Times of India.

Department's Position: We disagree with the petitioner. The Times of India rate is solely for trucks and provides a specific foreign inland truck rate, whereas the Embassy cable rate is for all modes of transportation in the surrogate country and provides a less specific rate for foreign inland trucks. The Department stated in its *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China,* 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993), that the August 3, 1993 cable from India (Embassy cable) appears to be an aggregate of various rates: trucking, shipping and rail. We note that in *Hand Tools* and *Hand Tools, Final Results Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews for 1996–1997,* 63 FR 16758 (April 6, 1998), the Department did not consider the aggregate nature of the Embassy cable rate.

Also, it should be noted that the Times of India rate was used by the Department in the last two HSLWs administrative reviews.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, we determine that the following weighted-average margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd	10/01/96–09/30/97	3.85
PRC Rate	10/01/96–09/30/97	128.63

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to section 351.212(b)(1) of the Department's regulations, we have calculated an importer-specific duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those sales. In order to estimate the entered value, we subtracted international movement expenses from the gross sales value. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that specific importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of HSLWs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for ZWG, which has a separate rate, and all ZWG exports through market-economy trading companies, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in these final results of review; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate which is 128.63 percent, which is the All Other PRC Manufacturers, Producers and Exporters rate from the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC,* 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993); and (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit rates shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 351.402(f) of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 351.305(a)(3) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 9, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–6535 Filed 3–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P