

antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between EP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. We have calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates for each class or kind of HFHTs by dividing the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of the importer's/customer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of HFHTs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates (Shandong Huarong, LMC, TMC, FMEC, and SMC) will be the rates for those firms established in the final results of these administrative reviews for the classes or kinds listed above; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rates will be the PRC-wide rates established in the final results of the previous administrative reviews; and (3) the cash deposit rates for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rates applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. The PRC-wide rates are: 21.93 percent for axes/adzes; 66.32 percent for bars/wedges; 44.41 percent for hammers/sledges; and 108.2 percent for picks/mattocks. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

Notification of Interested Parties

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 353.26 of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C.

1675(a)(1) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: October 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-29763 Filed 11-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-428-820]

Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On September 25, 1997, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 50292) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Germany, covering the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. The review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the interested party that requested the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Decker, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0196.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 29, 1997, the Department received a request from the respondent in this case, Mannesmannrohren-Werke AG ("MRW") and Mannesmann Pipe & Steel Corporation ("MPS") (collectively "Mannesmann"), to conduct an administrative review of Mannesmann, pursuant to section 19 CFR 351.213(b) of the Department's regulations. The period of review is August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. On September 25, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 50292) a notice

announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Germany, covering the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

Rescission of Review

On October 7, 1997, we received a timely request for withdrawal of the request for administrative review from Mannesmann. Because there were no other requests for administrative review from any other interested party, in accordance with section 351.213 (d) (1) of the Department's regulations, we have rescinded this administrative review.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675) and 19 CFR 351.213 (d) (4).

Dated: October 29, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97-29766 Filed 1-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-068]

Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete From Japan; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of final court decision and amended final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: On April 22, 1997, the Court of International Trade (the Court) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department) second remand determination arising out of the administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on steel wire strand for prestressed concrete ("PC Strand") from Japan. See *Mitsui & Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-49 (CIT April 22, 1997). As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending the final results of review in this matter and will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate Mitsui's entries covered by these amended final results at the rates assigned to each of Mitsui's suppliers for the periods April 1, 1978 through

March 31, 1979; April 1, 1979 through November 30, 1980; December 1, 1980 through November 30, 1981; December 1, 1981 through November 30, 1982; and December 1, 1982 through November 30, 1983.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike Heaney or Linda Ludwig, Office Eight, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4475.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 11, 1994, the Court issued an order remanding to the Department the final results of the administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on PC Strand from Japan, covering exports by Mitsui & Co. (Mitsui) during the period April 1, 1978 through November 30, 1985.¹ *Mitsui & Co. v. United States*, Slip Op. 94-44 (CIT March 11, 1994).

On August 5, 1994, in accordance with the Court's remand order, the Department filed its final results of redetermination. (See Final Redetermination Pursuant to the Court Remand, August 5, 1994, *Mitsui & Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 90-12-00633 (Remand Results 1)). In this determination, to determine whether Mitsui had engaged in middleman dumping during each period of review (POR), the Department considered whether a substantial portion of Mitsui's sales were at prices that were substantially below its acquisition costs. Based on our analysis of the number of sales made at prices below acquisition costs and the magnitude of resulting losses, the Department determined that Mitsui had engaged in middleman dumping because Mitsui made a "substantial number of sales at prices substantially below its acquisition cost" (See Final Remand Results 1 at 9).

In response to comments on the redetermination submitted by the plaintiffs and the defendant intervener, the Department requested a remand to address clerical errors and methodological questions raised by both parties concerning the existence or absence of middleman dumping. (See

Defendant's Response to the Comments Filed by Plaintiffs and the Intervenor to the Redetermination Upon Remand Filed by the Department of Commerce, Nov. 30, 1994 *Mitsui & Co., Ltd. v. United States*.)

On June 10, 1996, the Court issued an order remanding the Department's Final Redetermination of August 1994. The Court directed the Department to: (1) Correct clerical errors noted by the plaintiffs and the defendant intervener relating to currency conversion, average movement charges, and acquisition costs; (2) consider the methodological questions raised by plaintiffs relating to (a) the use of number of transactions as opposed to the relative quantity or value of PC strand, (b) the calculation of "value" in determining the extent of below-cost sales, (c) the calculation of the cost of acquisition, and (d) the need for information from Mitsui's suppliers in order to review the existence or absence of middleman dumping; and (3) consider the intervenor's claim that the Department failed to include certain expenses reported by Mitsui in its sales listings.

On October 9, 1996, the Department filed its second redetermination with the Court. (See Prestressed Concrete Strand from Japan, Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, October 9, 1996, Court No. 90-12-00633 (Remand Results 2).) In this redetermination, the Department corrected clerical errors identified by both parties. With respect to the methodological issues, the Department determined that because a value-based methodology provides a more meaningful understanding of the extent to which merchandise has been sold below acquisition costs, a value-based methodology was appropriate to determine whether Mitsui had engaged in middleman dumping during the PORs. Accordingly, we determined whether a substantial portion of Mitsui's sales were below acquisition costs by comparing the total value of PC strand sales below acquisition costs to the total value of PC strand sales. Based on our examination of Mitsui's sales, we determined that Mitsui did not make a substantial portion of sales below acquisition costs during each POR. Because the portion of below-acquisition-cost sales during each POR was not substantial, and examination of whether prices were substantially below acquisition cost was unnecessary. See Remand Results 2 at 6.

We also determined that (1) reexamining our methodology for calculating "value" was unnecessary because we did not need to determine whether Mitsui's sales were substantially below acquisition cost, (2) Mitsui's acquisition costs should be calculated using currency conversions based on the exchange rate in effect on the date of shipment, (3) we did not require additional information from Mitsui's suppliers during the PORs, and (4) we included all actual expenses incurred and reported by Mitsui in comparing Mitsui's resale prices to its acquisition costs. See Remand Results 2 at 7. Finally, because we had determined that Mitsui did not engage in middleman dumping during the periods covered by the redetermination, we concluded that it was appropriate to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate Mitsui's entries according to the rates determined for reach of Mitsui's suppliers for the relevant periods. We noted that this was the methodology followed in the relevant administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on PC Strand from Japan for other exporters. See Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 48 FR 45586 (Oct. 6, 1983) (1978-1979; 1979-1980 POR); and Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 51 FR 30894 (Aug. 29, 1986) (1980-1981; 1981-1982 POR) Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 52 FR 4373 (Feb. 11, 1987) (1982-1983 POR).

On April 22, 1997, the Court upheld the Department's second redetermination on remand. *Mitsui & Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-49 (CIT April 22, 1997). The period to appeal has expired and no appeal was filed. Therefore, as there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending our final results of review.

Amended Final Results of Reviews

Pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Act, we are now amending the final results of the administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on PC strand from Japan with respect to exports by Mitsui and determine that the following margins exist:

¹ For the period December 1, 1983 through November 30, 1985, Mitsui had no shipments of merchandise subject to the order.

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Shrinko Wire Company, Ltd./Mitsui & Co., Ltd	04/01/78-03/31/79	0
	04/01/79-11/30/80	0
	12/01/80-11/30/81	0
	12/01/81-11/30/82	0
	12/01/82-11/30/83	0
Sumitomo Electric Ind., Ltd./Mitsui & Co., Ltd	04/01/78-03/31/79	0
	04/01/79-11/30/80	0
	12/01/80-11/30/81	0
	12/01/81-11/30/82	0
	12/01/82-11/30/83	0
Suzuki Metal Ind. Co., Ltd./Mitsui & Co., Ltd	04/01/78-03/31/79	0
	04/01/79-11/30/80	0
	12/01/80-11/30/81	0
	12/01/81-11/30/82	0
	12/01/82-11/30/83	0
Teikoku Sangyo Co., Ltd./Mitsui & Co., Ltd	04/01/78-03/31/79	0
	04/01/79-11/30/80	0
	12/01/80-11/30/81	0
	12/01/81-11/30/82	0
	12/01/82-11/30/83	0
Tokyo Rope Mfg. Co. Ltd./Mitsui & Co., Ltd	04/01/78-03/31/79	0
	04/01/79-11/30/80	0
	12/01/80-11/30/81	4.5
	12/01/81-11/30/82	4.5
	12/01/82-11/30/83	14.5

¹ No shipments during the POR.

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will issue appraisal instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service. Further, for any shipments from the remaining known manufacturers and/or exporters not covered by these reviews, the current cash deposit shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(8).

Dated: November 3, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-29765 Filed 11-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of process to revoke Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 83-00034.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to Micro Products Company. Because this certificate holder has failed

to file an annual report as required by law, the Department is initiating proceedings to revoke the certificate. This notice summarizes the notification letter sent Micro Products Company.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Acting Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482-5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 ("the Act") (15 U.S.C. 4011-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue export trade certificates of review. The regulations implementing Title III ("the Regulations") are found at 15 CFR part 325. Pursuant to this authority, a certificate of review was issued on April 13, 1984 to Micro Products Company.

A certificate holder is required by law (Section 308 of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 4018) to submit to the Department of Commerce annual reports that update financial and other information relating to business activities covered by its certificate. The annual report is due within 45 days after the anniversary date of the issuance of the certificate of review (§ 325.14(a) and (b) of the Regulations). Failure to submit a complete annual report may be the basis for revocation. (§ 325.10(a) and 325.14(c) of the Regulations).

The Department of Commerce sent to Micro Products Company on April 3, 1997, a letter containing annual report questions with a reminder that its

annual report was due on May 28, 1997. Additional reminders were sent on August 7, 1997, and on September 12, 1997. The Department has received no written response to any of these letters.

On November 6, 1997, and in accordance with § 325.10 (c)(1) of the Regulations, a letter was sent by certified mail to notify Micro Products Company that the Department was formally initiating the process to revoke its certificate. The letter stated that this action is being taken because of the certificate holder's failure to file an annual report.

In accordance with § 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations, each certificate holder has thirty days from the day after its receipt of the notification letter in which to respond. The certificate holder is deemed to have received this letter as of the date on which this notice is published in the **Federal Register**. For good cause shown, the Department of Commerce can, at its discretion, grant a thirty-day extension for a response.

If the certificate holder decides to respond, it must specifically address the Department's statement in the notification letter that it has failed to file an annual report. It should state in detail why the facts, conduct, or circumstances described in the notification letter are not true, or if they are, why they do not warrant revoking the certificate. If the certificate holder does not respond within the specified period, it will be considered an admission of the statements contained