which reported that they had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR and as to China First Pencil Company, Ltd. (China First) and Guangdong Provincial Stationery & Sporting Goods Import and Export Corporation (Guangdong). With respect to China First and Guangdong, we verified that the only subject merchandise exported by these firms during the December 21, 1994 through November 30, 1995 POR was merchandise excluded from the order (*i.e.*, manufactured by the factories upon which the zero margins in the less-than-fair-value investigation were based). See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China, 59 FR 66909, (December 28, 1994). Therefore, these final results apply only to the PRC-wide entity which includes the remaining respondents in this review which did not reply to our questionnaire and show that they were entitled to a rate separate from the PRC entity.

Final Results of the Review

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments. Therefore, the preliminary results are unaltered. Based on the rationale set forth in our preliminary determination, we have determined that a margin of 44.66 percent exists for the PRC entity for the period December 21, 1994 through November 30, 1995. (This rate applies to all exports of pencils from the PRC other than those produced and exported by China First and those produced by Shanghai Three Star Stationery Company, Ltd. (Three Star) and exported by Guangdong, and those exported by Shanghai Foreign Trade Corporation (SFTC), an exporter which was previously determined to be entitled to a separate rate, and for which the petitioner withdrew its request for this administrative review.) The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/ producer/ exporter	Weighted average margin percentage
PRC Rate	44.66

The U.S. Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and normal value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions concerning the respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) No cash deposit is required for entries of subject merchandise both produced by China First and exported by China First, or for subject merchandise both produced by Three Star Stationery and exported by Guangdong; (2) the cash deposit rate for merchandise exported by China First and produced by any manufacturer other than China First, merchandise exported by Guangdong and produced by any manufacturer other than Three Star, and merchandise exported by all other PRC exporters will be the PRC rate of 44.66 percent; (3) the cash deposit rate for SFTC will be 8.31 percent; and (4) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate of its supplier, *i.e.*, the PRC rate.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review. This notice serves as the final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This 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 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 30, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–11756 Filed 5–5–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–791–001]

Final Results of the 1992 Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; Ferrochrome From South Africa

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On December 13, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on ferrochrome from South Africa for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992 (*see* 61 FR 65546) (Preliminary Results). We have completed this review and determine the net subsidy to be zero percent ad valorem for all companies. The Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise from South Africa exported on or after January 1, 1992, and on or before December 31, 1992.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Thirumalai, Office 1, Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4087.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 13, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the *Preliminary Results.* The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results.* Respondents Consolidated Metallurgical Industries, Ltd. (CMI), Ferralloys Limited (Ferralloys) and Samancor Ltd. (Samancor), producers of the subject merchandise which exported ferrochrome to the United States during the review period, submitted a case brief on January 22, 1997. No case brief was submitted by the Macalloy Corporation (petitioner).

This review covers three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise

(CMI, Ferralloys, and Samancor), which account for all exports of the subject merchandise to the United States from South Africa, and eight programs. One company, Chromecorp Technology (PTY) Ltd. (Chromecorp), reported having no exports to the United States during the review period; therefore, we did not include Chromecorp in this review (*see* the *Preliminary Results*).

Applicable Statute

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of Review

The imported product covered by this review is ferrochrome from South Africa which is currently classifiable under items 7202.41.00, 7202.49.10 and 7202.49.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Cash Deposit Purposes

Respondents received countervailable benefits only with respect to one program. We weight-averaged the rate received by each company for this program, including companies with de minimis and zero rates, by that company's share of total exports of ferrochrome to the United States (*see* Ceramica Regiomontana, *S.A.* v. *United States*, 853 F. Supp. 431 (CIT 1994)). We then summed the individual companies' weighted-averaged rates to determine the total subsidy rate benefitting exports of subject merchandise to the United States. The benefits received under this program were so small (0.003 percent) as to render a zero ad valorem subsidy rate, when rounded. Therefore, the total country-wide rate is zero percent ad valorem. Since the country-wide rate was zero, no further calculations were necessary.

Analysis of Programs

Based upon our analysis of respondents' questionnaire responses and written comments from the interested parties, we determine the following:

I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

A. Regional Industrial Development Incentives: Subsidy on Housing for Key Personnel

In the *Preliminary Results* we found that this program conferred benefits on the subject merchandise of 0.003 percent which, when rounded, gives an *ad valorem* subsidy rate of zero percent. We received no comments by the interested parties. Therefore, we have not changed our findings from the *Preliminary Results.*

II. Programs Found Not To Be Used

Our analysis of the comments submitted by the interested parties, summarized below, has led us to change the status of the following program from a program conferring subsidies to a program not used with respect to exports of subject merchandise to the United States:

A. Category A of the EIP (see comment, below).

In addition, in the *Preliminary Results* we found that the producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise did not apply for or receive benefits under the following programs:

B. Industrial Development Corporation Loans;

C. Export Incentive Program, Categories B, C and D;

D. Regional Industrial Development Incentives;

(1) Labor Incentive;

(2) Interest Concession;

E. Preferential Rail Rates;

F. Government Loan Guarantees;

G. Beneficiation Allowances—Electric Power Cost Aid Scheme;

H. General Export Incentive Scheme;

I. Rail Transport Rebate on Outgoing Goods (subprogram of the Regional Industrial Development Incentives).

We received no comments regarding these programs from the interested parties. Therefore, we have not changed our findings in the *Preliminary Results.*

Analysis of Comments

Comment

Respondents argue that the Department does not have to rely on GOSA oversight in order to achieve the requisite assurance that Category A benefits were limited to non-U.S. exports, as required by the GOSA. Instead, respondents point out that the Department has other means at its disposal with which to assure itself, including the option to conduct verification. Respondents also state that the decision to require GOSA oversight is contrary to the Department's policy of preferring to rely upon primary evidence from respondents above secondary evidence from the foreign governments. In addition, according to respondents, the decision ignored the evidence already on the record which clearly indicated that Category A benefits were tied to non-U.S. exports. Nevertheless, should the Department continue to require government oversight, the information submitted by respondents should demonstrate that there was sufficient GOSA oversight of Category A claims to ensure that the allocated benefits were tied solely to exports to countries other than the United States.

DOC Response

We agree with respondents that government oversight of claims under a program whose benefits are allocated to exports in general is not necessarily required for a determination that the benefits are tied to specific markets. However, it is essential that any such tying of benefits be done by the government at time of bestowal (*see* General Issues Appendix, Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From Austria (58 FR 37217 at 37232 (July 9, 1993)).

The record in this case shows that the producers of the subject merchandise were required by the GOSA to refrain from claiming Category A benefits on exports to the United States. In addition, other information on the record, including evidence of GOSA oversight of Category A claims, demonstrates sufficiently that the producers did not claim or receive benefits on exports to the United States pursuant to the GOSA's requirement. Therefore, we determine that the benefits received were tied to markets other than the United States at the time of bestowal and, accordingly, that Category A was not used with respect to exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.

Final Results of Review

For the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992, we determine the net subsidy to be zero percent *ad valorem* for all companies. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of subject merchandise exported on or after January 1, 1992 and entered on or before December 31, 1992. Because the countervailing duty order was revoked effective January 1, 1995 (*see* Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders (60 FR 40568, August 9, 1995)) pursuant to section 753 of the Act, as amended by the Uruguay Round

Agreements Act, no other instructions will be sent to the U.S. Customs Service.

This notice 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 19 CFR 355.34(d). Timely written 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 administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 355.22.

Dated: April 29, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–11757 Filed 5–5–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–357–403; C–357–005]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Argentina and Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Argentina; Termination of Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review/termination of administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: On December 30, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative reviews of the countervailing duty order on Oil Country Tubular Goods (OCTG) from Argentina for the periods 1992, 1993 and 1994, and the countervailing duty order on Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products (Cold-Rolled Steel) from Argentina for the periods 1992 and 1993. The Department preliminarily determined that it lacked the authority to assess countervailing duties on the entries subject to these reviews, and announced its intent to terminate the reviews. We have now finalized that determination and terminate these reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dana Mermelstein or Richard Herring, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 30, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 68713) the preliminary results of its administrative reviews and its intent to terminate the administrative reviews of the countervailing duty orders on OCTG and Cold-Rolled Steel from Argentina. The Department has now completed these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

The review of OCTG covering the period January 1 through December 31, 1994, was initiated on December 15, 1995 (60 FR 64413). The review of OCTG covering the period January 1 through December 31, 1993, was initiated on December 15, 1994 (59 FR 64650). The review of OCTG covering the period January 1 through December 31, 1992, was initiated on December 17, 1993 (58 FR 65964).

The review of Cold-Rolled Steel covering the period January 1 through December 31, 1993, was initiated on May 12, 1994 (59 FR 24683). The review of Cold-Rolled Steel covering the period January 1 through December 31, 1992, was initiated on May 27, 1993 (58 FR 30767).

In the preliminary results, the Department determined that it lacks the authority to assess countervailing duties on entries of OCTG and Cold-Rolled Steel made on or after September 20, 1991 and on or before December 31, 1994. We invited interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. We did not receive any comments. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the preliminary results (61 FR 68713), we are terminating these reviews.

The question of the Department's authority to assess duties on unliquidated entries of OCTG made on or after January 1, 1995 remains to be determined in the context of the ongoing changed circumstances reviews. See, Leather from Argentina, Wool from Argentina, Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina, and Carbon Steel Cold-Rolled Flat Products from Argentina; Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Reviews (Changed Circumstances Reviews), to be published on May 2, 1997, in the **Federal Register**.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

With the exception of the 1994 administrative review of the countervailing duty order on OCTG from Argentina, the Department is conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. The 1994 OCTG review is being conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, effective January 1, 1995. Otherwise, citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of the Reviews

OCTG from Argentina. Imports covered by this order include shipments of Argentine oil country tubular goods. Oil country tubular goods include hollow steel products of circular cross-section intended for use in the drilling of oil or gas and oil well casing, tubing and drill pipe or carbon or alloy steel, whether welded or seamless, manufactured to either American Petroleum Institute (API) or proprietary specifications. The scope covers both finished and unfinished OCTG. The products covered in this review are provided for under item numbers of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS): 7304.20.20, 7304.20.40, 7304.20.50, 7304.20.60, 7304.20.80, 7304.39.00, 7304.51.50, 7304.20.70, 7304.59.60, 7304.59.80, 7304.90.70, 7305.20.40, 7305.20.60, 7305.20.80, 7305.31.40, 7305.31.60, 7305.39.10, 7305.39.50, 7305.90.10, 7305.90.50, 7306.20.20, 7306.20.30, 7306.20.40, 7306.20.60, 7306.20.80, 7306.30.50, 7306.50.50, 7306.60.70, 7306.90.10. The HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Cold-Rolled Steel from Argentina. Imports covered by this order include shipments of Argentine cold-rolled carbon steel flat products, whether or not corrugated or crimped; whether or not painted or varnished and whether or not pickled; not cut, not pressed, and not stamped to non-rectangular shape; not coated or plated with metal; over 12 inches in width and under 0.1875 inches in thickness whether or not in coils; as currently provided for under the following item numbers of the HTS: 7209.11.00, 7209.12.00, 7209.13.00, 7209.14.00, 7209.21.00, 7209.22.00, 7209.23.00, 7209.24.00, 7209.31.00, 7209.32.00, 7209.33.00, 7209.34.00, 7209.41.00, 7209.42.00, 7209.43.00, 7209.44.00, 7209.90.00, 7210.70.00, 7211.30.50, 7211.41.70, 7211.49.50,