both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their request to the Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Enforcement, Attention: Sheila Forbes, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 351.303(f)(1)(i) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation'' for requests received by the last day of December 1997. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of December 1997, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: November 28, 1997.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–31936 Filed 12–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–421–804]

Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Netherlands; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Extension of Time Limit

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands. This review covers the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 5, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen Kramer or Linda Ludwig, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0405 or 482–3833, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Due to the complexity of issues involved in this case, it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit. The Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until March 8, 1998, in accordance with Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994. See memorandum to Robert S. La Russa from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding the extension of case deadline, dated November xx, 1997.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: November 24, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–31937 Filed 12–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–811]

Steel Wire Rope from the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and intent to revoke antidumping duty order in part.

SUMMARY: In response to requests by the petitioner, the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope & Specialty Cable Manufacturers, and by six manufacturers/exporters of subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Korea. The review covers 15 manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review is March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997.

We have preliminarily found that, for certain exporters, sales of subject merchandise have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the export price and the normal value. Also, if these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we intend to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to Chung Woo Rope Co., Ltd., Ssang Yong Cable Manufacturing Co., Ltd. and Sung Jin Company, based on three years of sales at not less than NV. *See Intent to Revoke* section of this notice.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit case briefs in this proceeding should provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 5, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sunkyu Kim, at (202) 482–2613, or John Brinkmann, at (202) 482–5288; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, 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 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 353 (1997).

Case History

On March 26, 1993, the Department of Commerce (Department) published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea. *See* 58 FR 16397. On March 7, 1997, the Department published a notice providing an opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order for the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997. *See* 62 FR 10521. On March 31, 1997, the petitioner requested an administrative review of 15 manufacturers/exporters of steel wire rope from Korea. On March 31, 1997, each of the following companies also requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their sales: Chung Woo Rope Co., Ltd. (Chung Woo), Chun Kee Steel Wire Rope Co., Ltd. (Chun Kee), Kumho Wire Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Kumho), Manho Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Manho), Ssang Yong Cable Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Ssang Yong) and Sun Jin Company (Sung Jin). In addition, Chung Woo, Kumho, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin each requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to their merchandise (*see Intent to Revoke* section of the notice below). We published a notice of initiation of this administrative review on April 24, 1997. *See* 62 FR 19988.

On April 2, 1997, the Department revoked the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea with respect to Manho and Chun Kee, effective for entries of subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse on or after March 1, 1996 (*see Steel Wire Rope from the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 62 FR 17171 (April 9, 1997) (''Steel Wire Rope Third Review Final'')). Because the current review covers shipments of merchandise from the Republic of Korea during the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997, on May 7, 1997, the Department terminated the review with respect to Manho and Chun Kee. (*See Steel Wire Rope from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Termination In Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 26776 (May 15, 1997)).

On April 28, 1997, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to the 13 remaining respondents. The Department received responses from Chung Woo, Kumho, Sung Jin and Ssang Yong in July 1997. The Department issued supplemental questionnaires to these companies on August 11, 1997. Responses to these questionnaires were received on August 25, 1997.

Chung Woo, Kumho, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin each requested revocation of the order with respect to their merchandise. The petitioner, on August 21, 1997, also requested verification of the responses of Chung Woo, Kumho, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin on grounds that each company had requested revocation of the order. Accordingly, the Department scheduled a verification of each company's response pursuant to section 782(i) of the Act. On September 2, 1997, Kumho submitted a letter requesting that the Department postpone the scheduled verification of its responses. According to Kumho, the company entered bankruptcy proceedings on August 20, 1997, and therefore was not able to participate in the verification during the scheduled time in September 1997. Subsequently, on October 10, 1997, Kumho submitted a letter withdrawing its request for revocation of the antidumping duty order. In that letter, Kumho stated that due to bankruptcy proceedings, it was impossible for the company to participate in a verification. Kumho also included in its submission certain documentation supporting its claim that the company is in bankruptcy. Due to this unusual circumstance, Kumho requested that the verification be cancelled on the grounds that its withdrawal of the request for revocation made verification unnecessary.

We would not have verified Kumho's responses in this review if Kumho had not requested revocation of the order with respect to its merchandise. The Department verified Kumho's responses in the preceding 1995/96 administrative review. In addition, the reason the petitioner gave for its request for verification of Kumho's responses was the company's request for revocation. Furthermore, the documentation Kumho provided to the Department sufficiently establishes its claim that the company is in bankruptcy. Therefore, on grounds that Kumho has withdrawn its request for revocation, we canceled the verification of the company. For the preliminary results, we are calculating a dumping margin based on Kumho's home market and U.S. sales databases submitted on July 9, 1997.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is steel wire rope. Steel wire rope encompasses ropes, cables, and cordage of iron or carbon steel, other than stranded wire, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, and not made up of brass-plated wire. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090. Excluded from this review is stainless steel wire rope, *i.e.*, ropes, cables and cordage other than stranded wire, of stainless steel, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, which is classifiable under HTS subheading 7312.10.6000. Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Non-Responding Companies

For two respondents, Jinyang Wire Rope Inc. (Jinyang) and Yeonsin Metal (Yeonsin), while we have confirmed that the questionnaires were delivered to the companies, we did not receive responses to our questionnaire. Accordingly, we are assigning to these companies a margin based on adverse facts available. *See Use of Facts Available* section of the notice below.

For four other respondents, Boo Kook Corporation (Boo Kook), Dong-Il Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Dong-Il), Hanboo Wire Rope (Hanboo) and Seo Jin Wire Rope (Seo Jin), the questionnaires were undelivered and returned to the Department. Thereafter, we received information from the U.S. Embassy in Seoul, South Korea, that two of these companies, Hanboo and Seo Jin, were closed. In accordance with our practice with respect to companies to which we cannot send a questionnaire, we are assigning to these companies the ''All Others'' rate from the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, which is 1.51 percent. *See Sweaters Wholly or in Chief Weight of Man-Made Fiber From Hong Kong: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 59 FR 13926 (March 24, 1994).

With respect to Boo Kook and Dong-Il, the U.S. Embassy informed us of their new addresses. Subsequently on July 7, 1997, we sent the questionnaires to these two companies at their new addresses. While we have confirmed that the questionnaires were delivered to both companies, we did not receive responses to our questionnaire.

Accordingly, we are assigning these two companies a margin based on adverse facts available. *See Use of Facts Available* section of this notice below.

Non-Shippers

Two companies, Myung Jin Co., Ltd. and TSK Korea Co., Ltd. notified us that they did not have shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR), and we have confirmed this with the United States Customs Service.

Use of Facts Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for Boo Kook, Dong-Il, Jinyang, Yeon Sin, and Sungsan Special Steel Processing, Inc. (Sungsan). With respect to Boo Kook, Dong-Il, Jinyang, and Yeon Sin, we find that these firms have not provided ''information that has been requested by the administering authority'' because they did not respond to our antidumping questionnaire. Furthermore, we determine that, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, it is appropriate to make an inference adverse to the interests of these companies because they failed to cooperate by not responding to our questionnaire and, thus, by not acting to the best of their ability.

Where the Department must resort to facts available because a respondent failed to cooperate to the best of its ability, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the use of an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in selecting from among the facts available. Section 776(b) of the Act also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination in the LTFV investigation, a previous administrative review, or any other information placed on the record.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information has probative value. (*See* H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d sess. 870 (1994).)

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. *See, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (Feb. 22, 1996) (where the Department rejected the highest margin as adverse best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin).

For the previous three administrative reviews of this proceeding, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 1.51 percent, as best information or facts available. In our final results of the 1995/96 administrative review, however, we stated that this rate may no longer have the desired effect of inducing cooperation of potential respondents. *See* SAA at 868. Therefore, we stated that we would collect information bearing on this issue to permit us to make a determination whether the 1.51 percent rate is sufficiently adverse to effectuate the purpose of the facts available rule and, if necessary, adjust the rate accordingly. *See Steel Wire Rope Third Review Final*, 62 FR 17171, 17176. For purposes of these preliminary results, we continue to use 1.51 percent as adverse facts available. However, we are reconsidering the appropriateness of this rate as an adverse facts available rate and intend to adjust this rate for the final results, if necessary. To this end, we invite interested parties in this proceeding to submit comments or information concerning this issue. In particular, we invite interested parties to supply specific data that the Department could consider if its chooses to establish an adverse facts available rate that is more appropriate for uncooperative respondents. Moreover, we invite interested parties to comment on the methods and sources by which the Department could satisfy its statutory requirement to corroborate from independent sources any proposed adverse facts available rate.

With respect to Sungsan, we find the use of facts available is appropriate. Sungsan submitted a letter in response to our questionnaire on June 23, 1997. In the letter, Sungsan stated that the company does not produce steel wire rope. However, the company further stated that it purchased steel wire rope from other companies in Korea and did export a small quantity of the merchandise to the United States during the POR. Subsequently, on November 4, 1997, the Department sent a letter to Sungsan requesting additional information concerning the company's shipment of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. Specifically, we requested Sungsan to identify the suppliers from which the company purchased the subject merchandise that was shipped to the United States during the POR and to confirm that the suppliers are not affiliated with Sungsan. Additionally, we requested that Sungsan clarify whether each of the suppliers had knowledge or reason to know that the products it sold to Sungsan were destined for the United States at the time of sale.

On November 14, 1997, Sungsan submitted its response to the Department's request for additional information. According to Sungsan, the supplier from which the company purchased the subject merchandise that it shipped to the United States during the POR is not affiliated with Sungsan. Furthermore, Sungsan stated that the supplier did not have knowledge that the merchandise it sold to Sungsan was destined for the United States at the time of sale. Based on this information, we conclude that Sungsan's sale to the United States during the POR is covered by this review and response to our questionnaire was required. Because Sungsan did not provide a full response to our questionnaire, we find that the application of a facts available rate is appropriate for Sungsan. However, in this case, the Department failed to notify Sungsan in a timely manner of the deficiencies in its response to our questionnaire. Accordingly, as facts available, we are assigning the respondent the ''All Others'' rate from the LTFV investigation, 1.51 percent, which has been used in prior segments of this proceeding as facts available.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by Chung Woo, Sung Jin and Ssang Yong. We used standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection

of the manufacturer's facilities and examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification results are outlined in the verification reports placed in the case file.

Export Price

For sales to the United States, the Department used export price (EP) as defined in section 772(a) of the Act for each of the respondents, because the subject merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and the use of constructed export price was not indicated by the facts of record.

We made company-specific adjustments as follows:

Chung Woo

We calculated EP based on packed, c.i.f. and c&f prices to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for domestic inland freight, brokerage and handling, ocean freight, marine insurance, terminal handling charges, wharfage expenses, bill of lading issuing fees, export license fees, and container taxes, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

The merchandise involved in certain U.S. and home market sales reported by Chung Woo was produced by unaffiliated suppliers. We included these sales by Chung Woo in our analysis because we determined that the suppliers did not know at the time of sale that the subject merchandise was to be exported to the United States. We compared these U.S. sales to the appropriate home market sales of merchandise produced by the same suppliers and sold by Chung Woo.

Kumho

We calculated EP based on packed, c.i.f. and c&f prices to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for domestic inland freight, brokerage and handling, ocean freight, marine insurance, terminal handling charges, wharfage expenses, bill of lading issuing fees, container taxes, and container freight station expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

The merchandise involved in certain U.S. and home market sales reported by Kumho was produced by unaffiliated suppliers. We included these sales by Kumho in our analysis because we determined that the suppliers did not know at the time of sale that the subject merchandise was to be exported to the United States. We compared these U.S. sales to the appropriate home market sales of merchandise produced by the same suppliers and sold by Kumho.

Ssang Yong

We calculated EP based on packed, c.i.f. and c&f prices to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for domestic inland freight, brokerage and handling, ocean freight, marine insurance and containerization expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

Sung Jin

We calculated EP based on packed, delivered to Korean port prices to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for domestic inland freight and brokerage and handling expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

Consistent with our practice in the previous review, we did not make any duty drawback adjustments claimed by Chung Woo, Kumho, or Ssang Yong because they were unable to demonstrate a connection between payment of import duties and receipt of duty drawback on exports of steel wire rope, and because they did not demonstrate that they had sufficient imports of raw materials to account for the duty drawback received on exports of the manufactured product (*see Steel Wire Rope From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part,* 61 FR 64058, 64059 (December 3, 1996)). Sung Jin did not claim any duty drawback adjustments for its sales to the United States.

No other adjustments to EP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of foreign like product each respondent sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act, because each company had sales in its home market which were greater than five percent of its sales in the U.S. market. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value (NV) on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the exporting country.

For all respondents, pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product. We compared EP sales to sales in the home market of identical or similar merchandise.

We based NV on the price at which the foreign like product is first sold for consumption in the exporting country, in the usual commercial quantities, in the ordinary course of trade, and at the same level of trade as the EP, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. We increased home market price by the amount of U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act and reduced it by the amount of home market packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act.

We made company-specific adjustments as follows:

Chung Woo

We calculated NV based on ex-factory or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate, we made adjustments for movement expenses consistent with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In addition, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.56, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments to NV. Specifically, we deducted home market credit expenses and, where appropriate, added U.S. postage fees, U.S. letter of credit fees, U.S. bank charges, and U.S. credit expenses.

Kumho

We calculated NV based on delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate, we made adjustments for movement expenses consistent with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In addition, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.56, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments to NV. Specifically, we deducted home market credit expenses and, where appropriate, added U.S. postage fees, U.S. letter of credit fees, U.S. bank charges, U.S. credit expenses and export recommendation fees.

Ssang Yong

We calculated NV based on f.o.b. or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate, we made adjustments for movement expenses consistent with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In addition, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.56, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments to NV. Specifically, we deducted home market credit expenses and, where appropriate, added U.S.

postage fees, U.S. letter of credit fees, U.S. bank charges, and U.S. credit expenses. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for differences in the physical characteristics of merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

While Ssang Yong made sales of merchandise produced by unaffiliated suppliers in the home market, it did not sell in the United States merchandise produced by unaffiliated suppliers. Accordingly, we have excluded those home market sales of merchandise produced by unaffiliated suppliers from our analysis.

Sung Jin

We calculated NV based on ex-factory or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate, we made adjustments for movement expenses consistent with section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In addition, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.56, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments to NV. Specifically, we deducted home market credit expenses, and added U.S. credit expenses.

For all companies, prices were reported net of value-added taxes (VAT) and, therefore, no adjustment for VAT was necessary. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Intent To Revoke

Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin requested, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(b), revocation of the order with respect to their sales of the subject merchandise and submitted the certification required by 19 CFR 353.25(b)(1).[1] In addition, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2)(iii), these companies have agreed in writing to their immediate reinstatement in the order, as long as any producer or reseller is subject to the order, if the Department concludes under 19 CFR 353.22(f) that these companies, subsequent to revocation, sold merchandise at less than NV.

Based on the preliminary results in this review and the final results of the two preceding reviews (*see Steel Wire Rope From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 55965 (October 30, 1996), and *Steel Wire Rope Third Review Final*), Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin have preliminarily demonstrated three consecutive years of sales at not less than NV.

[1] As discussed above in the *Case History* section of the notice, Kumho withdrew its request for revocation of the order on October 10, 1997. Accordingly, we do not intend to revoke the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Kumho in this review.

Given the results of the two preceding reviews, if the final results of this review demonstrate that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin sold the merchandise at not less than NV, and if we determine that it is not likely that these companies will sell the subject merchandise at less than NV in the future, we intend to revoke the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates published by the Federal Reserve in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in effect on the date of sale of subject merchandise in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a ''fluctuation.'' In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined as a general matter that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine that a fluctuation exists, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Boo Kook Corporation	*1.51
Chung Woo Rope Co., Ltd.	0.00
Dong-Il Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	*1.51
Hanboo Wire Rope, Inc.	1.51
Jinyang Wire Rope, Inc.	*1.51
Kumho Wire Rope Mfg. Co., Ltd.	0.04
Myung Jin Co.	[1] 1.51
Seo Jin Rope	1.51
Ssang Yong Cable Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	0.02
Sung Jin Company	0.00
Sungsan Special Steel Processing	1.51
TSK Korea Co., Ltd.	([2])
Yeonsin Metal	*1.51

*Adverse Facts Available Rate.

[1] No shipments subject to this review. Rate is from the last relevant segment of the proceeding in which the firm had shipments/sales.

[2] No shipments subject to this review. The firm has no individual rate from any segment of this proceeding.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within ten days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument: (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the arguments. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will issue a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at the hearing, within 120 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties. For Chung Woo, Kumho and Ssang Yong, for duty assessment purposes, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total value of subject merchandise entered during the POR for each importer. In order to estimate the entered value, we subtracted international movement expenses from the gross sales value. For Sung Jin, we do not have the information to calculate an estimated entered value. Accordingly, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales and dividing this amount by the total quantity of subject merchandise sold during the POR. This specific rate calculated for each importer will be used for the assessment of antidumping duties on the relevant entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of steel wire rope from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication

date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of this administrative review (except no cash deposit will be required for those companies whose weighted-average margin is zero or *de minimis, i.e.,* less than 0.5 percent); (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original LTFV investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received an individual rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, the previous review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 1.51 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (58 FR 16397, March 26, 1993).

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 751(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 353.22, and 19 CFR 353.25.

Dated: December 1, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–31938 Filed 12–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program: Conditional Approvals, Findings Documents, Responses to Comments, and Records of Decision

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Conditional Approval of Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs and Availability of Findings Documents, Responses to Comments, and Records of Decision for Florida, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the conditional approval of the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Programs (coastal nonpoint programs) and of the availability of the Findings Documents, Responses to Comments, and Records of Decision for Florida, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA), 16 U.S.C. section 1455b, requires states and territories with coastal zone management programs that have received approval under section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act to develop and implement coastal nonpoint programs. Coastal states and territories were required to submit their coastal nonpoint programs to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for approval in July 1995.

NOAA and EPA have approved, with conditions, the coastal nonpoint programs submitted by Florida, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

NOAA and EPA have prepared a Findings Document for each 6217 program submitted for approval. The Findings Documents were prepared by NOAA and EPA to provide the rationale for the agencies' decision to approve each state and territory coastal nonpoint program. Proposed Findings Documents, Environmental Assessments, and Findings of No Significant Impact prepared for the coastal nonpoint programs submitted by Florida, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were made available for public comment in the **Federal Register.** Public comments were received and responses prepared on the programs submitted by Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, and Florida. No public comments were received on the programs submitted by Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), NOAA has also prepared a Record of Decision on each program. The requirements of 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508 (Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations to implement the National Environmental Policy Act) apply to the preparation of a Record of Decision. Specifically, 40 CFR section 1505.2 requires an agency to prepare a concise public record of decision at the time of its decision on the action proposed in an environmental impact statement. The Record of Decision shall: (1) state what the decision was; (2) identify all alternatives considered, specifying the alternative considered to be environmentally preferable; and (3) state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted.

In March 1996, NOAA published a programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS) that assessed the environmental impacts associated with the approval of state and territory coastal nonpoint programs. The PEIS forms the basis for the environmental assessments NOAA has prepared for each state and territorial coastal nonpoint program submitted to NOAA and EPA for approval. In the PEIS, NOAA determined that the approval and conditional approval of coastal nonpoint programs will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and that these actions will have an overall beneficial effect on the environment. Because the PEIS served only as a ''framework for decision'' on individual state and territorial coastal nonpoint programs, and no actual decision was made following its publication, NOAA has prepared a EPA Record of Decision on each individual state and territorial program submitted for review.

Copies of the Findings Documents, Responses to Comments, and Records of Decision may be obtained upon request from: Joseph A. Uravitch, Chief, Coastal Programs Division (N/ORM3), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, NOS, NOAA, 1305 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20910, tel. (301) 713–3155, x195.