2590–01–398–6736
2590–01–398–6737
2590–01–398–6738
2590–01–398–6739
2590–01–398–6740
2590–01–398–6741
2590–01–398–6742
2590–01–398–6743
2590–01–398–6744
2590–01–398–6745
2590–01–398–6746
2590–01–398–6747
2590–01–398–6748
2590–01–398–6749
2590–01–398–7187
2590–01–398–7188
2590–01–398–7189
2590–01–398–7190
2590–01–398–7191
2590–01–398–7192
2590–01–398–7193
2590–01–398–7194
2590–01–398–7195
2590–01–398–7196
2590–01–398–7197
2590–01–398–7198
2590–01–398–8072
2590–01–398–8073
2590–01–398–8074
2590–01–398–8075
2590–01–398–8076
2590–01–398–8077
2590–01–398–8078
2590–01–398–8079
2590–01–398–8080
2590–01–398–8081
2590–01–398–8082
2590–01–398–8083
2590–01–398–8084
2590–01–398–8085
2590–01–398–8086
2590–01–398–8087
2590–01–398–8088
2590–01–398–8089
2590–01–398–8090
2590–01–399–1362
2590–01–399–1363
2590–01–399–1364
2590–01–399–1365
2590–01–399–1935
2590–01–399–2932
2590–01–399–2933
2590–01–399–2934
2590–01–399–2936
2590–01–399–2937
2590–01–399–3840
2590–01–399–5100
2590–01–399–5863
2590–01–399–5864
2590–01–399–5865
2590–01–399–5866
2590–01–399–5867
2590–01–399–6773
2590–01–399–6774
2590–01–399–7502
2590–01–400–0372
2590–01–400–1809
2590–01–400–1810
2590–01–406–0481
2590–01–411–2566
2590–01–411–3170
2590–01–411–3171
2590–01–411–3172
2590–01–411–3174
2590–01–411–4393
2590–01–420–2875
2590–01–420–2877
2590–01–420–2878
2590–01–420–5984
2590–01–421–7060
2590–01–421–7067
NPA: Crossroads Rehabilitation Systems, Inc. Indianapolis, Indiana

Services

Food Service Attendant
Enlisted Dining Facility and Summer Camp
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York
NPA: Orange County Rehabilitation Center—Occupations, Inc. Middletown, New York

Grounds Maintenance
Florida Caribbean Science Center 7920 NW 71st Street
Gainesville, Florida
NPA: Association for Retarded Citizens of Alachua County, Inc. Gainesville, Florida

Janitorial/Custodial
Florida Caribbean Science Center 7920 NW 71st Street
Gainesville, Florida
NPA: Association for Retarded Citizens of Alachua County, Inc. Gainesville, Florida

Janitorial/Custodial
Postwide
Fort Stewart, Georgia
NPA: Goodwill Industries of the Coastal Empire, Inc. Savannah, Georgia

Operation of Postal Service Center
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia
NPA: Virginia Industries for the Blind Richmond, Virginia

Operation of Postal Service Center and Base Information Transfer Services
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas
NPA: Goodwill Industries of San Antonio San Antonio, Texas

Deletions

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities.

2. The action does not appear to have a severe economic impact on future contractors for the commodities and services.

3. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

4. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the commodities and services proposed for deletion from the Procurement List.

The following commodities and services have been proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

Commodities

Mophead, Wet

7920–00–926–5499
7920–00–926–5501
7920–00–926–5502
7920–00–926–5498

Bag, Evidence

8105–00–NIB–0004
8105–00–NIB–0005
8105–00–NIB–0002
8105–00–NIB–0001
8105–00–NIB–0003

Services

Administrative Services
Social Security Administration
Great Lakes Program Service Center
600 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois

Janitorial/Custodial
Federal Archives and Record Center
Building 12 and 22
Military Ocean Terminal
Bayonne, New Jersey

Janitorial/Custodial
U.S. Army Reserve Center
400 Horsham Road
Horsham, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial
U.S. Army Reserve Center
Division & Woodlawn Avenue
Willow Grove, Pennsylvania

Janitorial/Custodial
Federal Building
100 Bluestone Road
Mount Hope, West Virginia

Louis R. Bartalot,

Deputy Director (Operations).

[FR Doc. 98–23956 Filed 9–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–421–804]

Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Netherlands: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from the petitioners and respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on cold-rolled carbon steel flat products from the Netherlands. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that respondent has made sales below normal value during the period of review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen M. Kramer or Linda Ludwig, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0405 or 482–3833, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce published an antidumping duty order on cold-rolled carbon steel flat products from the Netherlands on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44172). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity To Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1996/1997 review period on August 4, 1997 (62 FR 41925). On August 29, 1997, both the respondent, Hoogovens Staal BV, and petitioners (Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Company (a Unit of USX Corporation), Inland Steel Industries, Inc., Geneva Steel, Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, and Lukens Steel Company) filed requests for review. We published a notice of initiation of the review on September 25, 1997 (62 FR 50292).

Due to the complexity of issues involved in this case, the Department extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until August 31, 1998, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)). The deadline for the final results of this review will continue to be 120 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review include cold-rolled (cold-reduced) carbon steel flat-rolled products, of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7209.15.0000, 7209.16.0030, 7209.16.0060, 7209.16.0090, 7209.17.0030, 7209.17.0060, 7209.17.0090, 7209.18.1530, 7209.18.1560, 7209.18.2550, 7209.18.6000, 7209.25.0000, 7209.26.0000, 7209.27.0000, 7209.28.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.23.1500, 7211.23.2000, 7211.23.3000, 7211.23.4500, 7211.23.6030, 7211.23.6060, 7211.23.6085, 7211.29.2030, 7211.29.2090, 7211.29.4500, 7211.29.6030, 7211.29.6080, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7215.50.0015, 7215.50.0060, 7215.50.0090, 7215.90.5000, 7217.10.1000, 7217.10.2000, 7217.10.3000, 7217.10.7000, 7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030, 7217.90.5060, and 7217.90.5090. Included in this review are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this review is certain shadow mask steel, *i.e.*, aluminum-killed, cold-rolled steel coil that is open-coil annealed, has a carbon content of less than 0.002 percent, is of 0.003 to 0.012 inch in thickness, 15 to 30 inches in width, and has an ultra flat, isotropic surface. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(3) of the Act, we verified information provided by Hoogovens at its headquarters in Beverwijk and IJmuiden, the Netherlands, using standard verification procedures, including inspection of the manufacturing facilities, examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. We also verified information provided by Hoogovens Steel USA, Inc. at its office in Scarsdale, New York.

Export Price (EP)

In calculating the U.S. starting price, the Department considered whether respondent's sales reported as export price (EP) sales are more appropriately characterized as CEP sales, as argued by petitioners in their letter to the Department dated July 10, 1998. Respondent offered a rebuttal to petitioners' argument in a letter dated August 6, 1998.

In previous reviews the Department accepted the characterization of these sales as reported. Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Netherlands; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 61 FR 48465 (September 13, 1996); 62 FR 18476 (April 15, 1997); 63 FR 13204 (March 18, 1998).

To ensure proper application of the statutory definitions of EP and CEP, where a U.S. affiliate is involved in making a sale, we consider the sale to be CEP unless the record demonstrates that the U.S. affiliate's involvement in making the sale is incidental or ancillary. Thus, whenever sales are made prior to importation through an affiliated sales agent in the United States, the Department typically determines whether to characterize the sales as EP sales based upon the following criteria: (1) whether the merchandise was shipped directly to the unaffiliated buyer, without being introduced into the affiliated selling agent's inventory; (2) whether this

procedure is the customary sales channel between the parties; and (3) whether the affiliated selling agent located in the United States acts only as a processor of documentation and a communications link between the foreign producer and the unaffiliated buyer. See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Newspaper Printing Presses From Germany, 61 FR 38175 (July 23, 1996); Certain Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 61 FR 18547, 18551 (April 26, 1996); Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Germany: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 18390 (April 15, 1997); Certain Cold-Rolled and Corrosion Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 63 FR 13170, 13177 (March 18, 1998).

The Department found that the sales through Hoogovens Steel USA, Inc. (HSUSA) satisfy these criteria. The subject merchandise is shipped directly from Hoogovens' mill to customers in the United States. HSUSA does not take title to the merchandise and does not maintain inventories of subject merchandise. This procedure is the customary sales channel between the parties, and the Department found no exceptions to this rule. The analysis of the third criterion is more complex. In this case the producer sells directly to the U.S. customer. The affiliate does not issue invoices, conduct customer credit checks, or finance sales, and rarely handles receipt of payment for Hoogovens' sales. Rather, Hoogovens creates and maintains most of the documentation for U.S. sales in the Netherlands. With respect to negotiations and price setting, the record is less clear. On the one hand, Hoogovens has stated that HSUSA negotiates prices with U.S. customers, subject to Hoogovens' approval. On the other hand, HSUSA does not have the authority to set prices or quantities. Under the terms of the agency agreement between Hoogovens and HSUSA, HSUSA is responsible for conducting market research, finding new customers, and soliciting orders. However, the agency agreement provides that in performance of these activities on behalf of Hoogovens, HSUSA has no authority to conclude contracts on Hoogovens' behalf. HSUSA cannot negotiate above the prices set by Hoogovens and its compensation does not depend on the price, quantity or profitability of sales. The record shows that Hoogovens is directly and continuously involved in negotiations and other communications with unaffiliated customers, and is solely responsible for providing technical service. See Verification at Hoogovens Steel USA, Inc., July 15, 1998, page 3 and Verification Exhibits 4 and 6. HSUSA serves as a communications link in relaying price quotes and other information, as well as quality complaints, between Hoogovens and customers. HSUSA regularly visits U.S. customers, both alone and in the company of Hoogovens officials from the Netherlands, and participates in meetings with U.S. customers that take place in the Netherlands. Based upon the information on the record, the Department preliminarily concludes that HSUSA's role is ancillary to the sales made in the Netherlands.

We note that this is a very complex and difficult issue. While we have preliminarily determined to treat the transactions through HSUSA as EP sales, we note that certain record evidence could be argued to support treating these transactions as CEP sales. The Department invites parties to submit information and comment on this issue. Any such information or argument should be included in parties' case and rebuttal briefs. We intend to examine this issue carefully for the final results of this review. Any information or arguments parties provide will be fully analyzed in making this final decision. Parties are encouraged to provide any relevant information and arguments on this issue to ensure that the Department's final determination as to whether Hoogovens' sales to unaffiliated customers should be treated as EP or CEP is based on a complete and thorough record.

We calculated EP based on the delivered, duty-paid price to unaffiliated customers in the United States. We made adjustments for discounts and post-sale price adjustments. We made deductions, where applicable, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight and marine insurance, brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight, post-sale warehousing, and U.S. customs duties in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. For EP sales, we rejected the reported imputed credit expenses based on the weighted average interest rate on short term dollar-denominated loans taken out in the Netherlands. We recalculated these U.S. credit expenses using the weighted average interest rate on HSUSA's short term borrowings in the United States during the POR.

Constructed Export Price (CEP)

We based CEP on the delivered price to unaffiliated customers in the United States. We made deductions for foreign inland freight, ocean freight and marine insurance, brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. customs duties. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including credit expenses, indirect selling expenses, and inventory carrying costs. In accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, for sales made through the affiliated Rafferty-Brown companies, we also deducted the cost of further manufacturing, including repacking expenses. Finally, we made an adjustment for an amount of profit allocated to these expenses in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

In the absence of cost of production (COP) data for certain home market sales,[1] we estimated COP for calculation of the CEP profit allocation and the home market profit rate for CV as follows:

1. We estimated the home market fixed costs by calculating the weighted average ratio of fixed costs to variable costs for U.S. sales (using the reported VCOMU and TCOMU variables) and multiplying the reported home market variable costs (VCOMH) by this ratio.
2. We obtained the total cost of manufacturing (COM) by adding the reported total variable costs and the estimated fixed costs.
3. We obtained general and administrative expenses and interest expenses from the constructed value (CV) data base and added them to the total COM to obtain COP.

Normal Value (NV)

In order to determine whether sales of the foreign like product in the home market are a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of subject merchandise sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Hoogovens' aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its respective aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales.

[1] Hoogovens reported CV data, which provide the cost of manufacturing the products sold in the United States. As the product mix is very different in the home market, the CV data are not representative of total costs.

Hoogovens made sales to both affiliated and unaffiliated customers in the home market during the period of review. We included sales to affiliated customers when we determined those sales to be at arms length (*i.e.*, at weighted average prices that were 99.5 percent or more of weighted average prices for identical products sold to unaffiliated customers in the home market). When the weighted average price to an affiliated customer was less than 99.5 percent of the weighted average price to unaffiliated customers, or there were no sales of identical merchandise to unaffiliated customers, we excluded sales to that affiliated customer from our calculation of NV. See e.g., Rules and Regulations, Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties 62 FR 27296, 27355 (May 19, 1997): ''The Department's current policy is to consider transactions between affiliated parties as 'arm's length' if the prices to affiliated purchasers are on average at least 99.5 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated purchasers.''

Home market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to customers. We made deductions to NV for inland freight, early payment discounts, rebates, credit expenses, and packing. We made deductions or additions, as appropriate, for post-sale price adjustments. Where CV was used as the basis of NV, we deducted direct selling expenses (comprised of credit and warranty/technical service expenses).

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (''LOT'') as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. In this case, the exporter sells directly to unaffiliated customers. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. We determine any effect on price comparability by examining sales at different levels of trade in the home market (or the third country market) used to calculate NV. Any price effect must be manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between home market (or third-country) sales used for comparison and sales at the equivalent LOT of the export transaction. To quantify the price differences, we calculate the difference in the weighted average of the net prices of the same models sold at different levels of trade in the home market. Net prices are used because any difference will be due to differences in LOT rather than other factors. We use the average percentage difference between these weighted averages to adjust NV when the LOT of NV is different from that of the export sale. If there is no pattern of price differences, then the difference in LOT does not have a price effect and no adjustment is necessary.

In the case of CEP sales, Section 773 (b)(7)(B) of the statute also provides for an adjustment to NV if it is compared to U.S. sales at a different LOT, provided the NV is more remote from the factory than the CEP sales and we are unable to determine whether the difference in levels of trade between CEP and NV affects the comparability of their prices. This latter situation might occur when there is no home market (or third-country) LOT equivalent to the U.S. sales level, or where there is an equivalent home market (or third-country) level, but the data are insufficient to support a conclusion on price effect. This adjustment, the CEP offset, is the lower of the (1) indirect selling expenses of the home market (or third-country) sale; or (2) indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price used to calculate CEP. The CEP offset is not automatic each time we use CEP. The CEP offset is made only when the LOT of the home market (or third country) sale is more advanced than the LOT of the U.S. CEP sale and there is not an appropriate basis for determining whether there is an effect on price comparability.

To examine LOT in this review, we requested detailed information concerning the selling functions associated with sales to service centers and to several categories of end-users in each of Hoogovens' markets and interviewed sales, technical service and research managers. The information gathered indicated that there are no significant differences among the selling functions performed and services offered to service centers and end-user customers in either the home or U.S. markets. In both markets, the larger customers received more frequent visits from sales personnel. In the home market, a higher level of service was provided to automotive customers than to other end-users, but the sales were at the same stage of marketing as all other home market sales. Hoogovens stated it cannot differentiate among the selling functions performed and services offered to different classes of home market or export price customers. However, Hoogovens claimed it has no home market sales at a LOT equivalent to the CEP LOT, alleging:

> While the CEP sale has been adjusted to create, in effect, an ex-factory level of trade, the starting price of the home market sales reflects many selling activities not reflected in the adjusted CEP price. These include indirect selling activities, indirect warranty and technical service expenses, and inventory carrying costs incurred on home market sales.

Section A response (October 6, 1997), p. 13.

We disagree with Hoogovens' claim that the prices used to determine NV reflect many selling activities not reflected in CEP. In calculating CEP, the Department deducted the imputed credit expenses incurred by the Rafferty-Brown companies as direct selling expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1), the Department deducted indirect selling expenses (ISE), including imputed inventory carrying costs (ICC) incurred in the United States by the Rafferty-Brown companies for sales to the first unaffiliated buyers. The Department did not deduct ISE incurred in the Netherlands (reported in computer data fields DINDIRSU and DINVCARU), nor expenses of the U.S. sales office from the adjusted CEP, on the grounds that these are expenses associated with the sale to Hoogovens U.S. affiliates, rather than with the sales by the affiliates to the first unaffiliated buyers. Thus, the CEP includes Hoogovens' warranty and technical service expenses for U.S. sales, as well as ISE, including the expenses of the sales offices in IJmuiden and New York incurred in connection with the sales to the affiliated service centers.

Hoogovens' starting price for home market sales includes direct warranty and technical service expenses, ICC, the expenses of the sales office in IJmuiden, and other indirect selling expenses incurred for home market sales. Thus, for the purposes of the LOT analysis, there is no distinguishable difference between the selling functions included

in the home market starting price and the selling functions included in the CEP. On the basis of this analysis, the Department has determined that there is no basis for Hoogovens' claim that home market sales are at a different, more advanced LOT than the adjusted CEP sales. The Department therefore has determined for these preliminary results that Hoogovens' sales are made at one LOT in both markets.

We note that this is a very complex and difficult issue. While we have preliminarily determined to treat all home market and U.S. sales as at the same LOT, we note that this is a change from the prior review period. The Department invites parties to submit information and comment on this issue. Any such information or argument should be included in parties' case and rebuttal briefs. We intend to examine this issue carefully for the final results of this review. Any information or arguments parties provide will be fully analyzed in making this final decision. Parties are encouraged to provide any relevant information and arguments on this issue to ensure that the Department's final determination as to whether all of Hoogovens' home market and U.S. sales are at the same LOT is based on a complete and thorough record.

Sales Comparisons

To determine whether sales of cold-rolled carbon steel flat products in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared EP or CEP to NV, as described in the ''Export Price,'' ''Constructed Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777(A) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions. When there were no contemporaneous home market sales of the foreign like product, we used CV as the basis for normal value, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act. All the sales to which CV was applied were CEP sales of secondary merchandise. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act and the methodology enunciated in the Memorandum of April 19, 1995, entitled ''Treatment of Non-Prime Merchandise for the First Administrative Review of Certain Carbon Steel Flat Products.'' We included the cost of manufacture, and selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A). In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the home market. For selling expenses, we used the weighted average home market selling expenses. We calculated profit by subtracting the weighted average total cost of production (estimated as described above) from the total weighted average sales revenue. We adjusted CV for credit and warranty expenses.

Reimbursement

Section 351.402(f) of the antidumping regulations requires the Department to deduct from EP or CEP the amount of any antidumping duty that is reimbursed to the importer. Based on verified evidence on the record in this review, including the revised agency agreement between Hoogovens and Hoogovens Steel USA, Inc. (HSUSA) and the refund to Hoogovens by HSUSA of a portion of the cash deposits advanced equal to the Department's calculation of the antidumping duties to be assessed in the third administrative review, the Department has preliminarily determined that HSUSA is solely responsible for the payment of antidumping duties. Further, evidence on the record in this review shows that as a result of corporate restructuring, HSUSA has sufficient assets to establish its ability to pay the antidumping duties to be assessed. Therefore, for this period of review, we have determined that Hoogovens has not reimbursed HSUSA for antidumping duties to be assessed.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997:

Company	Margin (percent)
Hoogovens Staal BV	0.95

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish 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 a hearing, within 120 days after the publication of this notice.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For assessment purposes, the duty assessment rate will be a specific amount per metric ton. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of cold-rolled carbon steel flat products from the Netherlands 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 firm will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent, and therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106, in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of this review; and (3) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original fair value investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 19.32 percent.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during these review periods. 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 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 31, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–23930 Filed 9–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P