

explain whether it maintains product-specific cost data such as the "rose plant" cost data already reported in its questionnaire response. Petitioner maintains that, unless the respondent uses bunches produced in its ordinary books and records to allocate costs, the Department should require Pacifico to report its costs based on cultivation area.

Department's Position: We disagree with petitioner that Pacifico's costs should be reallocated on the basis of cultivation area. The Court of International Trade in *Floral Trade* states that "allocation is * * * an inexact science, and is simply a way to estimate the costs incurred by the firm

to manufacture the product, complete the process, or deliver the service," and that "allocation methods vary even among firms in the same industry." *Floral Trade Council v. U.S.*, 822 F.Supp. 766, 772 (CIT 1993). The final review results for Mexican flowers cited by petitioner only indicate that in that instance we found the grower's use of cultivation area to be an acceptable allocation basis for certain costs (61 FR 40604). This does not stand for the proposition that relative area is the correct method of allocating growing costs.

In the instant proceeding, we find no evidence that Pacifico used cultivation area as a basis of allocation in its books

and records, or that flowers produced by Pacifico are field crops. Furthermore, the record does not support petitioner's claim that Pacifico's production cost allocation methodology distorts costs. See *Colombian Flowers* at 7010, where the Department made a similar determination. Therefore, for these final results, we have accepted Pacifico's methodology of allocating costs because Pacifico's allocation is reasonable and there is no evidence that it distorts Pacifico's costs.

Final Results of review

As a result of our review, we have determined that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
Rancho Del Pacifico	4/1/95-3/31/96	0.00

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company shall be the above rate; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate shall 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 review, the cash deposit rate will be 18.20 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation (52 FR 6361, March 3, 1987).

These deposit rates shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a 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.

Notification to Interested Parties

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 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 353.22.

Dated: May 9, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-13058 Filed 5-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-427-912]

Calcium Aluminate Flux from France; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: On March 11, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1995-96 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on calcium aluminate flux from France (CA flux) (62 FR 11150). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Lafarge Aluminates, Inc. (Lafarge), for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. The Department received no written comments or requests for a hearing. Based on our analysis, these final results of review are unchanged from those presented in our preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: (May 19, 1997).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen McPhillips 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,

D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-3019 or 482-3833, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 11, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 11150), the preliminary results of the antidumping duty order on CA flux from France (59 FR 30337). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Final Results of Review

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. The Department received no written comments or requests for a hearing. Based on our analysis, these final results of review remain the same as those presented in the preliminary results of review. Therefore, we determine that the following weighted-average margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
Lafarge Aluminates, Inc	06/01/95-05/31/96	7.30

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and normal value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of CA flux from France within the scope of the order entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate list above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-value (LTFV) 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) for all other producers and/or exporters of this

merchandise, the cash deposit rate of 37.93 percent, the "all others" rate, established in the LTFV investigation, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a 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 to 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 subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification of Interested Parties

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 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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

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

Dated: May 9, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-13057 Filed 5-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-847]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Persulfates From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 19, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Maeder, Barbara Wojcik-Betancourt, or Howard Smith, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution

Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3330, (202) 482-0629, or (202) 482-5193, respectively.

THE APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the 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 Rounds Agreements Act ("URAA").

FINAL DETERMINATION: We determine that persulfates from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States Sales at Less Than Fair Value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 735 of the Act.

Case History

FMC Corporation ("FMC") is the petitioner in this investigation. The respondents in this investigation are, Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation ("AJ"), Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation ("Wuxi") (exporters), Shanghai Ai Jian Reagent Works ("AJ Works") (producer for AJ and Wuxi), Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import & Export Trade Corporation ("Guangdong") (exporter), Guangzhou City Zhujiang Electrochemical Factory ("Zhujiang") (producer for Guangdong), ICC Chemical Corporation ("ICC")¹. Since the preliminary determination in this investigation (*Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Persulfates From the PRC* 61 FR 68232, (December 27, 1996), the following events have occurred:

In December 1996, and January 1997, FMC, AJ Works, AJ and Wuxi alleged that the Department made a ministerial error in its preliminary determination (see Comment 8 below). The Department found that there was an error made in the preliminary determination; however, this error did not result in a change of at least five absolute percentage points in, but no less than 25 percent of, the weighted-average dumping margin calculated in the preliminary determination. Accordingly, no revision to the preliminary determination was made. (see Ministerial Error Memorandum from the Team to Jeffrey P. Bialos dated January 17, 1997).

On March 25, 1997, petitioner submitted the Chinese Communist Party ("CCP") Circular and requested that the

¹ ICC is Guangdong's U.S. customer. ICC submitted responses in this investigation because it claimed that U.S. price ("USP") should be based on its sales to U.S. customers. We have determined that USP should be based on Guangdong's price to ICC (see Comment 25).