price was for the appropriate type of container used, whereas the *Indian Import Statistics* were aggregated over various types of containers. We made further adjustments to account for freight costs incurred between the PRC supplier and manganese metal producers.

- To value electricity, we used the average rate applicable to large industrial users throughout India as reported in the *1995 Confederation of Indian Industries Handbook of Statistics.* We adjusted the March 1, 1995 value to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value rail freight, we relied upon rates quoted by a manganese mine in India. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation up to the POR using WPI published by the IMF.
- To value truck freight, we used a rate derived from a newspaper article in the April 20, 1994 issue of The Times of India. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation up to the POR using WPI published by the IMF.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of the EP to NV, we preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period June 14, 1995, through January 31, 1997:

Manufacturer exporter	Margin (percent)
HIED	11.00
CMIECHN/CNIECHN	6.43
Minmetals	5.88
CEIEC	11.77
Country-Wide Rate	143.32

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 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 44 days after the publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written comments (case briefs) within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal comments (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 final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between EP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. We have calculated an importer-specific duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of AD duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total value of subject merchandise entered during the POR. In order to estimate the entered value, we subtracted international movement expenses (*e.g.*, international freight and marine insurance) from the gross sales value. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for the PRC companies that have separate rates and were reviewed (HIED and CMIECN/CNIECN), the cash deposit rates will be the rates for these firms established in the final results of this review; (2) for Minmetals and CEIEC, which we determined to be entitled to a separate rate in the LTFV investigation but which did not have shipments to the United States during the POR, the rates will continue to be 5.88 percent and 11.77 percent, respectively, the rates which currently apply to these companies; and (3) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be 143.32 percent. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 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: October 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–29494 Filed 11–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–501]

Natural Bristle Paintbrushes and Brush Heads From The People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review of natural bristle paintbrushes and brush heads from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paintbrushes and brush heads (paintbrushes) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in response to a request by petitioner, the Paint Applicator Division of the American Brush Manufacturers Association (the Paint Applicator Division). This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period of February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between export price and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Scheier, Elisabeth Urfer, or Maureen Flannery, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4733.

Applicable Statute

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 353, as of April 1, 1996.

Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on paintbrushes from the PRC on February 16, 1986 (51 FR 5580). On February 3, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 4978) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping order on paint brushes from the PRC covering the period February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997.

On January 29, 1997, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.2(k)(1), Brenner Associates, a U.S. importer of the subject merchandise, requested that we conduct an administrative review of Hebei Animal By-Products I/E Corporation (Hebei). On February 24, 1997, the Hunan Provincial Native Produce & Animal By-Products I/E Corporation (Hunan) submitted a request for a review. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on March 18, 1997 (62 FR 12793). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the PRC. Excluded from the order are paint brushes and brush heads with a blend of 40% natural bristles and 60% synthetic filaments. The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under item 9603.40.40.40 of the Harmonized tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

This review covers the period February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by Hunan and its supplier by using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and the selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report.

Facts Available

We premliinarily determine that, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, the use of facts available is appropriate for Hebei because this firm did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. Hebei had requested and was granted an extension to file its questionnaire response with the Department. Hebei requested a second extension after the response was due, and was denied its request. (*See* letter from Edward Yang to Perry Gartner, June 10, 1997.) Because necessary information is not available on the record with regard to sales by Hebei, the use of facts available is warranted.

Where a respondent has failed to cooperate to the best of its ability, Section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use facts available that are adverse to the interests of that respondent, which include information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. As facts available, we are using the rate calculated the Hebei in the review covering the period from February 1, 1994, through January 31, 1995 (1994–1995 review), 351.92 percent.

Because information from prior proceedings constitutes secondary information, section 776(b) provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administration Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value.

To corroborate secondary information, the Department examines, to the extent practicable, the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as surrogate values, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for calculated margins is administrative determinations. 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; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 60 FR 49567 (September 26, 1995), where the Department disregarded the highest margin as best information available because that margin was based on an uncharacteristic business expense, which resulted in the high margin.) In this case, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 351.92 percent, which was the rate calculated for Hebei in the 1994–1995 review. There is no information that indicates that this rate is not appropriate. Because Hebei is a part of the PRC entity, this rate becomes the PRC rate (*see Separate Rates* below).

Separate Rates

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this policy, exporters in non-market economies (NMEs) are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: (1) Whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of

a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and (4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management.

With respect to the absence of *de jure* government control over export activities, evidence on the record indicates that Hunan is a collectively-owned enterprise. The ''law of the People's Republic of China on Industrial Enterprises Owned by the Whole People'' identify rules and regulations pertaining to collectively-owned enterprises which give rural collective enterprise such rights as the right to act on their own behalf, adopt independent accounting, assume the sole responsibility for their profits and losses, and elect their own management. (*See* Exhibit 3 of Hunan's May 21, 1997, questionnaire response.) Additionally, paintbrushes do not appear on the ''Temporary Provisions for Administration of Export Commodities,'' approved on December 21, 1992, and are not, therefore, subject to the constraints of this provision. (*See* Questionnaire Response of May 21, 1997, at A–6 and *Memorandum to the File* dated October 10, 1997, ''Natural Bristle Paintbrushes and Brush Heads: Laws and Regulations Governing Exports from the PRC''.) At verification we confirmed that paintbrushes are not subject to export controls. *See* public version of *Verification Repot of Sales for Hunan Provincial Native Produce & Animal By-Products Corp.* dated September 25, 1997.

With respect to the absence of *de facto* control over export activities, Hunan's management is elected by Hunan's staff, and is responsible for all decisions such as the determination of its export prices, profit distribution to employee distributions, employee welfare funds and investments, employment policy, marketing strategy, and for negotiating contracts. At verification we found that the department heads negotiated sales of paint brushes, that Hunan planned to distribute unallocated profit, and that employees could be fired or reassigned, and salaries could be reduced. *See Separate Rate for Hunan Provincial Native Produce and Animal By-Products Im/Ex Corp. in the 1996–1997 Administrative Review of Paintbrushes and Brush Heads from the People's Republic of China* dated October 31, 1997, (*Separate Rates Memorandum)* and public version of *Verificaiton Report* dated September 25, 1997, which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Because evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, over Hunan's export activities, the Department preliminarily grants Hunan a separate rate. For further discussion of the Department's preliminary determination that Hunan is entitled to a separate rate, *see Separate Rates Memorandum*.

In the administrative review covering the period from February 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995 (1994–95 review), we determined that Hebei merited a separate rate. However, because Hebei did not respond to the questionnaire in the present (1996–97) review, it will not be considered for a separate rate in this review.

United States Price

For sales made by Hunan, we based United States Price on export price, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unrelated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States.

We calculated export price based on the price to unrelated purchasers. We deducted an amount for foreign inland freight, insurance, and brokerage and handling. We selected Indonesia for all surrogate values with the exception of inland insurance, for the reasons explained in the ''Normal Value'' section of this notice.

Normal Value

For companies located in NME countries, section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine NV using a factors-of-production methodology if (1) the merchandise is exported from an NME country, and (2) available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as an NME country. Pursuant to section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Accordingly, we have applied surrogate values to the factors of production to determine NV.

We calculated NV based on factors of production in accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act and section 353.52(c) of our regulations. We determined that Indonesia (1) is comparable to the PRC in terms of level of economic development, and (2) is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. *See Memorandum to the File* dated October 24, 1997, ''Natural Bristle Paint Brushes from the People's Republic of China—Significant Production in Indonesia of Comparable Merchandise.'' Therefore, for this review, we used publicly available information relating to Indonesia to value the various factors of production.

Additionally, we used publicly available information relating to India to value inland insurance, where Indonesian surrogate values for insurance were not available. *See Memorandum to the File from Eric Scheier,* dated October 24, 1997, ''Factor Values Used for the Final Results of the 1996–1997 Administrative Review of Natural Bristle Paintbrushes and Brush Heads from the People's Republic of China.''

We valued the factors of production as follows:

- For brush handles, bristles, epoxy, wood, and packing materials, we used a per kilogram value obtained from the *Foreign Trade Statistical Bulletin* (*Indonesian Import Statistics*). Adjustments for inflation with respect to these four factors of production and with respect to packing materials were not necessary, as statistics were available for the entire POR. For transportation distances used for the calculation of freight expenses on raw materials, we added to surrogate values from Indonesia a surrogate freight cost using the shorter of (a) the distances between the closest PRC port and the factory, or (b) the distance between the domestic supplier and the factory. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Collated Roofing Nails From the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 51410 (October 1, 1997) (*Roofing Nails*).
- It is the Department's current policy to value an input purchased from a market economy in a market-economy currency by using the actual price paid for that input. Because the purchase of ferrule was made from a market-economy supplier and paid for in a market-economy currency, we have used the actual price paid by Hunan for ferrule to value ferrule inputs.
- We do not have information on Indonesian insurance rates, nor do we have information on inland insurance rates from any of our five possible surrogate countries. We have therefore

used the most recent figure available for Indian marine insurance, in place of inland insurance, as we did in *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 41347 (August 1, 1997). We adjusted this rate to reflect inflation through the end of the period of review (POR) using the Indian Wholesale Price Index (WPI) inflator derived from wholesale price indices published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

• For brokerage and handling, we used the publicly available information from a United States shipper that was used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Saccharin from People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 58818 (November 15, 1994). This value was adjusted to reflect inflation through the end of the POR using the Indonesian WPI published by the IMF.

• For unskilled, skilled and indirect labor, as well as for packing labor, we used the labor rates reported in the 1995 *Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia.* This source provides weekly labor rates and hours worked per week for unskilled labor only. Indonesian skilled labor rates were unavailable. We used this source to value unskilled, skilled and indirect labor. We used unskilled labor rates to value skilled labor in the 1994–1995 administrative review of this case. We adjusted these rates to reflect inflation through the end of the POR using Indonesian WPI published by the IMF.

• For factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit, we used data provided by the respondent, from the *Large and Medium Manufacturing Statistics: 1995, Vol. II,* published by the Indonesian Bureau of Statistics. (*See* Hunan's submission dated July 28, 1997.) This source provides a cost breakdown for large and medium sized manufacturers of hand tools and cutlery, and was used in *Roofing Nails.* Petitioner did not contest the use of this data, but argued that we should add certain categories to our calculations, such as ''New and Second-Hand Purchases,'' and ''Construction Undertaken by the Establishment and by Others,'' and that we replace ''Value of Gross Output'' with ''Total Value of Gross Output.'' We made the petitioner's suggested adjustments because each of these items represent part of the costs incurred to produce the subject merchandise. We also subtracted ''Sale of Used Items'' from SG&A and ''Increase in Stock of Semifinished Goods'' from ''Total Value of Gross Output.'' We calculated factory overhead as a percentage of the total cost of manufacture. We calculated an SG&A rate by dividing SG&A expenses by the cost of manufacture. Lastly, we calculated a profit rate by dividing profit by the cost of production.

• To value electricity, we used a value found in *A Brief Guide for Investors: 1995,* published by the Indonesian Government's Investment Coordinating Board. We adjusted this value to reflect inflation through the end of the POR using Indonesian WPI published by the IMF. We then converted that figure to dollars using the exchange rate on the date of sale certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

• To value truck and rail freight, we used the rates reported in a September 1991 cable from the U.S. Consulate in Indonesia submitted for the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China,* 58 FR 47859 (September 20, 1993). More recent information was not available in this review. We adjusted the rates to reflect inflation through the end of the POR using Indonesian WPI published by the IMF.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions pursuant to section 353.60 of the Department's regulations at the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Hunan Provincial Native Produce & Animal By-Products I/E Corp	02/01/96–01/31/97	0.01
PRC rate	02/01/96–01/31/97	351.92

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c)(6). Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b). 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 in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(c). 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 publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

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

Furthermore, the following deposit rate will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of paintbrushes from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For Hunan, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be zero, because the company-specific rate established in the final results of this administrative review is, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.6, de minimis, i.e., less than 0.5 percent; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the rate will be the PRC country-wide rate; and (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 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: October 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–29497 Filed 11–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of process to revoke export trade certificate of review No. 92–00005.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to World International Investments Corp. Because this certificate holder has failed to file an annual report as required by law, the Department is initiating proceedings to revoke the certificate. This notice summarizes the notification letter sent World International Investments Corp.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (''the Act'') (15 U.S.C. 4011–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue export trade certificates of review. The regulations implementing Title III (''the Regulations'') are found at 15 CFR part 325. Pursuant to this authority, a certificate of review was issued on June 5, 1992 to World International Investments Corp.

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

The Department of Commerce sent to World International Investments Corp. on May 23, 1997, a letter containing annual report questions with a reminder that its annual report was due on July 20, 1997. Additional reminders were sent on August 7, 1997, and on September 12, 1997. The Department has received no written response to any of these letters.

On November 3, 1997, and in accordance with Section 325.10(c)(1) of the Regulations, a letter was sent by certified mail to notify World International Investments Corp. that the Department was formally initiating the process to revoke its certificate. The letter stated that this action is being taken because of the certificate holder's failure to file an annual report.

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

If the certificate holder decides to respond, it must specifically address the Department's statement in the notification letter that it has failed to file an annual report. It should state in detail why the facts, conduct, or circumstances described in the notification letter are not true, or if they are, why they do not warrant revoking the certificate. If the certificate holder does not respond within the specified period, it will be considered an admission of the statements contained in the notification letter (Section 325.10(c)(2) of the Regulations).

If the answer demonstrates that the material facts are in dispute, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice shall, upon request, meet informally with the certificate holder. Either Department may require the certificate holder to provide the documents or information that are necessary to support its contentions (Section 325.10(c)(3) of the Regulations).

The Department shall publish a notice in the **Federal Register** of the revocation or modification or a decision not to revoke or modify (Section 325.10(c)(4) of the Regulations). If there is a determination to revoke a certificate, any person aggrieved by such final decision may appeal to an appropriate U.S. district court within 30 days from the date on which the Department's final determination is published in the **Federal Register** (Sections 325.10(c)(4) and 325.11 of the Regulations).

Dated: November 3, 1997.

Morton Schnabel,

Acting Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–29433 Filed 11–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of issuance of an export trade certificate of review, application No. 97–00002.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce has issued an Export Trade Certificate of Review to Goff-Chem, Inc. This notice summarizes the conduct for which certification has been granted.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of l982 (15 U.S.C. 4001–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. The regulations implementing Title III are found at 15 CFR Part 325 (1997).

The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs (''OETCA'') is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Department of Commerce to publish a summary of a Certificate in the **Federal Register**. Under Section 305(a) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

Description of Certified Conduct

Export Trade

1. *Products*

All products.

2. *Services*

All services.

3. *Technology Rights*

Technology Rights, including, but not limited to, patents, trademarks, copyrights and trade secrets that relate to Products and Services.