meeting is to brief the Committee on Commission and regional programs and approve plans for future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact John Dulles, Director of the Rocky Mountain Regional Office, 303–866–1400 (TDD 303–866–1049). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, December 15, 1997.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 97–33557 Filed 12–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–817]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Brazil: 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 Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Brazil. This review covers the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 24, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Samantha Denenberg 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, N.W., Washington, D.C.; telephone (202) 482–0414 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. LaRussa from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding the extension of the case deadline, dated December 16, 1997.

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

Dated: December 16, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–33605 Filed 12–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan (A–588–028)

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

ACTION: Amended final results of antidumping duty administrative order.

SUMMARY: On November 10, 1997, the Department of Commerce published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. This review covered six manufacturers/exporters of roller chain in Japan during the period April 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996: (1) Daido Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Daido); (2) Enuma Chain Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Enuma); (3) Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Izumi); (4) Hitachi Metals Techno Ltd. (Hitachi); (5) Pulton Chain Co., Ltd. (Pulton); and (6) R.K. Excel Co., Ltd. (RK) (collectively, the respondents).

Interested parties submitted ministerial error allegations with respect to the final results of administrative review for Daido and Enuma on November 17, 1997. Based on the correction of certain ministerial errors made in the final results of review, we are amending our final results of review with respect to Daido and Enuma.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 24, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Trentham or Jack Dulberger, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office Four, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4793 and (202) 482–5505, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has now amended the final results of this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department's regulations are to the regulations set forth at 19 CFR part 353 (1997).

Scope of Review

The merchandise subject to this review is roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. The term ''roller chain, other than bicycle,'' as used in this review, includes chain, with or without attachments, whether or not plated or coated, and whether or not manufactured to American or British standards, which is used for power transmissions and/or conveyance. This chain consists of a series of alternately-assembled roller links and pin links in which the pins articulate inside from the bushings and the rollers are free to turn on the bushings. Pins and bushings are press fit in their respective link plates. Chain may be single strand, having one row of roller links, or multiple strand, having more than one row of roller links. The center plates are located between the strands of roller links. Such chain may be either single or double pitch and may be used as power transmission or conveyor chain. This review also covers leaf chain, which consists of a series of link plates alternately assembled with pins in such a way that the joint is free to articulate between adjoining pitches. This review further covers chain model numbers 25 and 35. Roller chain is currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 7315.11.00 through 7619.90.00. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

Background

On November 10, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice of final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan (Notice of Final Results and Partial Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Roller Chain, Other than Bicycle, from Japan (62 FR

60472, November 10, 1997) (Roller Chain Final FR Notice)).

On November 17, 1997, two of the respondents in the above-referenced review, Enuma and Daido, submitted timely written allegations that the Department made certain ministerial errors in the above-referenced administrative review. Enuma alleged two ministerial errors with respect to the following: (1) unmatched identical models within the 90–60 day rule period and (2) a data input error by respondent in the sales database. Daido alleged five ministerial errors with respect to the following three issues: (1) unmatched identical models within the 90–60 day rule period, (2) unmatched U.S. sales with identical sales in the home market database, and (3) data input errors by respondent in the sales database. Petitioner did not allege the existence of ministerial errors, nor has petitioner commented on respondent's allegations. For a complete discussion of the allegations, see the Department's December 17, 1997, Decision Memorandum Re: Ministerial Error Allegation in the Antidumping Administrative Review on Roller Chain, Other than Bicycle, from Japan (95–96).

As discussed below, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(d), we have determined that certain ministerial errors were made in our margin calculations for Enuma and Daido.

Alleged Ministerial Errors

Enuma

Issue 1: Unmatched U.S. Sales—Computer Searching Error

Enuma states that the Department incorrectly identified three U.S. sales as not having a home market match within the comparison period (*i.e.,* the 90–60 day period). Enuma contends that the printout of its November 15, 1996, sales tape, which the Department used in its final results calculations, shows home market sales of the identical model, during the 90–60 day period for these three sales. Enuma requests that the Department correct this error and to review its program to determine if any other currently designated unmatched U.S. sales have matches and to revise the dumping margins accordingly.

DOC Position: We agree with Enuma and have corrected this ministerial error. After review of Enuma's margin program, we found that we inadvertently failed to include a step in the product matching section of the program. This resulted in a failure to properly identify all home market sales of the identical model during the 90–60 day window period. Correction of the margin program resulted in matching two of the three previously unmatched U.S. sales identified by Enuma in its November 17, 1997, clerical error allegation and an additional unmatched U.S. sale not identified by Enuma. The third U.S. sale identified by Enuma could not be matched to the home market sale identified by Enuma because the home market sale was a sale to an affiliated customer which was determined not to be at arm's length and was subsequently excluded from our analysis. *See Roller Chain Final FR Notice.*

Issue 2: Unmatched U.S. Sales—Computer Input Error

In two instances, Enuma states that it inadvertently assigned slightly different control numbers for the same products on its home market and U.S. sales tapes. In the first instance, Enuma states that an extra digit was mistakenly added to the end of a home market control number. In the other, Enuma states that an extra digit was added to the end of a U.S. control number. As a result, Enuma argues that U.S. sales that should have had identical home market matches went unmatched. Enuma requests that we revise the control numbers for those two models so that the control numbers on both the home market and U.S. sales tapes are identical.

DOC Position: Section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), authorizes the Department to establish procedures for the correction of ministerial errors in final determinations. Section 751(h) provides that the term ''ministerial'' error includes errors in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the administering authority considers ministerial.

The Department's implementing regulations at 19 CFR 353.28 establish which errors the Department considers ministerial. A ''ministerial error'' is defined under 19 CFR 353.28 as: an error in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial.

The Department interprets the authority granted to it by Section 751(h) of the Act as allowing the Department to make post-final results corrections only for its *own* (''ministerial'') errors. *See* Preamble of 19 CFR § 351.224 (emphasis in original). Therefore, the Department does not believe that it may make corrections after final results of administrative review for errors committed by a party to the proceeding. Consequently, we made no revision to Enuma's margin calculation with regard to Enuma's alleged error.

Daido

Issue 1: Unmatched U.S. Sales—Computer Searching Error

Daido states that the Department incorrectly applied the 90–60 day window in its attempt to match U.S. and home market sales of identical or similar merchandise within the contemporaneous time period. Specifically, Daido states that the Department only applied the 90–60 day rule in a forward direction (*i.e.,* 60 days forward), but did not search for home market sales 90 days prior to the date of the U.S. sale. As a result, Daido maintains that numerous sales were designated as unmatched U.S. sales.

DOC Position: We agree with Daido and have corrected this ministerial error. After review of Daido's margin program, we found that we inadvertently failed to include a step in the product matching section of the program. This resulted in a failure to properly search for home market sales 90 days prior to the date of the U.S. sale. Correcting the margin program resulted in matching previously unmatched U.S. sales as identified by Daido in its November 17, 1997, clerical error allegation.

Issue 2: Unmatched U.S. Sales with Identical Sales in the Home Market Database

Daido states that its home market portion of its questionnaire response contained two matching control number fields—one for CEP sales matching purposes and another for EP sales matching purposes. Daido claims that it was necessary to report two control number fields in the database because, depending on the type of transaction (*i.e.,* CEP or EP), there were different codes applied to identical merchandise. Daido states that the Department correctly matched CEP sales against sales with an identical control number in the home market control number field corresponding to CEP sales. However, Daido argues that, the Department failed to match EP sales with an identical control number in the home market control number field corresponding to EP sales. Daido claims that this failure resulted in the Department designating these sales as unmatched.

DOC Position: We agree with Daido and have corrected this ministerial error. After review of Daido's margin

program, we found that we inadvertently failed to include a step in the product matching section of the program. This resulted in a failure to properly search for identical control numbers in both of the home market control number fields for a given U.S. sale. Correcting the margin program resulted in matching previously unmatched U.S. sales as identified by Daido in its November 17, 1997, clerical error allegation.

Issue 3: Unmatched U.S. Sales—Computer Input Error by Respondent

Daido states that, in three instances, it inadvertently assigned slightly different control numbers for the same products on its home market and U.S. sales tapes. Specifically, in the first instance, Daido states that it made home market sales of a model identical to one sold in the United States. However, Daido states that although the digits in the control number are exactly the same in the U.S. and home market sales tapes, it inadvertently coded the home market model with a space in the middle. In the second instance, Daido claims that an extra digit was mistakenly added to the end of a home market control number. In the final instance, Daido maintains that although for one model the control number in the U.S. sales listing differs from the control number in the home market sales listing by one digit (*i.e.*, the use of a ''C'' in the home market and a ''D'' in the United States), the products are identical. As a result of these three errors, certain U.S. sales went unmatched. Daido requests that we revise the matching control numbers in the three instances listed above so that the control numbers on both the home market and U.S. sales tapes are identical.

DOC Position: The Department does not believe that it may make corrections after final results of administrative review for errors committed by a party to the proceeding. (*See* Enuma issue number 2). Consequently, we made no revision to Daido's margin calculation with regard to these alleged errors.

Amended Final Results

As a result of our correction of the ministerial errors, we have determined the following amended margins exist for Enuma and Daido for the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percentage*
Daido	3.09
Enuma	1.55

*Amended Weighted-Average Margin

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions concerning the respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these amended final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for each reviewed company named above will be the rate as stated above; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed 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, or the original 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 15.92 percent, the All Others rate based on the first review conducted by the Department in which a ''new shipper'' rate was established in the final results of antidumping administrative review (48 FR 51801, November 14, 1983).

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

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification 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 the APO is a sanctionable violation.

These amended final results of 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 353.28(c).

Dated: December 17, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–33606 Filed 12–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness).

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) announces the following proposed reinstatement of a public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by 13 February 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Department of the Army, Hq DAO ODCSPER (DAPE–PRO) ATTN: Mr. Robbie Robinson, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–0300.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the above address or call at (703) 614–4766.

Title, Associated Form, and OMB Control Number: Repatriation Processing Center Processing Sheet, DD Form 2585, OMB Number 0704–0334.

Needs and Uses: This information collection is necessary for personnel accountability of all evacuees,