foreign market sales to be outside ''the ordinary course of trade.'' This issue was not raised by any party in this proceeding. However, the URAA amended the definition of sales outside the ''ordinary course of trade'' to include sales below cost. See section 771(15) of the Act. Consequently, the Department has reconsidered its practice in accordance with this court decision and has determined that it would be inappropriate to resort directly to CV, in lieu of foreign market sales, as the basis for NV if the Department finds foreign market sales of merchandise identical or most similar to that sold in the United States to be outside the ''ordinary course of trade.'' Instead, the Department will use sales of similar merchandise, if such sales exist. The Department will use CV as the basis for NV only when there are no above-cost sales that are otherwise suitable for comparison. Therefore, in this proceeding, when making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the ''Scope of the Review'' section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the information provided by OBV in response to our antidumping questionnaire. We have implemented the Court's decision in this case to the extent that the data on the record permitted. Since there were sufficient sales above cost, it was unnecessary to calculate CV in this case.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a ''fluctuation.'' There were no significant fluctuations during the POR.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of EP to NV, we preliminarily determine that the weighted-average dumping margin for OBV for this administrative review period is as follows:

BRASS SHEET AND STRIP FROM THE NETHERLANDS

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Outokumpu Copper Strip B.V. (OBV)	0.00

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within ten days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first business 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 the case briefs and comments, may be submitted no later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of the administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in any written comments or at a hearing, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Cash Deposit

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of BSS from the Netherlands entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of the final results of this administrative review, as provided in section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for OBV will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review (no deposit will be required for a zero or *de minimis* margin, *i.e.*, margin lower than 0.5 percent); (2) For merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of the proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate published for the most recent segment; (3) If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be the ''all others'' rate of 16.99 percent established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. See Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less-Than-Fair Value; Brass Sheet and Strip From the Netherlands, 53 FR 30455 (August 12, 1988). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

All U.S. sales by the respondent OBV will be subject to one deposit rate according to the proceeding. The cash deposit rate has been determined on the basis of the selling price to the first unrelated customer in the United States. For appraisement purposes, where information is available, we will use the entered value of the subject merchandise to determine the appraisement rate.

This notice serves as preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties. This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)).

Dated: May 4, 1988.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–12316 Filed 5–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty new shipper review.

SUMMARY: On February 3, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel flanges (SSF) from India (63 FR 5501). This review covers exports of this merchandise to the United States by one manufacturer/exporter, Panchmahal Steel Ltd.

(Panchmahal), during the period February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments. There was no dumping margin for Panchmahal for this review period.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 11, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam or John Kugelman, 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. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2704 or 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

The antidumping duty order on SSF from India was published February 9, 1994 (59 FR 5994). On February 3, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of this new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on SSF from India (63 FR 5501). The Department has now completed this new shipper review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this order are certain forged stainless steel flanges, both finished and not finished, generally manufactured to specification ASTM A–182, and made in alloys such as 304, 304L, 316, and 316L. The scope includes five general types of flanges. They are weld neck, used for butt-weld line connection; threaded, used for threaded line connections; slip-on and lap joint, used with stub-ends/butt-weld line connections; socket weld, used to fit pipe into a machined recession; and blind, used to seal off a line. The sizes of the flanges within the scope range generally from one to six inches; however, all sizes of the above-described merchandise are included in the scope. Specifically excluded from the scope of this order are cast stainless steel flanges. Cast stainless steel flanges generally are manufactured to specification ASTM A–351. The flanges subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7307.21.1000 and 7307.21.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

The review covers one Indian manufacturer/exporter, Panchmahal, and the period February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997.

Comments From Interested Parties

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our analysis, which is unchanged from the preliminary results of review, we have determined that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for Panchmahal:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Panchmahal	2/1/96–1/31/97	0.00

The Department shall instruct the Customs Service to liquidate all appropriate entries, and to assess no antidumping duties on Panchmahal's entries.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act:

(1) The rate for the reviewed firm will be as listed above;

(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 will be that rate established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the earlier review or the original investigation, whichever is the most recent; or

(4) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 162.14 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also 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 the 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 (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22(h).

Dated: May 1, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–12335 Filed 5–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P