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. We have calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates for lug nuts by dividing the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of the importer's/customer's entries during the review period.

Furthermore, the following deposit rate will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For Rudong, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be 5.44 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 351.402(f) 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 determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–15471 Filed 6–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–809]

Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea; Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Clarification of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review and clarification of final results of antidumping duty changed circumstances review.

SUMMARY: In response to timely withdrawals of request for review by Hyundai Pipe Co. Ltd., Korea Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., SeAH Steel Corporation and Shinho Steel Co., Ltd., the Department of Commerce is rescinding the 1996/1997 antidumping duty administrative review of circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from the Republic of Korea. Also, we are clarifying the cash deposit rate for SeAH Steel Corporation which was incorrectly stated in the final results of antidumping duty changed circumstances review published April 27, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 10, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marian Wells or Cynthia Thirumalai, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–6309 and 482–4087 respectively.

The 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 made 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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations refer to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 published in 62 FR 27295 (May 19, 1997).

Scope of Review

The merchandise subject to this review is circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube, of circular cross-section, not more than 406.4mm (16 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (black, galvanized, or painted), or end finish (plain end, beveled end, threaded, or threaded and coupled). These pipes and tubes are generally known as standard pipes and tubes and are intended for the low-pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air, and other liquids and gases in plumbing and heating systems, air-conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses. Standard pipe may also be used for light load-bearing applications, such as for fence tubing, and as structural pipe tubing used for framing and as support members for reconstruction or load-bearing purposes in the construction, shipbuilding, trucking, farm equipment, and other related industries. Unfinished conduit pipe is also included in this order.

All carbon-steel pipes and tubes within the physical description outlined above are included within the scope of this review except line pipe, oil-country tubular goods, boiler tubing, mechanical tubing, pipe and tube hollows for redraws, finished scaffolding, and finished conduit. In accordance with the Department's *Final Negative Determination of Scope Inquiry on Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube from Brazil, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Venezuela* (61 FR 11608, March 21, 1996), pipe certified to the API 5L line-pipe specification and pipe certified to both the API 5L line-pipe specifications and the less-stringent ASTM A–53 standard-pipe specifications, which falls within the physical parameters as outlined above, and entered as line pipe of a kind used for oil and gas pipelines is outside of the scope of the antidumping duty order.

Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Recession of 1996/97Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

On December 23, 1997, we published our *Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Administrative Reviews* (62 FR 246). Subsequently, we received timely withdrawals of request for review from Hyundai Pipe Co. Ltd., Korea Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., SeAH Steel Corporation (''SeAH'') and Shinho Steel Co., Ltd. Because there was no other request for review for these

companies from any other interested party and because no other request for review was received with respect to other companies, we are rescinding this review in its entirety in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Clarification of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

On April 27, 1998, we published our *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review; Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Korea* (63 FR 20572). In these final results, the cash deposit rate listed for SeAH was incorrect. The correct cash deposit rate is 5.31 percent *ad valorem*, as found in *Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea; Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* (63 FR 2200, 2202, January 14, 1998). This cash deposit rate will apply to all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after April 27, 1998. This cash deposit rate shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice is published in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(f).

Dated: June 14, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–15469 Filed 6–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–301–602]

Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: 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 February 2, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia. This review covers a total of 424 producers and/or exporters of fresh cut flowers to the United States during the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes for the final results. The review indicates the existence of dumping margins for certain firms during the review period.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 10, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosa Jeong, Hong-Anh Tran or Todd Hansen, Office 1, Group 1, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–1278, (202) 482–0176 or (202) 482–1276, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting 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 statute 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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to those codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 2, 1998, we published a notice of *Preliminary Results and Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (Preliminary Results),* wherein we invited interested parties to comment. *See* 63 FR 5354. At the request of the interested parties, we held a public hearing on April 14, 1998.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia (standard carnations, miniature (spray) carnations, standard chrysanthemums and pompon chrysanthemums). These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 0603.10.30.00, 0603.10.70.10, 0603.10.70.20, and 0603.10.70.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

Fair Value Comparisons

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) as defined in section 772(a) and 772(b) of the Act. We calculated EP and CEP based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results* with the following exceptions: (1) we recalculated Tuchany's credit expenses net of commission and international freight expenses (*see infra* Comment 14); (2) we accounted for the returns for Clavecol and Caicedo for the months reported rather than allocating them over the period of review (POR) (*see infra* Comment 16).

Normal Value

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results,* we determined that home market and third-country sales are not an appropriate basis for normal value (NV) and, therefore, used constructed value (CV) as defined in section 773(e) of the Act as the basis for determining NV. We used the same methodology to calculate NV as that described in the *Preliminary Results.*

Analysis of Comments Received

We received case and rebuttal briefs from the Floral Trade Council (FTC), the domestic interested party, and the Asociacion Colombiana de Exportadores de Flores (Asocolflores), an association of Colombian flower producers representing many of the respondents in this case.

General Issues

Comment 1: Asocolflores argues that zero and *de minimis* margins should be included in the calculation of the rate for non-selected respondents since it is reasonable to assume that some of the non-selected respondents would have received the same had they been individually reviewed. Citing to *Serampore Indus. Pvt. Ltd.* v. *United States,* 696 F. Supp. 665, 668–69 (CIT 1988), Asocolflores argues that excluding zero and *de minimis* margins amounts to a presumption of dumping on behalf of non-selected firms.

Asocolflores further argues that if the rates of selected companies are not, in some way, ''representative,'' then there is no legal basis for using such rates for non-selected respondents. Referring to *National Knitwear & Sportswear Association* v. *United States,* 779 F. Supp. 1364, 1372 (CIT 1991), Asocolflores elaborates that the benefits of zero or *de minimis* margins made available to selected respondents should be extended to non-selected respondents. Acknowledging that the Act provides for the exclusion of zero and *de minimis* margins in calculating the cash deposit rate for non-examined producers in an investigation, Asocolflores differentiates this situation