expenses. *See E.I. DuPont* at 15–24. Therefore, for purposes of the instant review, the Department will continue to use Akzo's reported cost of production and constructed value data in calculating the antidumping duty margin.

Comment 5: Akzo claims that the computer program used in calculating the preliminary results contained three errors that must be corrected. First, Akzo argues that the difference in merchandise (DIFMER) adjustment was miscalculated by failing to convert the submitted variable cost of manufacturing of the U.S. product (VCOMU) from kilograms to pounds. Akzo explains that because the U.S. sales are reported on a per pound basis and the analysis is conducted on the same basis, it is necessary to convert the DIFMER adjustment to a per pound amount. Second, Akzo claims that in calculating the net constructed export price (CEP), the Department correctly added U.S. packing costs to normal value but incorrectly included U.S. packing costs as an adjustment to the gross price, thereby understating the net CEP and overstating the margin. Third, Akzo argues that the Department incorrectly deducted the ISE incurred in the home market on U.S. sales from CEP after correctly determining in the preliminary results and LOT analysis memo that these expenses were not related to the economic activity in the U.S. Akzo provided suggested changes to correct the alleged errors.

Petitioner did not rebut any of Akzo's aforementioned suggested corrections.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with Akzo and has revised the final margin program to reflect these changes. First, the Department has converted VCOMU from kilograms to pounds to ensure that the final margin analysis is performed on a comparable basis. Second, the Department has corrected the margin program to ensure that both the CEP and NV are calculated inclusive of packing costs. Finally, the Department's preliminary margin calculation program inadvertently included ISE that were not incurred in connection with economic activity as deductions to the U.S. selling price. The Department's analysis in the Level of Trade Memo, dated March 2, 1998, is correct in stating that only those expenses incurred connection with economic activity in the U.S. will be deducted from CEP in conducting the margin analysis. For purposes of these final results of review, the Department has revised the margin calculation to reflect the conclusion of the Level of Trade Analysis memo. For further explanation, *see* Calculation Memorandum, dated July 7, 1998.

Final Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/exporter	Period of review	Margin (percent)
Akzo	6/1/96–5/31/97	6.31
All Other ..	6/1/96–5/31/97	66.92

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer specific duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total entered value of sales examined during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of PPD–T aramid fiber from the Netherlands entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior 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 (3) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 66.92 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (59 FR 32678, June 24, 1994). These deposit requirements 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 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 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 353.305 and 19 CFR 353.306. 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 351.221.

Dated: July 7, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–18596 Filed 7–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–831]

Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On December 23, 1997, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 67044) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the People's Republic of China. This review covered the period from November 1, 1996 through October 31, 1997. The Department of Commerce has now rescinded this review as a result of the absence of reviewable entries and sales into the United States of subject merchandise during the period of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Krawczun or Thomas Schauer, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** on November 7, 1997 (62 FR 60219) a ''Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the People's Republic of China (59 FR 59209, November 16, 1994). On November 18, 1997, Fook Huat Tong Kee Pte. Ltd. (FHTK), the respondent, requested an administrative review of imports of its merchandise into the United States. The Department initiated the review on December 23, 1997 (62 FR 67044).

Documentation we received from the Customs Service subsequent to the initiation of the review demonstrated that, although Customs received importation documentation for the shipment of the subject merchandise, this shipment did not result in a reviewable entry or sale within the period of review. Therefore, we are rescinding the initiation of this review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3). For further information regarding this recission, *see* the decision memorandum entitled ''Whether to Rescind the 96/97 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China,'' from Laurie Parkhill to Richard W. Moreland dated July 6, 1998.

The cash-deposit rate for FHTK will remain at 376.67 percent, the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding (59 FR 59029, November 16,1994). This notice is in accordance with section 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: July 6, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–18595 Filed 7–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–427–814, A–428–825, A–475–824, A–588–845, A–201–822, A–580–834, A–583–831, A–412–818]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, South Korea, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abdelali Elouaradia (France), at (202) 482–2243; Robert James (Germany), at (202) 482–5222; Rick Johnson (Italy, Republic of Korea, and Taiwan) at (202) 482–3818; Dorothy Woster (Japan), at (202) 482–3362; Tom Killiam (Mexico), at (202) 482–2704; Nancy Decker (United Kingdom), at (202) 482–0196, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigations

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's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997).

The Petition

On June 10, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') received petitions filed in proper form by Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, Armco, Inc.,[1] J&L Specialty Steel, Inc.,[2] Washington Steel Division of Bethlehem Steel Corporation (formerly Lukens, Inc.), the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC, the Butler Armco Independent Union[3] and the Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc.[4] (petitioners). The Department received supplemental information to the petitions on June 15, 16, 17, 19 and 24, 1998.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, petitioners allege that imports of stainless steel sheet and strip in coils (SSSS) from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that petitioners filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9) (C) and (D) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations they are requesting the Department to initiate (*see Discussion* below).

Scope of Investigations

For purposes of these investigations, the products covered are certain stainless steel sheet and strip in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject sheet and strip is a flat-rolled product in coils that is greater than 9.5 mm in width and less than 4.75 mm in thickness, and that is annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject sheet and strip may also be further processed (*e.g.*, cold-rolled, polished, aluminized, coated, *etc.*) provided that it maintains the specific dimensions of sheet and strip following such processing.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') at subheadings: 7219.13.00.30, 7219.13.00.50, 7219.13.00.70, 7219.13.00.80, 7219.14.00.30, 7219.14.00.65, 7219.14.00.90, 7219.32.00.05, 7219.32.00.20, 7219.32.00.25, 7219.32.00.35, 7219.32.00.36, 7219.32.00.38, 7219.32.00.42, 7219.32.00.44, 7219.33.00.05, 7219.33.00.20, 7219.33.00.25, 7219.33.00.35, 7219.33.00.36, 7219.33.00.38, 7219.33.00.42, 7219.33.00.44, 7219.34.00.05, 7219.34.00.20, 7219.34.00.25, 7219.34.00.30, 7219.34.00.35, 7219.35.00.05, 7219.35.00.15, 7219.35.00.30, 7219.35.00.35, 7219.90.00.10, 7219.90.00.20, 7219.90.00.25, 7219.90.00.60, 7219.90.00.80, 7220.12.10.00, 7220.12.50.00,

[1] Armco, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Mexico case.

[2] J& L Specialty Steel, Inc. is not a petitioner in the France case.

[3] Butler Armco Independent Union is not a petitioner in the Mexico case.

[4] Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Mexico case.