5. Election of Chairman.

The meeting will be open to the public and a limited number of seats will be available. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. Written statements may be submitted at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate distribution of public presentation materials to Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials two weeks prior to the meeting date to the following address: Ms. Lee Ann Carpenter, OAS/EA MS: 3886C, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

For further information or copies of the minutes, contact Lee Ann Carpenter at 202–482–2583.

Dated: January 28, 1998.

Lee Ann Carpenter,

Director, Technical Advisory Committee Unit.

[FR Doc. 98–2500 Filed 2–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–405–802]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Finland; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 1998.

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

ACTION: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 1998.

SUMMARY: On September 25, 1997, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 50292) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate (Carbon Steel Plate) from Finland. This review covered the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. This review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for review of subject merchandise during the period of review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephanie Tolson or Linda Ludwig, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–2312 or 482–3833, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 2, 1997, Dewey Ballantine, on behalf of petitioners in this proceeding, requested a review of sales made by Rautaruukki Oy (Rautaruukki). On September 17, 1997, Rautaruukki filed a letter certifying to the Department that there had been no sales or shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). On September 26, 1997, Rautaruukki advised the Department that it had contacted the U.S. Bureau of the Census in order to confirm that there were no entries of the subject merchandise into the United States during the POR despite the Bureau's report to the contrary. The Department sent a no-shipment inquiry regarding Rautaruukki to U.S. Customs on October 16, 1997. Customs did not indicate that there were any such entries.

On January 20, 1998, Rautaruukki filed a letter with the Department confirming that the entries of cut-to-length carbon steel plate reported in the Census Bureau statistics as imports from Finland during the POR were in error. On January 21, 1998, petitioners withdrew their request for this administrative review.

Ordinarily, parties have 90 days from the publication of the notice of initiation of review in which to withdraw a request for review. See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(62 FR 27295, 27393, May 19, 1997). We did not receive petitioners withdrawal request until January 21, 1998, after the 90-day period had elapsed. Given that the review has not progressed substantially and there would be no undue burden on the parties or the Department, the Department has determined that it would be reasonable to grant the withdrawal at this time. See Id. Therefore, in accordance with section 353.213(d) of the Department's regulations, the Department is rescinding this administrative review.

This administrative review is being rescinded in accordance with Section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 351.213(d)(3).

Dated: January 28, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 98–2627 Filed 2–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by one manufacturer/exporter, Panchmahal Steel Ltd. (Panchmahal), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges (flanges) from India. The review covers sales during the period February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997.

We preliminarily determine that Panchmahal sold subject merchandise at not less than normal value during the period of review (POR).

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam, Alain Letort, or John Kugelman, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2704 (Killiam), –4243 (Letort), or –0649 (Kugelman).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 353 (April 1997). Although the Department's new regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27296—May 19, 1997), do not govern these

proceedings, citations to those regulations are provided, where appropriate, to explain current departmental practice.

Background

The Department published the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel flanges from India on February 9, 1994 (59 FR 5994). Panchmahal, by letters dated February 24, March 18, and April 1, 1997, requested a new shipper review pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and section 353.22(h) of the Department's interim regulations, which govern determinations of antidumping duties for new shippers. These provisions state that, among other requirements, a producer or exporter requesting a new shipper review must include with its request the date on which the merchandise was first entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, or, if it cannot certify as to the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the merchandise for export to the United States (interim regulations, section 353.22(h)(2)(i)). Panchmahal provided the shipment date at the time of its request for review.

On May 2, 1997, the Department published a notice of initiation of this new shipper review of Panchmahal (62 FR 24088). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 353.22 of its interim regulations.

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.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all stainless steel flanges which respondent sold in the home market during the POR to be foreign like products for the purpose of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in the Department's antidumping questionnaire. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondent.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise by the respondent to the United States were made at less than normal value, we compared export price (EP) to normal value (NV), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price

We calculated the price of United States sales based on EP, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to the date of importation and the constructed export price methodology was not indicated by the facts of record.

We calculated EP based on packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for movement expenses, which were comprised of international freight and marine insurance; we also added duty drawback to the starting price.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home-market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

We made adjustments to NV for differences in credit expenses. We reduced NV by home market packing costs section under 773(a)(6)(B) and increased NV by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (''LOT'') as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on constructed value (''CV''), that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (''SG&A'') expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

In its questionnaire responses, Panchmahal stated that there were no differences in its selling activities by customer categories within each market. In order to confirm independently the absence of separate levels of trade within or between the U.S. and home markets, we examined Panchmahal's

questionnaire responses for indications that Panchmahal's functions as a seller differed qualitatively or quantitatively among customer categories. Where possible, we further examined whether each selling function was performed on a substantial portion of sales.

Panchmahal sold to end-users in the U.S. market. In the home market, Panchmahal sold to local distributors and end-users. Panchmahal performed essentially the same selling functions for sales to all its home-market customers, as well as to U.S. customers. Thus, our analysis of the questionnaire response leads us to conclude that sales within or between each market are not made at different levels of trade. Accordingly, we preliminarily find that all sales in the home market and the U.S. market were made at the same level of trade. Therefore, we have not made a level of trade adjustment because all price comparisons are at the same level of trade and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) is not appropriate.

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) 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.'' In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. See, *e.g.,* Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (61 FR 8915, 8918—March 6, 1996). The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determined a fluctuation existed, we substituted the benchmark for the daily rate.

Preliminary Results of the Review

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

CERTAIN STAINLESS STEEL FLANGES FROM INDIA

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Panchmahal	0.00

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first working 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 such briefs or comments, may be filed 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 90 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Cash Deposit

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) The cash deposit rate for the respondent will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review (except that no deposit will be required for firms with zero or *de minimis* margins, *i.e.,* margins lower than 0.5 percent); (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 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 these or any prior reviews, the cash deposit rate will be the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. 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: January 26, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–2626 Filed 2–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a) (3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 97–105. *Applicant:* Georgia Institute of Technology, Institute for Bioengineering and Bioscience, 281 Ferst Drive, SST/P. Weber Building, IBB, Atlanta, GA 30332–0363. *Instrument:* CardioMed Flowmeter, Model CM4008. *Manufacturer:* MediStim as, Norway. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to investigate the mechanism of cardiac flow in an *in vitro* model of the left ventricle. Experiments consist of studying the parameters that influence the flow patterns in order to better understand the mechanism of cardiac flow, so that the diagnosis of cardiovascular disease can be improved. The research projects are a part of the scientific training of graduate and undergraduate students seeking advanced degrees (Master's and Ph.D. levels) in the Cardiovascular Fluid Mechanics Laboratory. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: December 24, 1997.

Docket Number: 97–106. *Applicant:* University of Wisconsin-Madison, 750