(hereinafter collectively referred to as ''item'') exported or to be exported from the United States, that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations, including but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations.

II. No person may directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the denied person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the denied person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the denied person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

III. After notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, cooperation, or business organization related to Suburban Guns by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order.

IV. This Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-product direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

V. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until July 25, 2007.

VI. A copy of this Order shall be delivered to Suburban Guns. This Order shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 23, 1998.

Eileen M. Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 98–8521 Filed 3–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–826]

Notice of Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Wire Rod From Canada

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

ACTION: Notice of Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abdelali Elouaradia at 202/482–2243, or James C. Doyle at 202/482–0159, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. 20230.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act'') as amended, 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 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.

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are certain hot-rolled carbon steel and alloy steel products, in coils, of approximately round cross section, between 5.00 mm (0.20 inch) and 19.0 mm (0.75 inch), inclusive, in solid cross-sectional diameter. Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; (e) free machining steel that contains by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.4 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, and/or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium; or (f) concrete reinforcing bars and rods.

The following products are also excluded from the scope of this investigation:

- Coiled products 5.50 mm or less in true diameter with an average partial decarburization per coil of no more than 70 microns in depth, no inclusions greater than 20 microns, containing by weight the following: carbon greater than or equal to 0.68 percent; aluminum less than or equal to 0.005 percent; phosphorous plus sulfur less than or equal to 0.040 percent; maximum combined copper, nickel and chromium content of 0.13 percent; and nitrogen less than or equal to 0.006 percent. This product is commonly referred to as ''Tire Cord Wire Rod.''
- Coiled products 7.9 to 18 mm in diameter, with a partial decarburization of 75 microns or less in depth and seams no more than 75 microns in depth, containing 0.48 to 0.73 percent carbon by weight. This product is commonly referred to as ''Valve Spring Quality Wire Rod.''
- Coiled products 11 mm to 12.5 mm in diameter, with an average partial decarburization per coil of no more than 70 microns in depth, no inclusions greater than 20 microns, containing by weight the following: carbon greater than or equal to 0.72 percent; manganese 0.50–1.10 percent; phosphorus less than or equal to 0.030 percent; sulfur less than or equal to 0.035 percent; and silicon 0.10–0.35 percent. This product is free of injurious piping and undue segregation. The use

of this excluded product is to fulfill contracts for the sale of Class III pipe wrap wire in conformity with ASTM specification A648–95 and imports of this product must be accompanied by such a declaration on the mill certificate and/or sales invoice. This excluded product is commonly referred to as ''Semifinished Class III Pipe Wrapping Wire.''

The products under investigation are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3000, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, and 7227.90.6050 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Exclusion of Pipe Wrapping Wire

As stated in the *Preliminary Determination*, North American Wire Products Corporation (''NAW''), an importer of the subject merchandise from Germany, requested that the Department exclude SWR used to manufacture Class III pipe wrapping wire from the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty investigations of SWR from Canada, Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela. Because petitioners did not agree to this scope exclusion, we did not exclude this merchandise in the preliminary determination. On December 22, 1997, NAW submitted to the Department a proposed exclusion definition. On December 30, 1997 and January 7, 1998, the petitioners submitted letters concurring with the definition of the scope exclusion and requesting exclusion of this product from the scope of the investigation. We have reviewed NAW's request and petitioners' comments and have excluded SWR for manufacturing Class III pipe wrapping wire from the scope of this investigation. *See* Memorandum to Richard W. Moreland dated January 12, 1998. Accordingly, on February 3, 1998, we instructed the U.S. Customs Service to terminate suspension of liquidation on all entries of Class III pipe wrapping wire from Canada.

Amendment of Final Determination

On February 24, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Steel Wire Rod From Canada* (63 FR 9182) (''*Final Determination*''). This notice covered Sidbec-Dosco (Ispat) Inc. (now Ispat-Sidbec), Stelco, Inc. (''Stelco''), and Ivaco, Inc. (''Ivaco''). The period of investigation (''POI'') for all respondents was January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996.

On February 20, 1998, respondent Ivaco filed timely allegations of ministerial errors with regard to the *Final Determination*. On February 27, 1998, counsel for petitioners in this investigation (Connecticut Steel Group, Co-Steel Raritan, GS Industries, Inc., Keystone Steel & Wire Co., North Star Steel Texas, Inc., and Northwestern Steel & Wire Co.) filed timely allegations of ministerial errors and replies to Ivaco's comments. On March 16, 1998, Ivaco filed timely replies to petitioners' comments. We have reviewed the submissions of both petitioners and respondents, and we are issuing an amended final determination based on the corrections of ministerial errors as detailed below.

First, Ivaco states that the Department made a calculation error in the code which defines home market freight expense for Ivaco Rolling Mill's (IRM) direct sales to unaffiliated customers and to a particular affiliated customer. Ivaco alleges this error resulted in the Department not calculating the freight expense incurred in transporting the subject merchandise to these customers in the home market.

Petitioners agree with Ivaco that the Department made a calculation error in the code which defines home market freight expense for IRM's direct sales to unaffiliated customers. However, petitioners disagree that the Department erred in calculating freight expenses for sales to affiliated customers.

The Department agrees with both parties that a ministerial error was made when calculating home market freight expense for IRM's direct sales to unaffiliated customers, and has corrected the program accordingly. However, the Department has not erred in calculating freight expenses for IRM's direct sales to affiliated customers, therefore, no changes were made to the program.

Second, Ivaco maintains that due to a programming error the margin program fails to apply the level of trade (LOT) adjustment for Ivaco's sales. According to Ivaco, the error occurs because the Department relies on the CON2 data set, and that the variable in the home market data set used to identify LOT is not recognized by the program code. Consequently, in these instances, no level of trade adjustment is applied.

Petitioners maintain that LOT adjustment is not warranted, but agree that the margin program fails to apply it. Petitioners propose new code lines to the program to correct the error.

The Department agrees with both parties that the margin program fails to apply the LOT adjustment and accordingly has corrected it by adding the appropriate code lines to the program.

Third, Ivaco states that the Department improperly applied the yield adjustment factor to all Ivaco sales, instead of only to Ivaco sales of processed rod, as the Department intended.

Petitioners state that using facts available in the record, and given the total inability of Ivaco to provide the necessary information, the Department, with its limited resources and time, was more than justified in employing this calculation.

The Department agrees with Ivaco that it has erred in applying the yield adjustment factor to all Ivaco sales. The Department intended to apply yield adjustment factor to only Ivaco sales of processed rod. *See* Cost Disclosure Memorandum at 2.

Fourth, Petitioners claim that the Department erred when calculating the constructed export price, and that the variable INDEXUS should be replaced by INDEXPU, which is inclusive of inventory carrying costs and indirect selling expenses, as expressed in the Department's calculation memorandum.

Ivaco agrees that the Department inadvertently erred when calculating the constructed export price but disagrees that the adjustment should also include domestic indirect selling expenses.

The Department agrees with Ivaco that when calculating the constructed export price, the Department adjusts for expenses associated with commercial activities in the United States in accordance with section 772(d)(1). We have, therefore, replaced the variable INDEXUS with the variable INDEXPU exclusive of domestic indirect selling expenses.

Finally, Ivaco claims that the Constructed Value (CV) calculation uses one weighted-average selling expense and one weighted-average profit figure for both of Ivaco's LOTs, rather than calculating separate CVs for each LOT by using weighted average values at each LOT, as the Department intended.

Petitioners claim that the Department has already rejected Ivaco's claim that CV should be calculated by LOT; therefore, this is not a ministerial error and the language proposed by Ivaco is methodological in nature.

Ivaco raised this issue in its comments on the preliminary determination, and the Department disagreed that the program for the CV calculation should be changed as Ivaco suggested. We therefore, agree with petitioners that it is inappropriate to

correct the CV program as a ministerial error under 735(e) of the Act.

Amended Final Determination

The revised weighted average dumping margins are :

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Ivaco Inc.	1/1/96–12/31/96	6.95

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 1673d(d) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: March 25, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–8550 Filed 3–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–583–815]

Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Taiwan; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by respondent Ta Chen Stainless Pipe Co., Ltd. (Ta Chen), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is rescinding the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Taiwan (A–583–815). This review covered one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert James at (202) 482–5222 or John Kugelman at (202) 482–0649, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Applicable Statute and Regulations: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 5, 1996, the Department published its notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' for the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997 (62 FR 64353). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b) (1997), respondent Ta Chen requested that we conduct a review of Ta Chen's sales. On January 26, 1998, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997 (63 FR 3702).

By letter dated February 23, 1998, Ta Chen withdrew its request for administrative review. Section 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations provides for the rescission of antidumping duty administrative reviews if a party that requested the review withdraws that request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of review. See 19 CFR 353.213(d)(1) (62 FR 27295, 27393, May 19, 1997). As no other interested party requested the administrative review, and as Ta Chen's request falls within the 90-day time limit provided for withdrawing requests for review, the Department is rescinding this administrative review, in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), and 353.213(d)(4).

Dated: March 24, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 98–8551 Filed 3–31–98; 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, DC 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 97–086R. *Applicant:* The University of Texas at Austin, Bellmont 222, Austin, TX 78712. *Instrument:* 3–D Motion Analysis System, Model Vicon 140. *Manufacturer:* Oxford Metrics, Ltd., United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* Original notice of this resubmitted application was published in the **Federal Register** of October 15, 1997.

Docket Number: 98–015. *Applicant:* Brown University, Center for Advanced Materials Research, 182 Hope Street, Box M, Providence, RI 02912. *Instrument:* Material Preparation and Crystal Growth System, Model MCGS5. *Manufacturer:* Crystallox, Ltd., United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to grow single crystals of high temperature metallic materials that will be used for a variety of research projects. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* March 4, 1998.

Docket Number: 98–016. *Applicant:* University of Wisconsin-Madison, 750 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53706–1490. *Instrument:* High Speed Length Controller, Model 308B. *Manufacturer:* Aurora Scientific Inc., Canada. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used as part of an experimental apparatus whose purpose is the measurement of the mechanical properties of muscle cells, including heart cells. Experiments will include studies to determine the basis of calcium activation of muscle contraction and the role that calcium plays in the regulation of force generation and shortening speed. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* March 11, 1998.

Docket Number: 98–017. *Applicant:* University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, Department of Pharmacology (C–236), 4200 E. Ninth Avenue, Denver, CO 80262. *Instrument:* High Intensity Xenon Flashlamp System, Model JML–C1. *Manufacturer:* Hi-Tech Scientific, Germany. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used in experiments to determine the rapid and synchronous release of neurotransmitters or neuromodulators at specific regions of brain slices from rat hippocampal