

Producer and/or exporter	Margin (percent)
Barilla	71.49
De Cecco	0.36
Indalco	1.62
La Molisana	14.33
Pagani	71.49
Puglisi	2.03
Rummo	7.04

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within thirty days of publication. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs in this proceeding should provide a summary of the arguments, not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at the hearing, within 120 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

For EP sales which were not imported by an affiliated party, we divided the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between normal value and EP) for each importer/customer by the total value of the sales to that importer/customer. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting *ad valorem* dollar amount against each importer's/customer's entries under the order during the review period.

For CEP sales, we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of the reviewed sales for each importer. Where an affiliated party acts as an importer for EP sales, we included the applicable EP sales in this assessment-rate calculation. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that

importer's entries under the order during the period of review.

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included in these administrative reviews, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales during the review period. To derive a single deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter, we weight-averaged the EP and CEP deposit rates (using the EP and the CEP as the weighing factors). We will direct the Customs Service to collect the resulting percentage deposit rate against the entered value of each producer's and/or exporter's entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the notice of the final results of this review. Accordingly, as provided in section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this for all shipments of certain pasta from Italy entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after that publication date: (1) The cash deposit rate for companies listed above will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent, in which case it is *de minimis* and the cash deposit will be zero; (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 antidumping 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 11.26 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the antidumping investigation. See, final investigation determination.

These cash deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until the publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402 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: July 31, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-21230 Filed 8-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-489-805]

Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Pasta From Turkey

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Turkey. This review covers three exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review is January 19, 1996, through June 30, 1997.

We have preliminarily found that, for certain exporters, sales of the subject merchandise have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price or constructed export price and the normal value.

We preliminarily find that, for the one company that had shipments during the review period and participated in the review, sales have not been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on the subject merchandise exported by this company.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 7, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judith Wey Rudman or John Brinkmann, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0192 or (202) 482-5288, 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 made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. 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, as published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27296).

Case History

On July 24, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Turkey (61 FR 38545). On July 21, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** the notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of this order for the period January 19, 1996 through June 30, 1997 (62 FR 38973). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), on July 31, 1997, the petitioners requested a review of the following producers and exporters of certain pasta: Filiz Gida Sanayi ve Ticaret (Filiz); and Nuh Ticaret ve Sanayi A.S. (Nuh Ticaret). Also on July 31, 1997, Pastavilla Kartal Makarnacilik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Pastavilla), requested an administrative review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2). On August 28, 1997, we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period of January 19, 1996 through June 30, 1997 (*Notice of Initiation*, 62 FR 45621).

On September 4, 1997, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to Filiz, Nuh Ticaret, and Pastavilla.¹ In its request for an administrative review, Pastavilla requested that its period of review (POR) be truncated on the basis that it had no U.S. entries, exports, or sales during the POR prior to May 1997. Accordingly, on September 11, 1997, we informed Pastavilla that it could limit its reporting of data to the period January 1 through June 30, 1997. In that letter we advised Pastavilla that if it elected to limit its reporting of data to the six-month period, and the Department subsequently initiated a sales-below-cost investigation, it would forego the application of the "recovery of cost" test pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Pastavilla

submitted its questionnaire response on October 20, 1997.

On November 21, 1997, petitioners alleged that Pastavilla had sold the foreign like product at prices below the cost of production (COP). On December 24, 1997, we initiated a sales-below-cost investigation with respect to Pastavilla. Pastavilla submitted its section D COP response on January 23, 1998.

The Department issued a supplemental questionnaire for sections A, B, and C to Pastavilla on February 27, 1998. On March 11, 1998, the Department issued a supplemental section D questionnaire to Pastavilla. Pastavilla's responses to the section A-C and section D supplemental questionnaires were received on March 16 and 27, 1998, respectively. The Department issued a second supplemental section D questionnaire on May 7, 1998, and Pastavilla filed its response May 21, 1998.

On January 28 1998, the Department published a notice postponing the preliminary results of this review until July 1, 1998 (63 FR 4218). On June 10, 1998, the Department published a notice further extending the deadline for the preliminary results of this review until no later than July 31, 1998 (63 FR 31735).

Partial Rescission

In the *Notice of Initiation*, we initiated a review of Filiz, Nuh Ticaret, and Pastavilla. However, on October 6, 1997, Nuh Ticaret informed the Department that it had no shipments of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. We have preliminarily confirmed this with information from the United States Customs Service. Therefore, in accordance with section 351.213(d)(3) of the Department's regulations and consistent with Department practice, we are preliminarily rescinding our review of Nuh Ticaret (*see, e.g., Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube from Turkey: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 63 FR 35191 (June 29, 1998) (*Turkish Pipe and Tube*) and *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 53287, 53288 (October 14, 1997)).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds (or 2.27 kilograms) or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees,

milk, gluten, diastases, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this scope is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons or polyethylene or polypropylene bags, of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the scope of this review are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white.

Imports of subject merchandise are currently classifiable under items 1902.19.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Use of Facts Available

Filiz did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. We have confirmed that the questionnaire was received by Filiz (*see Memorandum to the File dated March 4, 1998*) and, accordingly, for the reasons described below, we are assigning to Filiz a margin based on adverse facts available.

Section 776(a) of the Act requires the Department to resort to facts otherwise available (facts available) if necessary information is not available on the record or when an interested party or any other person "fails to provide [requested] information by the deadlines for submission of the information or in the form and manner requested, subject to subsections (c)(1) and (e) of section 782." As provided in section 782(c)(1) of the Act, if an interested party "promptly after receiving a request from [the Department] for information, notifies [the Department] that such party is unable to submit the information requested in the requested form and manner," the Department may modify the requirements to avoid imposing an unreasonable burden on that party. Since Filiz did not provide any such notification to the Department, subsections (c)(1) and (e) do not apply to this situation. Accordingly, we preliminarily find, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for Filiz.

Where the Department must resort to facts available because a respondent failed to cooperate to the best of its ability, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the use of an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in selecting from among the facts available. Because Filiz failed to cooperate by not responding to our

¹ Section A of the questionnaire requests general information concerning a company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under review that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all of its markets. Sections B and C of the questionnaire request home market sales listings and U.S. sales listings, respectively. Section D requests additional information about the cost of production of the foreign like product and constructed value of the merchandise under review.

antidumping questionnaire and, thus, having not acted to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information, we have determined that an adverse inference with respect to Filiz is warranted.

Section 776(b) of the Act also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination in the antidumping investigation, a previous administrative review, or any other information placed on the record. Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that "corroborate" means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information has probative value. (See H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d sess. 870 (1994).)

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, in an annual review, the Department will not engage in updating the petition to reflect the prices and costs that are found during the current review. Rather, the process of corroboration is to determine that the significant elements used to derive a margin in a petition are reliable and relevant to the conditions upon which the petition is based.

With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. (See, e.g., *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (February 22, 1996)).

In this instance, we have no reason to believe that the application of the highest petition margin, calculated based on our revisions to the estimated margins in the petition concerning Turkish pasta, is inappropriate. We have assigned Feliz the rate of 63.29 percent as adverse facts available, for purposes of these preliminary results. This margin is the same margin derived from the petition that was corroborated and assigned to Feliz during the investigation. (See, *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey*,

61 FR 30309 (June 14, 1996).) For purposes of this preliminary determination, we find that this margin continues to be of probative value. We note that the SAA, at 870, states that "the fact that corroboration may not be practicable in a given circumstance will not prevent the agencies from applying an adverse inference. * * *" In addition, the SAA at 869, emphasizes that the Department need not prove that the facts available are the best alternative information.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of certain pasta from Turkey were made in the United States at less than fair value, we compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the normal value (NV). Because Turkey's economy experienced high inflation during the POR (over 70 percent), as is Department practice, we limited our comparisons to home market sales made during the same month in which the U.S. sale occurred and did not apply our "90/60 contemporaneity rule (see, e.g., *Turkish Pipe and Tube and Certain Porcelain on Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 42496, 42503 (August 7, 1997)). This methodology minimizes the extent to which calculated dumping margins are overstated or understated due solely to price inflation that occurred in the intervening time period between the U.S. and home market sales.

We first attempted to compare products sold in the U.S. and home markets that were identical with respect to the following characteristics: pasta shape; type of wheat; additives; and enrichment. However, we did not find any home market sales of merchandise that were identical in these respects to the merchandise sold in the United States. Accordingly, we compared U.S. products with the most similar merchandise sold in the home market based on the characteristics listed above, in that order of priority.

Constructed Export Price

We calculated CEP for Pastavilla, in accordance with subsections 772(b), (c) and (d) of the Act, because sales to the first unaffiliated purchaser took place after importation into the United States. We based CEP on packed delivered prices to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, we made deductions for movement expenses including inland freight from plant or warehouse to port of exportation, foreign brokerage and handling,

international freight, marine insurance, U.S. duties, and U.S. inland freight expenses (freight from port to the customer). We revised the reported U.S. inland freight expenses to include the amount of the taxes shown on the freight invoice. In addition, we increased the CEP by the amount of the countervailing duties paid that were attributable to an export subsidy, in accordance with section 772(c)(1)(c).

In accordance with section 772(d)(1), we deducted from the starting price those selling expenses that were incurred in selling the subject merchandise, including direct selling expenses (credit costs and bank charges) and indirect selling expenses, that related to economic activity in the United States. We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Pastavilla's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and (C) of the Act, because Pastavilla's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

Sales to Affiliated Parties

Pastavilla and its affiliated home market distributor made home-market sales to an affiliated supermarket chain during the POR. Because Pastavilla could not report the price to the unaffiliated customers of the supermarket chain, in accordance with section 351.403(c) of the Department's regulations, we performed an analysis to determine whether the prices to the affiliated supermarket chain were comparable to the prices to unaffiliated parties. We compared Pastavilla's sales prices to the affiliated supermarket chain, for identical products, to sales prices to all other unaffiliated customers, net of all movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct expenses, and packing. Where prices to the affiliated party were on average 99.5 percent or more of the price to the unaffiliated parties, we determined that sales made to the affiliated party were at arm's length (see 19 CFR 351.403(c) and 62 FR at 27355). We only included in our margin analysis those sales to the affiliated party that were made at arm's length.

Cost of Production Analysis

Before making any comparisons to normal value, we conducted a COP analysis to determine whether Pastavilla's home market sales were made below the cost of production. We calculated the COP based on the sum of Pastavilla's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A) and packing, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We relied on Pastavilla's information as submitted, except in the specific instances discussed below.

As noted above, we determined that the Turkish economy experienced significant inflation during the POR. Therefore, to avoid the distortive effect of inflation on our comparison of costs and prices, we requested that Pastavilla submit the product-specific cost of manufacturing (COM) incurred during each month of the POR. We calculated a POR-average COM for each product after indexing the reported monthly costs during the POR to an equivalent currency level using the Turkish wholesale price index from the International Financial Statistics published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We then restated the POR-average COM in the currency value of each respective month.

We revised Pastavilla's submitted G&A expense rate to exclude Duzey's G&A expenses and its cost of sales from the calculation of the rate. In addition, we calculated a severance rate and multiplied the revised G&A expense rate, the reported interest expense rate, and the severance expense rate by the monthly COMs to derive product-specific monthly COPs. (See Memorandum to Christian Marsh from Stan Bowen dated July 31, 1998 for further details.)

Test of Home Market Prices

We compared the product-specific monthly COPs (less selling expenses) to home market sales of the foreign like product in order to determine whether sales had been made at prices below the COP. We determined the net home market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses.

Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of Pastavilla's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of

that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the six-month period were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act and disregarded the below-cost sales from our analysis. We used the remaining sales in our margin analysis, in accordance with section 773(b)(1).

Price-to-Price Comparisons

We calculated NV based on CIF or delivered prices to home market customers. We made deductions from the starting price for inland freight, inland insurance, discounts, and rebates. In accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs. In addition, we made adjustments for direct expenses, including imputed credit expenses, advertising, warranty expenses, and interest revenue, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We recalculated credit expenses and inventory carrying costs using the monthly short-term Turkish interest rates from the Economist.²

We also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable costs of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs as adjusted for inflation for each month of the POR, as described in the *Cost of Production Analysis* section above.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we determined NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. CEP sales, to the extent practicable. When there were no sales at the same level of trade, we compared U.S. sales to home market sales at a different level of trade.

To determine whether home market sales were at different levels of trade we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated (or arm's length) customers. If the comparison-market sales were at a different level of trade and the differences affected price

²The Economist was the only source we found that published short-term lending rates for Turkey.

comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we made a level-of-trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

Finally, if the NV level was more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there was no basis for determining whether the difference in levels between NV and CEP affected price comparability, we granted a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. (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).) For a detailed description of our level-of-trade analysis for these preliminary results, see the July 31, 1998, Level of Trade Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach, on file in Import Administration's Central Records Unit (Room B-099) of the main Commerce building.

Currency Conversion

Because this proceeding involves a high-inflation economy, we limited our comparison of U.S. and home market sales to those occurring in the same month (as described above) and only used daily exchange rates. (See *Steel Cookware from Mexico* and *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey*, 61 FR 30309 (June 14, 1996).)

The Department's preferred source for daily exchange rates is the Federal Reserve Bank. However, the Federal Reserve Bank does not track or publish exchange rates for the Turkish Lira. Therefore, we made currency conversions based on the daily exchange rates from the Dow Jones Service, as published in the Wall Street Journal.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period January 19, 1996 through June 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Pastavilla	0
Filiz Gida	63.29

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice (see 19 CFR 351.224(b)). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. (see 19 CFR 351.310(c)). Any hearing, if

requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs in this proceeding should provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at the hearing, within 120 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on Pastavilla's entries of the merchandise subject to the review. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of certain pasta from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Pastavilla and Filiz will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit will be zero; (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 this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 60.87 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (*See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey*, 61 FR 38546 (July 24, 1996)).

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402 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: July 31, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-21231 Filed 8-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Textile and Apparel Categories With the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; Changes to the 1998 Correlation

August 3, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Changes to the 1998 Correlation

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lori E. Mennitt, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-3400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Correlation: Textile and Apparel Categories based on the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (1998) presents the harmonized tariff numbers under each of the cotton, wool, man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber categories used by the United States in monitoring imports of these textile products and in the administration of the textile program. The Correlation should be amended to include the changes indicated below. These changes were effective on August 1, 1998:

Changes to the 1998 Correlation

Category 222:

Delete 6002.92.9000

Add 6002.92.9020—Other knitted or crocheted fabrics of cotton, of single knit construction.

Add 6002.92.9080—Other knitted or crocheted fabrics of cotton, other than of single knit construction.

Category 362:

Delete 6302.10.0010

Add 6302.10.0005—Pillowcases and bolster cases, knitted or crocheted, of cotton.

Add 6302.10.0008—Sheets, knitted or crocheted, of cotton.

Add 6302.10.0015—Other bed linen, knitted or crocheted, of cotton.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98-21177 Filed 8-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Public Information Collection Requirement

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Renew Information Collection #3038-0026: Gross Margining of Omnibus Account.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission is planning to renew information collection 3038-0026, Gross Margining of Omnibus Accounts. The information collection is required to ensure compliance with Commission Regulation 1.58 that requires Futures Commission Merchants (FCMs) to carry omnibus accounts on a gross, rather than a net basis. In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Commission solicits comments to:

(1) evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (2) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) minimize the burden of the collection of the information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.