Dated: August 3, 1998.

Eileen M. Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 98–21661 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–803]

Industrial Nitrocellulose From Germany; 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 of industrial nitrocellulose from Germany.

SUMMARY: On April 9, 1998, the Department of Commerce published its preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose from Germany for the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997 (63 FR 17364). The Department of Commerce has now completed its administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930. For information on the assessment of antidumping duties for the reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, see the Final Results of Review section of this notice. This review covers imports of industrial nitrocellulose from one producer, Wolff Walsrode AG.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We have based our analysis on the comments received and have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Zev Primor, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4195, and 482–4114, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 9, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose from Germany for the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997 (63 FR 17364). The Department has now completed this administrative review, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

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 as stated in 62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of industrial nitrocellulose (INC) from Germany. INC is a dry, white, amorphous synthetic chemical with a nitrogen content between 10.8 and 12.2 percent, and is produced from the reaction of cellulose with nitric acid. INC is used as a film-former in coatings, lacquers, furniture finishes, and printing inks. The scope of this order does not include explosive grade nitrocellulose, which has a nitrogen content of greater than 12.2 percent. INC is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3912.20.00. White the HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage. The review period is July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1997.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from the respondent, Wolff Walsrode (Wolff) and the petitioner, Hercules Incorporated.

Comment 1: Respondent argues that the Department used Wolff's budgeted operating result from its financial statement rather than its actual operating result in calculating Wolff's constructed export price (CEP) profit ratio. Petitioner did not comment.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with respondent that Wolff's actual operating result should be used in calculating Wolff's constructed export price profit ratio because the actual operating result is the more accurate than the budgeted operating results. The Department has corrected this error.

Comment 2: Respondent argues that the Department inadvertently included all contemporaneous home market sales in the computer program's calculation of weighted-averaged normal values rather than selecting the sales during the most contemporaneous month as required by section 351.414(e)(2)(i) of the Department's regulations. Petitioner argues that this error only affects five U.S. sales and would be corrected in all but one instance when the Department corrects the product coding, as requested by the respondent. *See* comment six.

Department's Position: The Department has utilized respondent's computer programming language as outlined in their case brief for the final results. The Department notes that the computer program does calculate the weighted-average normal values during the most contemporaneous month as required by section 351.414(e)(2)(i). However, while the revised programming altered variable names, it did not change the results of the program.

Comment 3: Respondent argues that the Department inadvertently failed to add U.S. freight revenue in calculating the net CEP price. Petitioner did not comment.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with the respondent and has corrected this error.

Comment 4: Respondent argues that the Department inadvertently failed to deduct the CEP offset from the normal value of home market sales matched to U.S. CEP sales with no commissions. Respondent also argues that the Department failed to deduct the commission offset from normal value of home market sales matched to U.S. sales with commissions. Petitioner did not comment.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with respondent and has corrected these programming errors.

Comment 5: Respondent argues that the Department should calculate one assessment rate for transmittal to the U.S. Customs Service because Customs cannot readily determine whether a particular importation is an EP or CEP sale. Petitioner agrees with respondent, but wants to ensure that the entire amount of antidumping duty calculated by the Department is collected by Customs.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with respondent that in this instance there should be one rate per importer and has corrected this error.

Comment 6: Petitioner contends that the Department incorrectly used the SAS function, COMPRESS, in the

creation of the model matching hierarchy. As a result, the variables were improperly sorted. In addition, petitioner claims that the Department incorrectly defined three product characteristic codes in the model match program. Respondent agrees that there is a programming error in the model matching hierarchy, but disagrees with petitioner's suggested solution. Respondent argues that the problem with the model match program identified by the petitioner is not solely caused by the COMPRESS code, but also by the Department's methodology in hand-coding viscosity levels in the program. Respondent argues that in addition to petitioner's recommendation, the Department must also alter the U.S. viscosity hand-coding section of the program to result in a more accurate model matching.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with both petitioner and respondent that there is a programming error with three models in the matching hierarchy. The Department has corrected the programming errors in the model matching hierarchy and the error in the hand coding section. However, the Department disagrees with petitioner and that the SAS function, COMPRESS, caused an improper sorting of models. The compress function is used to minimize space and has no impact on the model matching hierarchy.

Comment 7: Petitioner contends that only sales to the United States within the 12-month review period should be included in the model match program, and that the month code should be corrected. Respondent did not comment.

Department's Position: The Department agrees with petitioner and has corrected these programming errors.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of the comments received we have revised our analysis and determine that the following margins exist for the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Wolff Walsrode AG (WWAG) ...	7.18

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between normal value and export price may vary from the percentages stated above. We have calculated a company-specific duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the same sales. The rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular company made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of industrial nitrocellulose from Germany, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate for the firm as stated above; (2) if the exporter is not covered in this review, or the original 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; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, previous reviews, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacture is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate will be 3.84 percent, the ''all others'' rate from the LTFV investigation. 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 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1)(B) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 6, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–21789 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–570–825

Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China; 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 of sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China

SUMMARY: On April 9, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (63 FR 17367). This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period of July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon Farlander or Stephen Jacques, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0182 or (202) 482-1391, respectively.

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 in reference to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (62 FR 27295, May 19, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty