

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Bureau of Export Administration

**President's Export Council;  
Subcommittee on Encryption, Notice  
of Partially Closed Meeting**

A partially closed meeting of the President's Export Council Subcommittee on Encryption (PECSENC) will be held on September 18, 1998. The initial open session will convene at 9:00 a.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce, Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 4832, 14th Street between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, NW., Washington, DC. The initial open session is scheduled to adjourn at 12:00 p.m. The closed session will convene in Room 4832. The PECSENC will reconvene in open session at 3:00 p.m. in Room 4832. The Subcommittee provides advice on matters pertinent to policies regarding commercial encryption products.

**Open Session**

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman.
2. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
3. Update on Bureau of Export Administration initiatives.
4. Issue briefings.

**Closed Session**

5. Discussion of matters properly classified under Executive Order 12958, dealing with the U.S. export control program and strategic criteria related thereto.

**Open Session**

6. Issue briefing.
7. Reports by working groups.
8. Open discussion.

A Notice of Determination to close meetings, or portions of meetings, of the Subcommittee to the public on the basis of 5 U.S.C. 522(c)(1) was approved May 7, 1998, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. A copy of the Notice of Determination is available for public inspection and copying in the Central Reference and Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC. For further information, contact Ms. Lee Ann Carpenter on (202) 482-2583.

Dated: August 26, 1998.

**Iain S. Baird,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-23578 Filed 9-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

[A-201-806]

**Carbon Steel Wire Rope From Mexico;  
Final Results of Antidumping Duty  
Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On April 7, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon steel wire rope from Mexico (63 FR 16967). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, Aceros Camesa S.A. de C.V. (Camesa), and the period of March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received comments from Camesa and from the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Specialty Cable Manufacturers (the petitioner). We have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 2, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joanna M. Gabryszewski, Laurel LaCivita, or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0780, (202) 482-4236, or (202) 482-3020, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Applicable Statute**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provision 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 to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 353 (April 1, 1996).

**Background**

On April 7, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the review of the antidumping duty order on carbon steel

wire rope from Mexico (63 FR 16967). On May 7, 1998, we received comments from the petitioner and Camesa. The petitioner and Camesa submitted rebuttal comments on May 15, 1998. Both parties presented their comments in a hearing held on May 28, 1998.

The Department has now completed this antidumping duty administrative review in accordance with section 751(b) of the Act.

**Scope of Review**

The product covered by this review is steel wire rope. Steel wire rope encompasses ropes, cables, and cordage of carbon steel, other than stranded wire, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, and not made up of brass-plated wire. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090.

Excluded from this review is stainless steel wire rope, which is classifiable under HTS subheading 7312.10.6000, and all forms of stranded wire, with the following exception.

Based on the final affirmative determination of circumvention of antidumping duty order, 60 **Federal Register** 10831 (February 28, 1995), the Department has determined that steel wire strand, when manufactured in Mexico by Camesa and imported into the United States for use in the production of steel wire rope, falls within the scope of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Mexico. Such merchandise is currently classifiable under subheading 7312.10.3020 of the HTS.

Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes, our own written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Camesa, and the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

**Model Match Methodology**

On January 8, 1998, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued a decision in *CEMEX v. United States*, 133 F.3d 897 (Fed. Cir.) (*CEMEX*). In that case, based on the pre-URAA version of the Act, the Court discussed the appropriateness of using constructed value (CV) as the basis for foreign market value when the Department finds home market sales to be outside the "ordinary course of trade." This issue was not raised by any party in this proceeding. However, the URAA amended the definition of sales outside the "ordinary course of trade" to include sales below cost. See Section