The written description remains dispositive.

Background

We received requests for an administrative review of Siderca S.A.I.C., an Argentine producer and exporter of OCTG, and Siderca Corporation, an affiliated U.S. importer and reseller of such merchandise (collectively, Siderca). Petitions Lone Star Steel and IPSCO Tubulars, Inc. submitted a request for review on August 29, 1997, of the anitdumping duty order published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1995 (60 FR 41055). Petitioner North Star Steel of Ohio submitted a separate request for review on September 2, 1997. We initiated this review on September 25, 1997 (62 FR 50292). We received comments from Siderca and petitioners concerning whether Siderca made entries from consumption in the United States during the POR. Petitioners filed duty absorption requests on October 23, 1997 and October 26, 1997, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In its original submission Siderca claimed that ''it did not export, directly or indirectly, subject merchandise that was entered for consumption into the United States during the period of review.'' Siderca also claims that its U.S.A. affiliate, Siderca Corporation, did not import for consumption any subject merchandise during the POR.

Petitioners subsequently claimed that publicly available import data from the Department's IM–145 database contradicted Siderca's claims that no subject merchandise was entered for consumption during the POR. Petitioners asserted that Siderca was the only exporter of Argentine OCTG to the United States, and in fact entered a substantial quantity of OCTG during the POR. Specifically, petitioners claimed that 949.909 metric tons of Argentine OCTG were entered for consumption during the POR, and filed an affidavit claiming a sale was made from an FTZ to a U.S. company during the POR. Petitioners asked the Department to investigate these sales and to require Siderca to report all U.S. and home market sales of OCTG made during the POR.

In response, Siderca indicated that it made no U.S. sales or consumption entries during the POR. Siderca claimed that all of its shipments to the United States were FTZ or TIB entries, and were destined for re-export. Siderca indicated it had no knowledge of its customers having entered covered merchandise into the United States for consumption. Siderca argued that if any such entries occurred, they could not be the basis for a review of Siderca. Siderca emphasized that all customers are aware of Siderca's policy prohibiting entry of subject merchandise into the United States. Siderca asserted that entries appearing on the IM–145 were in error, and were most likely TIB entries mistakenly classified as consumption entries. Siderca also indicated that the entries in question could have been classified under the wrong HTS number. For several of the entries listed by petitioners, Siderca claimed that due to grade specification or dimensions, the merchandise was incapable of being produced in Argentina. (*See* November 12, 1997 submission at 9.)

On December 22, 1997, petitioners disputed Siderca's claim that it was unaware of any consumption entries of OCTG from Argentina, and that, regardless of Siderca's policy, as the sole producer of OCTG in Argentina, Siderca was responsible for any U.S. shipments entered for consumption during the POR.

The Department issued a supplemental questionnaire on March 18, 1998, requesting additional information on Siderca's FTZ or TIB shipments during the period.

Siderca provided sales documentation for all transactions during the POR indicating that all of its sales were either sold directly to a third country, were TIB entries for re-export to a third country, were FTZ entries for re-export to a third country, or were transportation and exportation (T&E) entries for re-export to a third country. As a condition of these types of entries Siderca is required to document to U.S. Customs the final disposition of the merchandise, and to confirm that all shipments are in fact re-exported.

On March 20, 1998, the Department forwarded a no-shipment inquiry to the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) for circulation to all Customs ports. Customs did not indicate to the Department that there was any record of consumption entries of OCTG by Siderca during the POR. On April 23, 1998, the Department requested additional information from Customs regarding one Siderca entry appearing in the Department's IM–115 database. Customs subsequently confirmed that the entry was in fact a TIB entry and one that had been misclassified as subject merchandise. (*See* memorandum to the file, Customs Confirmation of Siderca Entry, August 24, 1998.) Given Customs' confirmation that there were no consumption entries of Argentine OCTG, and documentation provided by Siderca (purchase orders and invoices) that all of its sales of OCTG during the POR were either TIB entries, FTZ entries for re-export to third countries, or direct sales to third countries, there is no evidence on the record of this review of any consumption entries of Argentine OCTG during the POR. In conclusion, the Department determines that none of Siderca's sales of subject merchandise were entered into the United States for consumption during the POR and, thus, there are no entries to review.

Because Siderca was the only firm for which a review was requested and it had no U.S. entries for consumption of covered merchandise during the POR, there is no basis for continuing this administrative review. We therefore are rescinding this review in accordance with section 351.213(d)(3) of the Department's regulations.

The issue of whether couplings and coupling stock are included within the scope of the antidumping duty order on OCTG from Argentina was originally raised by the petitioners in the context of this administrative review. Because we have determined pursuant to section 351.225(d) of the Department's regulations that the section 351.225(k)(1) analysis is dispositive that couplings and coupling stock are outside the scope of the order, we have issued separately a final scope ruling to that effect. (*See* Final Scope Ruling—Antidumping Duty Order on Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina, August 28, 1998.)

Finally, our decision to rescind this review renders moot the petitioners' request for a duty absorption inquiry.

The cash deposit rate for all firms will continue to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding (*i.e.*, 1.36 percent).

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 351.221.

Dated: August 28, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–24600 Filed 9–11–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of process to revoke Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 92–00004.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to J.J. Wheeling (d/b/a Aidex). Because this certificate holder has failed to file an annual report as required by law, the Department is initiating proceedings to revoke the certificate. This notice summarizes the notification letter sent to J.J. Wheeling (d/b/a Aidex).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (''the Act'') [15 U.S.C. 4011–21] authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue export trade certificates of review. The regulations implementing Title III (''the Regulations'') are found at 15 CFR part 325. Pursuant to this authority, a certificate of review was issued on May 13, 1992 to J.J. Wheeling (d/b/a Aidex).

A certificate holder is required by law (Section 308 of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 4018) to submit to the Department of Commerce annual reports that update financial and other information relating to business activities covered by its certificate. The annual report is due within 45 days after the anniversary date of the issuance of the certificate of review (Sections 325.14(a) and (b) of the Regulations). Failure to submit a complete annual report may be the basis for revocation. (Sections 325.10(a) and 325.14(c) of the Regulations).

The Department of Commerce sent to J.J. Wheeling (d/b/a Aidex), on May 3, 1998, a letter containing annual report questions with a reminder that its annual report was due on June 27, 1998. Additional reminders were sent on July 1, 1998, and on July 27, 1998. The Department has received no written response to any of these letters.

On August 27, 1998, and in accordance with Section 325.10 (c)[1] of the Regulations, a letter was sent by certified mail to notify J.J. Wheeling (d/b/a Aidex) that the Department was formally initiating the process to revoke its certificate. The letter stated that this action is being taken because of the certificate holder's failure to file an annual report.

In accordance with Section 325.10(c)[2] of the Regulations, each certificate holder has thirty days from the day after its receipt of the notification letter in which to respond. The certificate holder is deemed to have received this letter as of the date on which this notice is published in the **Federal Register**. For good cause shown, the Department of Commerce can, at its discretion, grant a thirty-day extension for a response.

If the certificate holder decides to respond, it must specifically address the Department's statement in the notification letter that it has failed to file an annual report. It should state in detail why the facts, conduct, or circumstances described in the notification letter are not true, or if they are, why they do not warrant revoking the certificate. If the certificate holder does not respond within the specified period, it will be considered an admission of the statements contained in the notification letter (Section 325.10(c)[2] of the Regulations).

If the answer demonstrates that the material facts are in dispute, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice will, upon request, meet informally with the certificate holder. Either Department may require the certificate holder to provide the documents or information that are necessary to support its contentions (Section 325.10(c)[3] of the Regulations).

The Department will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** of the revocation or modification or a decision not to revoke or modify (Section 325.10(c)[4] of the Regulations). If there is a determination to revoke a certificate, any person aggrieved by such final decision may appeal to an appropriate U.S. district court within 30 days from the date on which the Department's final determination is published in the **Federal Register** (Sections 325.10(c)(4) and 325.11 of the Regulations).

Dated: September 3, 1998.

Morton Schnabel,

Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–24559 Filed 9–11–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (ETTAC)

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee will hold a plenary meeting from 8:30 AM until 11:30 PM on September 17, 1998. The ETTAC was created on May 31, 1994, to advise the U.S. government on policies and programs to expand U.S. exports of environmental products and services.

DATE AND PLACE: September 17, 1998; Room 3407 of the Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

The plenary meeting will review the objectives and agendas of its five subcommittee working groups: Market Access, Trade Impediments, Government Resources, Finance, and Outreach. There will also be an update on the APEC trade liberalization process, and updates from Environmental Trade Working Group members.

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Sage Chandler, Department of Commerce, Office of Environmental Technologies Exports. Phone: 202–482–1500

Dated: September 4, 1998.

Carlos Montoulieu,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Environmental Technologies Exports.

[FR Doc. 98–24620 Filed 9–11–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 970725180–8168–02]

RIN 0693–ZA16

Request for Comments on Candidate Algorithms for the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES)

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; Request for comments.

SUMMARY: A process to develop a Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) for Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) specifying an Advanced Encryption Algorithm (AEA) has been initiated by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Earlier this year, candidate algorithms were nominated to NIST for consideration for inclusion in the AES. Those candidate algorithms meeting the minimum acceptability criteria have been announced by NIST and are available electronically at the address listed below.

This notice solicits comments on the candidate algorithms from the public, and academic and research communities, manufacturers, voluntary standards organizations, and Federal, state, and local government organizations. These comments will