will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such case briefs.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated an importer-specific assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total entered value of the examined sales. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Filati, Heveafil, Rubberflex, and Rubfil will be the rates established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, de minimis within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106, 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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.16 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These 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(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 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 351.213.

Dated: November 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29850 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–802]

Notice of Postponement of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review: Gray Portland Cement and Clinker from Mexico

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Krawczun, William Zapf or Richard Rimlinger, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0198, (202) 482–0180 or (202) 482–4477, respectively.

Postponement of Final Results of Review

On September 25, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an antidumping administrative review of the antidumping duty order on gray portland cement and clinker from Mexico (62 FR 50292). On September 10, 1998, we issued our preliminary results of review (63 FR 48471). The final results of review are currently due January 8, 1998. Due to an increase in case assignments, we transferred this case, on October 1, 1998, to another team of Department personnel for calculation of the final results. This transfer requires time for the newly assigned team to become familiar with the case. Also, the current final due date conflicts with several existing deadlines of the new team. For these reasons, we have determined that completion of the review within 120 days from the publication of our preliminary results of review is not currently practicable and, therefore, we are postponing the deadline for issuing these final results of review until no later than March 9, 1999.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: November 2, 1998.

Susan Kuhbach,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29997 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–822]

Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that sales of certain helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China were made below normal value during the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or Vincent Kane, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3464 or 482–2815, respectively.

Applicable Statute

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, as amended (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 are to 19 CFR part 351 et. seq. *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule,* 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Background

On October 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers (HSLWs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (58 FR 53914). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on October 2, 1997 (62 FR 51628). The

petitioner, Shakeproof Industrial Products Division of Illinois Tool Works, Inc., and the respondent, Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co. (ZWG) (also known as Hangzhou Spring Washer Plant), requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of ZWG. These requests were received on October 24 and 27, 1997, respectively. The notice of initiation of this administrative review was published on November 26, 1997 (62 FR 63069). On July 10, 1998, the Department extended the time limits for completion of the preliminary results in this proceeding until October 31, 1998 (*See* 63 FR 37328).

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with Section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are HSLWs of carbon steel, of carbon alloy steel, or of stainless steel, heat-treated or non-heat-treated, plated or non-plated, with ends that are off-line. HSLWs are designed to: (1) Function as a spring to compensate for developed looseness between the component parts of a fastened assembly; (2) distribute the load over a larger area for screws or bolts; and, (3) provide a hardened bearing surface. The scope does not include internal or external tooth washers, nor does it include spring lock washers made of other metals, such as copper.

HSLWs subject to this review are currently classifiable under subheading 7318.21.0030 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers the period from October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified sales and factor information provided by ZWG in Xiaoshan, PRC, using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of its facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. The findings at verification are detailed in the verification report dated October 15, 1998, the public version of which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B099 of the Main Commerce building (CRU-Public File).

Separate Rates Determination

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this policy, exporters in non-market economies (NMEs) are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with the individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and, (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: (1) Whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and, (4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. (*See Silicon Carbide,* 59 FR at 22587 and *Sparklers,* 56 FR at 20589.)

In each of the previous administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on HSLWs from the PRC, covering successive review periods from October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1996, we determined that ZWG merited a separate rate. We have found that the evidence on the record of this review also demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to ZWG's export activities according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers,* and an absence of government control with respect to the additional criteria identified in *Silicon Carbide.* Therefore, we have continued to assign ZWG a separate rate.

Export Price

Because ZWG sold the subject merchandise to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and Constructed Export Price methodology is not otherwise indicated, we have used export price in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act.

We calculated export price based on the f.o.b. price to unaffiliated purchasers. From this price, we deducted amounts for foreign inland freight and brokerage and handling. We valued these deductions using surrogate country cost data. We selected India as the surrogate country for the reasons explained in the ''Normal Value'' section of this notice.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine normal value (NV) using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) The merchandise is exported from an NME, and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act. The Department has treated the PRC as an NME in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Moreover, parties to this proceeding have not argued that the PRC HSLWs industry is a market-oriented industry (MOI) and, consequently, we have no basis to determine that the information would permit the calculation of NV using PRC prices or costs. Therefore, we calculated NV based on factors of production (FOP) in accordance with sections 773(c)(3) and (4) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.408(c).

Under the FOP methodology, we are required to value the NME producer's inputs in a comparable market economy country that is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. We determined that India is at a comparable level of economic development to that of the PRC. Also, India is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. Therefore, for this review, we have used Indian prices to value the FOP except where the factor was purchased from a market economy supplier and paid for in a market economy currency. (*See* Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach from Jeff May, dated March 5, 1998, ''Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the

PRC: Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' which is on file in the CRU-Public File.)

We selected, where possible, publicly available values from India which were: (1) Average non-export values; (2) representative of a range of prices within the POR or most contemporaneous with the POR; (3) product-specific; and, (4) tax-exclusive. We valued the factors of production as follows:

- A meaningful amount of the input carbon steel wire rod was purchased from the United Kingdom, a market economy supplier, and paid for in a market economy currency. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.408(c)(1), we valued this factor using the price paid to the market economy supplier. Thus, for carbon steel wire rod values, we used the average cost per metric ton of carbon steel wire rod imported from the United Kingdom by ZWG during the period of review. We made further deductions to account for the freight costs incurred between the port and ZWG.
- For the value of chemicals used in the production and plating process of HSLWs, we used per kilogram values obtained from the Indian publication *Chemical Weekly* and from the *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India-Imports (MFTI).* We adjusted these values, where appropriate, to reflect inflation through the POR using the Wholesale Price Index (WPI) as reported in the *International Financial Statistics* published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We also adjusted these values to account for freight costs incurred between the supplier and ZWG.
- For labor, we used the regression-based wage rate for the PRC in ''Expected Wages of Selected NME Countries,'' located on the Internet at http://www.ita.doc.gov/import__admin/records/wages/. Because of the variability of wage rates in countries with similar per capita GDP's, 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3) of the Department's regulations requires the use of a regression-based wage rate. The source for the regression based-wage rates is ''Expected Wages of Selected NME Countries—1995 Income Data,'' *1996 Year Book of Labour Statistics,* International Labour Office, (Geneva: 1996) Chapter 5B: Wages in Manufacturing.
- For factory overhead, selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit values, we used information from the January, 1997 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* for the Indian industry group ''Processing and Manufacturing: Metals, Chemicals, and Products Thereof.'' From this information, we were able to determine factory overhead as a percentage of the total cost of manufacturing, SG&A as a percentage of the total cost of manufacturing, and the profit rate as a percentage of the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A.
- For packing materials, we used the per kilogram values obtained from the *MFTI.* Where necessary, we adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. We also adjusted them to account for freight costs incurred between the PRC supplier and ZWG.
- To value coal, we used a per kilogram value obtained from the *MFTI.* We adjusted this value to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. We also adjusted this amount to account for freight costs incurred between the supplier and ZWG.
- To value electricity, we used the price of electricity for 1995 reported in the *1995 Confederation of Indian Industries Handbook of Statistics.* We adjusted the value to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value water, we used the November, 1993 *Water Utilities Data Book for the Asian and Pacific Region* published by the Asian Development Bank. We adjusted the value to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value foreign brokerage and handling, we used information reported in the *Less Than Fair Value Investigation of Stainless Steel Bar from India* in a document dated April 22, 1994.
- To value truck freight, we used a rate derived from the April 20, 1994 issue of *The Times of India.* We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value rail freight, we used rate information published by the Indian Railway Conference Association for rates in force from April 1, 1995. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value shipping freight, we used a rate reported to the Department in the August, 1993 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India which was submitted for and used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China,* 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993). We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

For a complete description of the factor values used, *see* ''Memorandum to File: Factor Values Used for the Preliminary Results of the Fourth Administrative Review,'' dated November 2, 1998 (Factors Memorandum) a public version of which is available in the Public File.

Additionally, we adjusted the reported figure for indirect labor based on our findings at verification, *see* ''Memorandum to File: Calculation Notes for Preliminary Results,'' dated November 2, 1998, a public version of which is available in the Public File.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd	10/01/96–09/30/97	4.29

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 44 days after the publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written comments (case briefs) within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal comments (rebuttal briefs), which must be 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 by the parties, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated an importer-

specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total value of the subject merchandise entered during the POR. In order to estimate the entered value, we subtracted international movement expenses from the gross sales value. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that specific importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of HSLWs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For ZWG, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate, which is 128.63 percent, which is the All Other PRC Manufacturers, Producers and Exporters rate from the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC*, 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993); and (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 doubled antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 771(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 3, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29995 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–805]

Industrial Nitrocellulose From the Republic of Korea; Notice of 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.

SUMMARY: On July 10, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose (INC) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, 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 to 19 CFR Part 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 10, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 37329) the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping order on industrial nitrocellulose (INC) from Korea, 55 FR 28267 (July 10, 1990). On August 10, 1998, we received a case brief from Daesang Corporation (respondent) as well as comments from Hercules Incorporated (petitioner). Based on our analysis of the comments received, we changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of INC from Korea. 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 System (HTS) subheading 3912.20.00. While the HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of industrial nitrocellulose, Daesang Corporation, and period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1

Daesang states that the Department made a clerical error in its preliminary results computer programming by erroneously adding both the commission offset (OFFSETU) and U.S. indirect selling expenses (INDEXUS) in its calculation of foreign net price expressed in dollars (FUPDOL). Daesang states that OFFSETU correctly accounted for home market commissions on two of the three matching control numbers (CONNUMs) for the U.S. sales, which had no commissions. Adding the variable INDEXUS in the calculation of FUPDOL would lead to a double counting of the commission offset. While petitioner did not comment on this specific issue, petitioner supports the Department's Preliminary Determination.

Department's Position

We agree with Daesang Corporation that home market commissions or U.S. indirect selling expenses, whichever is less, have been accounted for in U.S. offsets (OFFSETU) applied to FUPDOL, and have revised our programming language accordingly for these final results.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following margin exists: