selling functions along the chain of distribution between those sales shipped directly from the plant and sales from the warehouse. Therefore, we determine that the two home market channels of distribution comprise a single level of trade.

Based on analysis of the different types of selling functions listed by respondent, relevant classes of customers, and selling expenses for both types of sales in the home and U.S. markets, the Department preliminarily determines that EP sales and home market sales are made at the same level of trade. For these sales, WWAG performs similar selling functions in both markets. However, the Department preliminarily determines that CEP sales are made at a different level of trade than EP sales and the home market sales.

In calculating CEP, certain adjustments are made pursuant to Section 772(c) and (d) of the Act. Specifically, Section 772(d) states that the price used to establish constructed export price are adjusted to remove expenses incurred by WWAG and WWUS in selling subject merchandise in the United States including inventory management, freight arrangements, and invoice processing to name a few. Therefore, when selling functions for CEP sales are compared with selling functions for home market sales, home market sales (NV) are more remote from factory than CEP sales (*i.e.*, that NV is at a more advance level of trade than CEP). Therefore a level of trade adjustment is warranted when comparing NV to CEP sales.

Section 773(a)(7)(B) states that a CEP offset is granted when NV is compared to CEP and NV is determined to be at a more advanced level of trade than the CEP, but the data available do not provide an appropriate basis to determine whether the difference in level of trade affects price comparability. *See* 19 CFR 351.412(f).

In the present case, as there is no level in the home market comparable to the CEP level and only one level of trade in the home market, the data does not exist to quantity a level of trade adjustment. As a result, the Department has preliminarily determined to grant WWAG an adjustment to NV in the form of a CEP offset.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A of the Act based on the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. *See* Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions, 61 FR 9434 (March 8, 1996).

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Wolff Walsrode AG (WWAG)	6.58

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may also request a hearing within ten days of publication. If requested, a hearing will be held as early as convenient for the parties but not later than 44 days after the date of publication or the first work day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. 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 of this notice. The Department will issue a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such briefs, 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. In accordance with the methodology in *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Termination of Administrative Review: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea* (62 FR 55574, October 27, 1997), we calculated exporter/importer-specific assessment values by dividing the total dumping duties due for each importer by the number of tons used to determine the duties due. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-ton dollar amount against each ton of the merchandise entered by these importers during the review period.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review 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 case deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review (except no cash deposit will be required where weighted-average margin is *de minimis, i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent); (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received an individual rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous 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; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 3.84 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 2, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–9432 Filed 4–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–506]

Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware From The People's Republic of China; Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On January 26, 1998, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 3702) its notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from the People's Republic of China covering

the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997. This review has now been rescinded at the request of the respondent.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Lorenza Olivas, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations as set forth at 19 CFR § 353.1, *et seq.*, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

Pursuant to 19 CFR § 351.213(d) of the Department of Commerce's (the Department) regulations, on December 24, 1997, the respondent in this case, Clover Enamelware Enterprise Ltd., a manufacturer/exporter, and its third-country reseller, Lucky Enamelware Factory Limited (together, the respondent), requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from the People's Republic of China, published in the **Federal Register** on December 2, 1986 (51 FR 43414). On January 26, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 3702) its notice of initiation of the antidumping review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from the People's Republic of China, covering the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997.

Rescission of Review

On February 27, 1998, the respondent withdrew its request for administrative review. Section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations provides that ''[t]he Secretary will rescind an administrative review under this section, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review.'' See 19 CFR § 351.213(d)(1) (1997). Because the only party which requested a review has withdrawn its request within the regulatory time limit, we are now rescinding this review. The cash deposit rate will continue to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751 and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. § 1675 (1995); (19 U.S.C. § 1677f(i) (1995) and 19 CFR § 351.213(d)(4)).

Dated: April 3, 1998.

Maria Harris Tildon,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–9437 Filed 4–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–825]

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in response to requests from the petitioner, Union Camp Corporation, and four respondents: Tianjin Chemicals Import and Export Corporation (Tianjin), Guangdong Chemicals Import and Export Corporation (Guangdong), Sinochem International Chemicals Company, Ltd. (SICC) and Sinochem Jiangsu Import and Export Corporation (Jiangsu). This review covers four exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV) during this period. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the United States price (USP) and NV. These assessment rates, if adopted for the final results of the review, will be calculated on an importer-specific *ad valorem* duty basis. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 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.

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 Rounds 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, published on May 19, 1997.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC on July 14, 1995 (59 FR 35909). On July 21, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 38973) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC covering the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997.

On July 30, 1997, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), Union Camp requested that we conduct an administrative review of Tianjin, Guangdong, SICC, and Jiangsu. On July 29, 1997, Tianjin, Guangdong and SICC requested that we conduct an administrative review. Also on July 29, 1997, Tianjin has requested partial revocation of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC. However, because we have preliminarily determined a margin of 3.53 percent for Tianjin, which is above the Department's *de minimis* standard of 0.5 percent, we preliminarily determine that Tianjin has not met the requirements for revocation. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on August 28, 1997 (62 FR 45621). On August 30, 1997, we issued questionnaires to the four respondents. Jiangsu did not respond to the Department's questionnaire. The Department is conducting this