February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997. However, the Department incorrectly referenced the **Federal Register** notice covering the final results of the February 1, 1995 through January 31, 1996 POR in this notice. Specifically, the notice reads, ''On March 13, 1997, the Department published the final results of its administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on heavy forged hand tools, finished or unfinished, with or without handles (HFHTs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (62 FR 11813). These reviews cover five manufacturers/exporters and the period of review (POR) is February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997.'' Although the POR stated (1996–1997) was correct, the date of the publication for that determination was incorrect.

Pursuant to the Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.224(e), we correct this statement in the above-referenced notice to read as follows: ''On *April 6, 1998,* the Department published the final results of its administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on heavy forged hand tools, finished or unfinished, with or without handles (HFHTs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (63 FR 16758). These reviews cover five manufacturers/exporters and the period of review (POR) is February 1, 1996, through January 31, 1997.''

Dated: December 30, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–248 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–818]

Certain Pasta from Italy: Final Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On October 6, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. The review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States by Corex during the period July 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997. These final results do not differ from the preliminary results.

We find that Corex did not make sales below normal value during the period of review. We will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on certain pasta produced and exported by this company.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley or John Brinkmann, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0631 or (202) 482–5288, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1997).

Case History

On March 4, 1998, in response to a request by CO.R.EX. S.r.l, (Corex), the Department initiated a new shipper review.

On October 6, 1998, the Department published the preliminary results of this review. *See Notice of Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 53641 (*Preliminary Results*). From September 28, through October 2, 1998, we verified the information submitted by Corex. On November 3, 1998, we received a case brief from Corex. We did not receive comments from any other interested party.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds (2.27 kilograms) or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastases, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this scope is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons or polyethylene or polypropylene bags, of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the scope of this review are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white. Also excluded are imports of organic pasta from Italy that are accompanied by the appropriate certificate issued by the Instituto Mediterraneo Di Certificazione (IMC), by Bioagricoop Scrl, or by QC&I International Services.

The merchandise subject to review is currently classifiable under subheading 1902.19.20 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 merchandise under order is dispositive.

Scope Rulings

On August 25, 1997, the Department issued a scope ruling that multicolored pasta, imported in kitchen display bottles of decorative glass that are sealed with cork or paraffin and bound with raffia, is excluded from the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. *See* Memorandum from Edward Easton to Richard Moreland, dated August 25, 1997. In addition, the Department issued a scope ruling on July 30, 1998, that multipacks consisting of six one-pound packages of pasta that are shrink wrapped into a single package are within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. (*See* July 30, 1998 letter from Susan H. Kuhbach, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration to Barbara P. Sidari, Vice President, Joseph A. Sidari Company, Inc.).

On October 23, 1997, the petitioners [1] filed an application requesting that the Department initiate an anti-circumvention investigation against Barilla S.r.L., an Italian producer and exporter of pasta. On October 5, 1998, the Department issued its final determination that, pursuant to section 781(a) of the Act, circumvention of the antidumping duty order is occurring by reason of exports of bulk pasta from Italy produced by Barilla which subsequently are repackaged in the United States into packages of five pounds or less for sale in the United States. (*See Anti-circumvention Inquiry of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy: Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order,* 63 FR 54672 (October 13, 1998)).

On October 26, 1998, we self-initiated a scope inquiry to determine whether a package weighing over five pounds as a result of allowable industry tolerances may be within the scope of the

[1] Borden Foods Corp., Hershey Pasta and Grocery Group, and Gooch Foods Inc.

antidumping and countervailing duty orders. On November 18, 1998, the Department received comments regarding this scope inquiry. The Department received rebuttal comments on November 30, 1998. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(f)(5), the Department will issue a scope ruling within 120 days of the initiation of the inquiry.

Price Comparisons

We calculated export price (EP) and normal value based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results,* with the following exception:

We used a revised credit rate to calculate an imputed credit expense for U.S. and Australian sales, both of which were priced in Italian Lire (*see* memorandum from Constance Handley to the file, *Analysis Memorandum for CO.R.EX. S.r.l.,* (December 18,1998)).

Analysis of Comment Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. As noted above, we received one comment from Corex.

Comment 1: Commissions

Corex notes that during verification Department officials learned of commissions on Australian sales which Corex had inadvertently failed to include in its database. Corex notes further that the Department officials requested information relating to Corex's indirect selling expenses. Claiming there is no reason to believe that the information was ever intentionally withheld, Corex requests that this information be used in calculating the final margin.

DOC Position:

We are not including the information found at verification because inclusion of the information would not affect the final margin.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following margin exists for the period July 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Corex	0.0

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results,* because Corex is primarily a trading company, any entries of merchandise exported by Corex must identify Corex as the producer in order for the deposit rate established in this review to apply. If Corex is the exporter but not the producer, the deposit rate will be the rate for the identified producer. Otherwise, the ''all others'' rate will apply.

Therefore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of new shipper administrative review, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Corex, when identified as the producer, will be zero; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 11.26 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR part 351 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 29, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–244 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–059]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape From Italy

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping finding on pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy (63 FR 46410) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). On the basis of a Notice of Intent to Participate and a complete substantive response filed on behalf of the domestic industry, and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping finding would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th St. & Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 6, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to section 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders,* 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) (''*Sunset Regulations*''). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the