March 1, 1991 through February 29, 1992 (fifth review), and March 1, 1992 through February 28, 1993 (sixth review).

For a detailed description of the products covered by this order, see the final results of review referenced above.

On August 7, 1995, the petitioners, Hussey Copper, Ltd., The Miller Company, Outokumpu American Brass, Revere Copper Products, Inc., International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, International Union, Allied Industrial Workers of America (AFL-CIO), Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56), and the United Steelworkers of America, alleged that in calculating the final antidumping duty margins the Department committed the ministerial errors described below. The Department found the allegations constituted ministerial errors (see memo from the case analyst to Wendy Frankel dated February 9, 1996). However, because the petitioners filed suit with the CIT before we could correct this error, we were unable to make the corrections and publish the amended final results of reviews. Subsequently, the CIT granted the Department leave to correct these ministerial errors.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Ministerial Errors in Final Results of Review

1990–1991 Administrative Review

Comment 1: The petitioners allege that in the final results the Department incorrectly inserted a line of programming which adjusted Wieland's credit expenses based on the ratio between Wieland's U.S. deposit rate and Wieland's German short-term borrowing rate, whereas in our notice of final results we stated that we used the U.S. prime rate to calculate Wieland's imputed U.S. credit expenses for this period.

Department's Position: We have reviewed the questionnaire responses, case briefs, and computer programs, and we agree that including the line of programming in question was a clerical error. Accordingly, we have removed the incorrect line of programming for these amended final results.

Comment 2: The petitioners allege that in the cost test, the Department failed to subtract after-sale rebates and home market freight charges from home market prices, and failed to add home market packing expenses to cost of production.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners that it was a ministerial error to fail to deduct after-sale rebates and foreign inland freight expenses from price, and to fail to add packing expenses to costs, for the cost test. We have changed these portions of our analysis accordingly for these amended final results.

1991–1992 Administrative Review

Comment 3: The petitioners allege that the Department miscalculated the metal value for sales of alloy CDA250 by referring to the average value of two other alloys, one of which was CDA 260/M32; the petitioners argue that this last should have been CDA 260/M30.

Department's Position: We have reviewed the computer programs and we agree with the petitioners. We have corrected our analysis accordingly for these amended final results.

Comment 4: The petitioners allege that the Department did not use home market sales of alloy CDA 250 for comparison to U.S. sales in its computer program, despite our statement in the final results of review that we had used them.

Department's Position: We have reviewed the computer programs and we agree with the petitioners. Accordingly, we have corrected our analysis to include the appropriate computer language to allow for comparison of U.S. sales to home market sales of alloy CDA 250, where appropriate.

1991–1992 and 1992–1993 Administrative Reviews

Comment 5: The petitioners allege that in both reviews the Department incorrectly entered plus signs where minus signs should appear in the value-added tax adjustments for early payment discounts.

Department's Position: We have reviewed the computer programs, we agree with the petitioners, and we have corrected our analyses accordingly for these amended final results.

Amended Final Results of Reviews

After correcting the final results for these ministerial errors, the Department has determined that the following margins exist for the fourth, fifth, and sixth review periods:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Percent Margin
Wieland-Werke AG	3/1/90–2/28/91	2.57
	3/1/91–2/29/92	2.37
	3/1/92–2/28/93	0.46

Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the above percentages.

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR § 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the review periods. 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.

These administrative reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(f) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1673(d)) and section 353.28(c) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: April 23, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–10554 Filed 4–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 960409104–6104–01; I.D. 032596C]

Taking and Importing of Marine Mammals; Italy as a Large-Scale High Seas Driftnet Nation

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Identification of Large-Scale High Seas Driftnet Nation.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Court of International Trade ordered the Secretary of Commerce to identify Italy as a country for which there is reason to believe its nationals or vessels conduct large-scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any nation. The Secretary did so on March 28, 1996. As a result, the President is required to enter into consultations with Italy within 30 days after the identification to obtain an agreement that will effect the immediate termination of high seas large-scale driftnetting by Italian vessels and nationals. If consultations with Italy are not satisfactorily concluded, the importation into the United States of fish, fish products, and sportfishing equipment from Italy will be prohibited under the High Seas Driftnet Fisheries Enforcement Act (HSDFEA). Further, the Secretary of the Treasury has been

directed to deny entry of Italian large-scale driftnet vessels to U.S. ports and navigable waters. In addition, pursuant to the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (DPCIA), the importation of certain fish and fish products into the United States from Italy is prohibited, unless Italy certifies that such fish and fish products were not caught with large-scale driftnets anywhere on the high seas. This action furthers the U.S. policy to support a United Nations moratorium on high seas driftnet fishing, in part because of the harmful effects that such driftnets have on marine mammals, including dolphins.

EFFECTIVE DATES: Effective March 28, 1996, except for the documentation requirements of the DPCIA, which take effect on May 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wanda L. Cain, Fishery Biologist; telephone: 301–713–2055, or fax: 301–713–0376; or Paul Niemeier, Foreign Affairs Specialist; telephone: 301–713–2276, or fax: 301–713–2313.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The HSDFEA furthers the purposes of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215, which called for a worldwide ban on large-scale high seas driftnet fishing beginning December 31, 1992. On March 18, 1996, the U.S. Court of International Trade ordered the Secretary of Commerce to identify Italy as a country for which there is reason to believe its nationals or vessels conduct large scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any nation, pursuant to the HSDFEA (16 U.S.C. 1826a). On March 28, 1996, the Secretary notified the President that he had identified Italy as such a country. Italian officials were notified by the Department of State on March 29, 1996.

Pursuant to the HSDFEA, a chain of actions is triggered once the Secretary of Commerce notifies Italy that it has been identified as a large-scale high seas driftnet nation. If the consultations with Italy, described in the Summary, are not satisfactorily concluded within 90 days, the President must direct the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation into the United States of fish, fish products, and sport fishing equipment from Italy. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to implement such prohibitions within 45 days of the President's direction.

If the above sanctions are insufficient to persuade Italy to cease large-scale high seas driftnet fishing within 6 months, or Italy retaliates against the United States during that time as a result of the sanctions, the Secretary of Commerce is required to certify this fact to the President. Such a certification is deemed to be a certification under section 8(a) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978(a), also known as the Pelly Amendment). This authorizes the President to restrict imports of ''any products from the offending country for any duration'' to achieve compliance with the driftnet moratorium, so long as such action is consistent with U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The DPCIA (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(2)(E)) requires that an exporting nation whose fishing vessels engage in high seas driftnet fishing provide documentary evidence that certain fish or fish products it wishes to export to the United States were not harvested with a large-scale driftnet on the high seas. Importers are hereby notified that, effective May 29, 1996, all shipments from Italy containing fish and fish products specified in regulations at 50 CFR 216.24(e)(2) are subject to the importation requirements of the DPCIA. This delayed-effectiveness period allows shipments already in transit on March 28, 1996, to clear Customs, and allows adequate time for the appropriate forms to be made available to Italian exporters. These forms include NOAA Form 370, Fisheries Certificate of Origin, required by 50 CFR 216.24(e)(2). The Fisheries Certificate of Origin must accompany all imported shipments of an item with a Harmonized Tariff Schedule number for fish harvested by or imported from a large-scale driftnet nation. As part of those requirements, an official of the Government of Italy must certify that any such import does not contain fish harvested with large-scale driftnets anywhere on the high seas.

Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act, this collection of information has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under OMB Control No. 0648–0040. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to, a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Dated: April 22, 1996.

Gary Matlock,

Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 96–10470 Filed 4–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Cancellation of a Limit on Certain Wool Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in India

April 23, 1996.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs cancelling a limit.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 24, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Aldrich, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The United States Government has decided to rescind the restraint on imports of women's and girls' wool coats in Category 435 from India established on April 18, 1996, pursuant to Article 6.10 of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC).

In the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to cancel the limit established for Category 435 for the period April 18, 1996 through April 17, 1997.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see Federal Register notice 60 FR 65299, published on December 20, 1995). Also see 61 FR 16760, published on April 17, 1996.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

April 23, 1996.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on April 11, 1996, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain wool textile products, produced or manufactured in India and exported during the period which began