

determining whether water is included in the factory overhead value in the *RBIB*, and thus no basis for an adjustment. Therefore, in the final results, we are continuing to value water for ZWG's factory in accordance with the Department's practice in the previous segments of this case, as well as its position in previous cases.

*Comment 14: Aberrational Factor Values.*

Respondent asserts that the Department should not use data from the June 1996 *MFTI* to value trisodium phosphate (HTS 2835.23.00), cases, boxes, crates, and drums (HTS 4415.10.00), and pallets and load boards (HTS 4415.20.00), because respondent claims that the data are aberrational.

*Department's Position:* We agree with respondent's assertion that the value in the June 1996 *MFTI* for trisodium phosphate, HTS 2835.23.00, is aberrational, apparently due to the extraordinarily low quantity reported. Because we could not obtain more contemporaneous data to value trisodium phosphate, we have continued to use the March 1996 issue of *MFTI*, covering the period April 1995 through March 1996.

Respondent's comments regarding the issue of the valuation of pallets using data in the June 1996 *MFTI* for cases, boxes, crates, and drums (HTS 4415.10.00), and pallets and load boards (HTS 4415.20.00), are moot because we did not value pallets using HTS 4415.10.00 or HTS 4415.20.00 in the final results. (See Comment 10.)

#### Additional Changes for the Final Results

For the final results of this review, we have updated most surrogate values based on *MFTI*. Additionally, we have updated the labor surrogate value using the 1996 *YLS*. (See Final Analysis Memo.)

#### Final Results of the Review

As a result of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of the review:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd ....	10/01/95–09/30/96	14.15

The Department shall determine, and the Customs service shall assess,

antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Individual differences between United States price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of HSLWs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for ZWG, which has a separate rate, and all ZWG exports through market-economy trading companies, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in these final results of review; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be 128.63 percent, the PRC rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation of this case; 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 shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final 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 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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34.(d)(1). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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 353.22.

Dated: November 10, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97–30397 Filed 11–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–580–807]

#### Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip From the Republic of Korea, Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received information sufficient to warrant initiation of a changed circumstances administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from Korea (56 FR 25669 (June 5, 1991)). On July 5, 1996, Cheil Synthetics, Inc. (Cheil) was revoked from the order based on three consecutive years of no dumping. (See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Notice of Revocation in Part*, 61 FR 35177 (July 5, 1996).) Based on information provided in its September 29, 1997 letter, we preliminarily determine that Saehan Industries, Inc. (Saehan) is the successor firm to Cheil, and therefore, the Department's revocation of Cheil applies to Saehan.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 19, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael J. Heaney at (202) 482–4475 or Linda Ludwig at (202) 482–3833, AD/CVD Enforcement Office Eight, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

#### 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 by the Uruguay

Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR 351 (62 FR 27296).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On September 29, 1997, Saehan requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act to determine whether Saehan should properly be considered the successor firm to Cheil and if, as such, the revocation issued for Cheil should apply to Saehan. Saehan also requested the Department to publish the preliminary results concurrently with this notice of initiation, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). In its request, Saehan notified the Department that on February 28, 1997, Cheil officially changed its corporate name to Saehan, and despite this change in corporate name, the management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer base of Saehan are virtually identical to those of the former Cheil. In support of its claim, Saehan submitted documentary evidence demonstrating that Saehan maintained essentially the same management, production facilities, supplier, and customer relationships as Cheil. Citing the Department's determinations in *Sugars and Syrups from Canada; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 61 FR 48885 (Sept. 17, 1996) and *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 58 FR 59010 (Nov. 5, 1993), Saehan claimed that the Department should determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Cheil.

##### Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate, film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films, and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States subheading

3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

This changed circumstances administrative review covers Saehan.

##### Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Tariff Act, as amended (the Act), the Department is initiating a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether Saehan is the successor company to Cheil. In making such a determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in (1) management, (2) production facilities, (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. *See e.g., Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992). While no one or several of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if its resulting operation is similar to that of the predecessor. *See e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel, Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same entity as the former company, the Department will treat the successor company the same as the predecessor for purposes of antidumping liability, e.g., assign the same cash deposit rate, revocation, etc.

We have examined the information provided by Saehan in its September 29, 1997 letter and determined that Saehan has established a *prima facie* case that it is the successor-in-interest to Cheil. The management and organizational structure of the former Cheil has remained intact under Saehan, and there have been no changes in the production facilities, supplier relationships, or customer base. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that Saehan has maintained the same management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer bases as did Cheil.

Based upon the foregoing, we preliminarily determine that the July 5, 1996 revocation issued for Cheil applies to Saehan. Because Saehan has presented evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of its successorship status, we find it appropriate to issue the preliminary results in combination with

the notice of initiation in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii).

Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, which will include the results of its analysis raised in any such written comments.

This initiation of review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)), and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: November 12, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-30388 Filed 11-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-502]

#### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 19, 1997.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review for the antidumping order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, "the Act").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Totaro or Dorothy Woster, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482-1398 or 482-3362, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not