

or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: April 1, 1998.

Maria Harris Tildon,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-9686 Filed 4-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-811]

Steel Wire Rope From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review and revocation in part of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On December 5, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1996-97 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea and intent to revoke in part (62 FR 64354) (Preliminary Results). The review covers 15 manufacturers/exporters for the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997 (the POR). We have analyzed the comments received on our preliminary results and no changes in the calculated margin are required. However, we have changed the adverse facts available rate. The final weighted-average dumping margins for each of the reviewed firms are listed in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Brinkmann at (202) 482-5288 or James Kemp at (202) 482-0116; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 353 (1997).

Background

On December 5, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its 1996-97 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from the Republic of Korea and intent to revoke in part. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. A case brief was filed by the petitioner, the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Specialty Cable Manufacturers (the Committee); rebuttal briefs were filed by four respondents—Chung-Woo Rope Co., Ltd. (Chung Woo), Kumho Wire Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Kumho), Ssang Yong Cable Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Ssang Yong), and Sung Jin Company (Sung Jin). There was no request for a hearing.

We have conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Revocation In Part

Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin have sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (NV) for four consecutive review periods,¹ including this review.² They have also submitted certifications that they will not sell at less than NV in the future, along with an agreement for immediate reinstatement of the order if such sales occur. Further, on the basis of no sales at less than NV for these periods and the lack of any indication that such sales are likely in the future, we have determined that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin are not likely to sell the merchandise at less than NV in the future. Accordingly, we are revoking the order for Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung

¹ Section 353.25(a)(2) of the Department's regulations provides that a respondent may be eligible for revocation after a period of three years with no sales at less than fair value. However, Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin did not request revocation until the fourth review.

² Kumho also requested revocation, but later withdrew the request.

Jin. Also, see our discussion in response to Comment 1.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is steel wire rope. Steel wire rope encompasses ropes, cables, and cordage of iron or carbon steel, other than stranded wire, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, and not made up of brass-plated wire. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090. Excluded from this review is stainless steel wire rope, i.e., ropes, cables and cordage other than stranded wire, of stainless steel, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, which is classifiable under HTS subheading 7312.10.6000. Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

In the preliminary results of this review, we determined, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of adverse facts available is appropriate for Boo Kook Corporation, Dong-Il Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Jinyang Wire Rope Inc., and Yeon Sin Metal because they did not respond to our antidumping questionnaire. None of these parties commented on this preliminary determination, nor have any arguments been presented which would cause us to reconsider the appropriateness of assigning margins based on adverse facts available in the final results.

In the April 9, 1997, final results of the last review (See Steel Wire Rope From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order, 62 FR 17171, 1997) and in the preliminary results of the review, we stated our intent to reconsider the appropriateness of the facts available rate (1.51 percent) used in prior reviews.

Over the course of this proceeding, the Department has faced a pattern of continuous noncompliance on the part of a number of uncooperative respondents³ that received facts available. Therefore, we have concluded that the magnitude of the rate in place for the three prior reviews does not offer the adequate sanction to induce the respondents to cooperate in the

³ We have applied facts available to seven companies in the first review, five companies in the second review, three companies in the third review and four companies in the instant review.

proceeding. Moreover, if and when an interested party requests a review of Korean steel wire rope companies not previously reviewed, the Department needs to have in place a potential facts available rate that is sufficiently adverse to induce the cooperation of these companies.

The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) recognizes the importance of facts available as an investigative tool in antidumping duty proceedings. The Department's potential use of facts available provides the only incentive to foreign exporters and producers to respond to the Department's questionnaires. See SAA at 868. Section 776(b) of the Act states that the Department may draw an adverse inference where the party has not acted to the best of its ability to comply with the requests for necessary information. The Department applies adverse inferences to ensure that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully. One factor the Department considers in applying facts available is the extent to which a party may benefit from its own lack of participation. See SAA at 870.

We invited interested parties to supply specific data that the Department could consider in the event that we chose to establish a facts available rate that would be more appropriate to this segment of the proceeding. In response to this request for information, the Committee, in its case brief, requested that we use the simple average of the dumping margins from the petition (136.72) as adverse facts available. The respondents did not comment on this issue.

In order to consider fully this issue, we placed a copy of the petition on the record of this administrative review. In our analysis of the petition, we re-examined the bases for the initial dumping allegation. Based on this re-examination, we determined that the price-to-price sales used in the petition calculation are, with one adjustment, appropriate for use as adverse facts available in this review. The information we obtained during the current review indicates that Korean producers manufacture steel wire rope known as "commercial grade cable" or "aircraft grade cable," which differs from steel wire rope built to more demanding Military Specification (Mil Spec). Additionally, company officials interviewed during verification stated that they were not aware of any Korean steel wire rope manufacturers that have been certified to sell Mil Spec. steel wire rope in the United States. See Memo to the File, April 2, 1998.

Information in the petition, however, indicates that some of the price-to-price comparisons, involved Mil Spec sales. Accordingly, we adjusted the petition margin by excluding those sales, and calculated a simple average margin equal to 13.79 percent.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall in using facts otherwise available, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The SAA provides that "corroborate" means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. See H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d sess. 870 (1994). To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, where corroboration is not practicable, the Department may use uncorroborated information. See Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From The People's Republic of China, 62 FR 31972 (1997).

To corroborate the export prices in the petition, we compared them to U.S. Customs (Customs) import statistics from 1991 for the HTS subheadings 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090. However, we concluded that the Customs data was not comparable to the prices in the petition, because the Customs data encompasses a wide range of steel wire rope products, while the sales in the petition consist of a small number of specific product types. See Memo to the File, April 6, 1998. With regard to the normal values used in the petition's margin calculation, we were provided with no useful information by interested parties, and are aware of no other independent sources of information, which would assist us in this aspect of the corroboration process.

Notwithstanding the difficulties encountered in our attempts to corroborate the information from the petition, the Department has no evidence that suggests the petition does not have probative value. Accordingly, we determine that the information from the petition is the most appropriate basis for facts available. We note that the SAA specifically states that "the fact that corroboration may not be practicable in a given circumstance will not prevent the agencies from applying an adverse inference under subsection (b)." See SAA at 870. Moreover, the SAA emphasizes that the Department need not prove that the facts available

are the best alternative information. SAA at 869.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of steel wire rope to the United States were made at less than fair value for Chung Woo, Kumho, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin, we compared the export price to the normal value, as described in the preliminary results of this review.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: The Committee contends that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin failed to establish the second of three requisite regulatory criteria for revocation of an antidumping duty order. Specifically, the Committee argues that the burden is on the respondent requesting revocation to demonstrate, by placing substantial evidence on the record, that there is no likelihood of a resumption of sales at less than fair value and that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin failed to demonstrate this. Additionally, the Committee argues, citing *Tatung Co. v. United States*, 18 CIT 1137, 1144 (1994) (*Tatung Company*), that the fact that respondents have not sold subject merchandise at less than normal value in past administrative reviews does not establish that there is no likelihood these companies will begin dumping subject merchandise in the future.

Furthermore, the Committee contends that the Department cannot not revoke the order with respect to Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin based on the results of the last three reviews because of the instability caused by the recent economic crisis in Korea. According to the Committee, the economic crisis has created an environment that makes it impossible for the Department to determine that these three companies will not begin dumping subject merchandise in the U.S. market.

The depreciation of the won, according to the Committee, will facilitate the respondents' task of remaining price competitive and retaining market share in the short-term. However, the Committee contends the Korean economy will reverse course as the economic assistance package provided by the IMF begins to take effect. Furthermore, the Committee argues that an economic turnaround in Korea accompanied by appreciation of the won will create downward pressure on the price of steel wire rope as the Korean producers attempt to maintain the same price levels to satisfy their U.S. customers and retain market share in the face of competition from companies in other Asian nations. The Committee claims that the market forces created by

such a turnaround in the Korean economy will force Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin to dump merchandise in the U.S. market.

Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin respond that they have satisfied all three requisite criteria for revocation at 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2). They claim that the Department has granted revocation in virtually every case where a respondent has established three consecutive years of no dumping and furnished the required certifications. They argue that this is in accordance with the long standing policy that antidumping duty orders "shall remain in force only as long and to the extent necessary to counteract dumping which is causing injury." Color Television Receiver Except for Video Monitors, from Taiwan; Final Results, 55 FR 47093, 47097 (1990); Uruguay Round Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article 11 Antidumping Agreement.

Respondents cite *Tatung Company*, where the court found that past behavior constitutes substantial evidence of expected future behavior and a *de minimis* margin for three consecutive years serves as a reliable predictor for future pricing behavior. Based on this ruling, according to respondents, Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin should not be expected to sell steel wire rope at less than normal value in the future because they have received a zero or *de minimis* margin in all four review periods.

Respondents also state that the Committee acknowledges that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin have satisfied the first and third criteria of the Department's regulatory requirements. Respondents contend that the Committee's sole argument against revocation is the possibility that the subject companies will dump steel wire rope in the United States at a future date, and this view is based on the rapid depreciation of the won due to the economic situation in Korea. Citing Brass Sheet and Strip, 61 FR 49,727, 49,731 (1996) and Tapered Roller Bearing and Parts Thereof from Japan, 61 FR 57,629, 57,651 (1996), respondents claim that dumping is most likely when a foreign currency appreciates against the dollar because the value of the subject merchandise in the home market appreciates, relative to

the value of the same merchandise in the U.S. market. Respondents continue that even though the won was appreciating during the first three review periods and Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin sold increasing quantities of subject merchandise in the United States, no dumping was found. This, according to the respondents, makes revocation at this time particularly appropriate. They cite Color Television Receivers, Except for Video Monitors, From Taiwan, 55 FR 47093, 47097 (1990), and compare Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin to a respondent in that case which received revocation after selling at or above fair value for three administrative reviews while the Taiwanese currency appreciated 37 percent. Respondents continue, citing Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico, 61 FR 63822, 63825 (1996) (Fresh Cut Flowers), that since Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin did not sell merchandise at less than fair value while the won was appreciating, now that it is depreciating, they are even less likely to do so.

In response to the Committee's contention that a reversal in the economic crisis now engulfing Korea could cause a sudden appreciation of the won and, therefore, create pressure to dump subject merchandise in the United States, respondents claim that such an argument is the equivalent of saying that future dumping is likely in all cases because currency fluctuations are inevitable and unavoidable. Respondents cite Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil, 56 FR 52510, 52511, (1991) as a case in which the Department dismissed such arguments.

Finally, respondents contend that the Committee presented similar arguments in the 1995-1996 administrative review in opposition to the request for revocation submitted by Manho and Chun Kee, which was ultimately granted by the Department. Respondents argue that the circumstances under which the Department granted revocation to Manho and Chun Kee in the previous review are similar to those which exist in this review and, therefore, the Department is further justified in revoking the order on steel wire rope with respect to Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin.

Department's Position: We disagree with the Committee and are revoking the antidumping duty order with

respect to Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin. Section 751(d)(1) of the Act provides that the Department "may revoke" an antidumping order, in whole or in part, after conducting an appropriate review. 19 U.S.C. 1675(1) (1995). The Department's regulations elaborate upon this standard. Section 353.25(a)(2) provides that the Department may revoke an order, in part, if the Secretary concludes: (1) "One or more producers or resellers covered by the order have sold the merchandise at not less than foreign market value for a period of at least three consecutive years;" (2) "it is not likely that those persons will in the future sell the merchandise at less than foreign market value;" and (3) "the producers or resellers agree in writing to their immediate reinstatement in the order as long as any producer or reseller is subject to the order, if the Secretary concludes under section 353.22(f) that the producer or reseller, subsequent to the revocation, sold the merchandise at less than foreign market value."

We agree with respondents that in evaluating the "not likely" issue in numerous cases, the Department has considered three years of no dumping margins, plus a respondent's certification that it will not dump in the future, plus its agreeing to the immediate reinstatement in the order all to be indicative of expected future behavior. In such instances, this was the only information contained in the record regarding the likelihood issue.

In other cases, when additional evidence is on the record concerning the likelihood of future dumping, the Department is, of course, obligated to consider the evidence. Specifically, where appropriate, we consider such "factors as conditions and trends in the domestic and home market industries, currency movements, and the ability of the foreign entity to compete in the U.S. marketplace without [sales at less than normal value]." Brass Sheet and Strip, 61 FR 49727, 49730 (September 23, 1996). This is consistent with the Department's established practice and Article 11 of the Antidumping Agreement which establishes that revocation is appropriate only if the authorities determine that the order "is no longer warranted."

Based on the evidence on the record of this review, we have concluded that it is not likely that in the future these respondents will sell the subject merchandise at less than fair value. In the previous three reviews and for the final results of this review, Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin have had zero or *de minimis* weighted-average margins. As the petitioners note in their case brief, the Court of International Trade in *Tatung Company* acknowledged that past behavior constitutes substantial evidence of expected future behavior. Moreover, the Court also noted that "[p]redicting future behavior is not an easy task," and that the Department's consideration of whether dumped sales are likely in the future "necessarily involves an exercise of discretion and judgment." Petitioner's Case Brief at 21 citing *Tatung Company*, 18 CIT at 1144.

Regarding the arguments concerning the recent devaluation of the Korean won and the possible effect on the likelihood of future dumping, we agree, in part, with both the Committee and respondents that there are short term and long-term economic effects from the devaluation of the respondents' home market currency. Respondents emphasize the short-term effects, alleging that home market prices will fall, relative to the dollar, eliminating the likelihood of future dumping. The Committee focuses on the possible long-term appreciation of the Korean won which could raise home market prices, and the competitive pressures from other Asian suppliers which may force Korean suppliers to reduce U.S. prices.

In Brass Sheet and Strip we acknowledged that the continued strengthening of the home market currency may provide an impetus to resume sales at less than normal value in the absence of an antidumping duty order. Brass Sheet and Strip, 61 FR at 49731. We have also noted that during a period of a depreciating currency, as has recently occurred with the won, there is even less pressure to engage in less-than-normal-value pricing. Fresh Cut Flowers, 61 FR at 63825. However, exchange rate relationships and other macroeconomic factors may not be the overriding factors in every case; rather, they must be considered in conjunction with the remaining record evidence and

in light of the Department's experience in administering the revocation provisions. See Brass Sheet and Strip, 61 FR at 49731.

In this proceeding, other than the Committee's statement regarding the possible long-term appreciation of the won, there is no evidence on the record indicating the likelihood of a resumption of dumping. For example, there is no evidence of falling Korean prices in the United States. In fact, based on Customs data,⁴ we have found that prices have remained stable. Although we agree that over time home market inflation may offset the effect of a depreciating currency in dollar terms, this by itself does not indicate a likelihood of sales at less than fair value.

Market trends and other factors that are specific to steel wire rope lead us to distinguish this case from two recent proceedings in which we determined not to partially revoke, Brass Sheet and Strip and DRAMS from Korea. Unlike the respondent in Brass Sheet and Strip, Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin have never been found to have sold merchandise at less than fair value since the order was issued. Further, unlike the respondent in Brass Sheet and Strip, which made a single sales transaction in the period of review, these respondents have made sales in substantial quantities in the United States. Likewise, when compared to the market for DRAMS as reviewed in the revocation proceeding, the market for steel wire rope is significantly more stable. See DRAMS from Korea: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not To Revoke Order In Part, 62 FR 39809, 39817 (July 24, 1997). Based on our review of Customs data, we have concluded that the price of Korean steel wire rope exported to the United States has remained stable, with slight fluctuations, from 1992 through 1997, while, during the same period, the market for DRAMS experienced broad price swings.

⁴ The above-referenced public information is based on HTS subheadings 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090. Although these subheadings encompass a wide range of steel wire rope products, we concluded that they are representative of the price trends for the subject merchandise.

Based on the evidence on the record for the instant review and conclusions drawn from our experience with the subject respondents in prior reviews, it is our judgment that Chung Woo, Ssang Yong or Sung Jin have met the requirement established by our regulations of *de minimis* margins for the requisite consecutive number of years. In addition, each has certified that they will not dump in the future and agreed to immediate reinstatement in the order if we conclude that, subsequent to the partial revocation of the order, the particular respondent sells subject merchandise at less than normal value. We conclude that it is not likely that in the future these respondents will sell subject merchandise at less than normal value. Therefore, we are revoking the order with respect to Chung Woo, Ssang Yong or Sung Jin.

Comment 2: The Committee argues that the Department's use of a 1.51 percent dumping margin as adverse facts available for Boo Kook, Dong-Il, Jinyang and Yeon Sin undercuts the cooperation-inducing purpose of the facts available provision of the statute. According to the Committee, the rate received in the first three reviews and the preliminary results of the instant review has remained low enough to encourage persistent noncompliance.

The Committee contends that, instead of using the highest rate available from any prior segment of the proceeding as facts available, the Department should apply a simple average of the adjusted margins⁵ calculated in the petition of the original investigation.

The respondents did not comment on this issue.

Department's Position: We agree with the Committee in part and are raising the facts available rate to 13.79 percent (See the Facts Otherwise Available section of this notice).

Final Results of Review

We determine the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period March 1, 1996, through February 28, 1997:

⁵ In the April 23, 1992, letter to the Department from the petitioner, the Committee adjusted the rate calculated in the original petition to 136.72 percent.

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Boo Kook Corporation	*13.79
Chung Woo Rope Co., Ltd	0.00
Dong-Il Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd	*13.79
Hanboo Wire Rope, Inc	1.51
Jinyang Wire Rope, Inc	*13.79
Kumho Wire Rope Mfg. Co., Ltd	0.04
Myung Jin Co	¹ 1.51
Seo Jin Rope	1.51
Ssang Yong Cable Manufacturing Co., Ltd	0.02
Sung Jin Company	0.00
Sungsan Special Steel Processing	1.51
TSK Korea Co., Ltd	(²)
Yeon Sin Metal	*13.79

*Adverse Facts Available Rate.

¹ No shipments subject to this review. Rate is from the last relevant segment of the proceeding in which the firm had shipments/sales.

² No shipments subject to this review. The firm has no individual rate from any segment of this proceeding.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and normal value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions on each exporter directly to Customs.

Furthermore, 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 this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act. (1) For Chung Woo, Ssang Yong and Sung Jin, the revocation of the antidumping duty order applies to all entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after March 1, 1996. The Department will order the suspension of liquidation ended for all such entries and will instruct Customs to release any cash deposits or bonds. The Department will further instruct Customs to refund with interest any cash deposits on post-March 1, 1996 entries. (2) The cash deposit rates for the other reviewed companies will be those rates established above (except that, if the rate for a firm is *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent, a cash deposit of zero will be required for that firm). (3) 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. (4) If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original 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. (5) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered

in this or any previous review or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 1.51 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV Final Determination (58 FR 11029).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final 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 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 determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 6, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-9688 Filed 4-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-423-806]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel From Belgium; Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the countervailing duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Belgium, covering the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996. This extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Cassel 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.

Postponement

Under the Act, the Department of Commerce (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. The Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the