

On or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties, the cash deposits listed below for the subject merchandise. The All Others rate applies to all exporters of SSWR not specifically listed below.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Fagersta Stainless AB	5.71
All Others	5.71

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to stainless steel wire rod from Sweden, pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.211.

Dated: September 10, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-24771 Filed 9-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-469-807]

Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Spain

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 15, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard Smith or Wendy Frankel, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5193 or (202) 482-5849, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

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 of Commerce's (Department's) regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Amendment to the Final Determination

On July 20, 1998, in accordance with section 735(a) of the Act, the Department made a final determination that stainless steel wire rod (SSWR) from Spain is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Spain*, 63 FR 40391 (July 29, 1998) (final determination). On August 3, 1998, petitioners filed a timely allegation that the Department had made a ministerial error in its final determination. Specifically, petitioners assert that while the Department found in its final determination that the reported cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV) should be increased by the amount of an inventory write-down that respondent subtracted from reported costs, the Department made an arithmetic error in adjusting the reported costs which inadvertently decreased, rather than increased costs by the inventory write-down.

We have determined, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224, that a ministerial error was made in adjusting the COP and CV that were reported in the final determination. For a detailed discussion of the alleged ministerial error, see the memorandum from Howard Smith to Holly Kuga on the subject, "Ministerial Error Allegation" regarding the antidumping duty investigation of stainless steel wire rod from Spain—final determination, dated August 20, 1998.

Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(e), we are amending the final determination of the antidumping duty investigation of stainless steel wire rod from Spain. The revised weighted-average dumping margins are in the "Antidumping Duty Order" section below.

Scope of Order

For purposes of this investigation, SSWR comprises products that are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed and/or pickled and/or descaled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons or other shapes, in coils, that may also be coated with a lubricant containing copper, lime or oxalate. SSWR is made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more

of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are manufactured only by hot-rolling or hot-rolling, annealing, and/or pickling and/or descaling, are normally sold in coiled form, and are of solid cross-section. The majority of SSWR sold in the United States is round in cross-sectional shape, annealed and pickled, and later cold-finished into stainless steel wire or small-diameter bar.

The most common size for such products is 5.5 millimeters or 0.217 inches in diameter, which represents the smallest size that normally is produced on a rolling mill and is the size that most wire-drawing machines are set up to draw. The range of SSWR sizes normally sold in the United States is between 0.20 inches and 1.312 inches diameter. Two stainless steel grades, SF20T and K-M35FL, are excluded from the scope of the investigation. The chemical makeup for the excluded grades is as follows:

SF20T

Carbon—0.05 max
Manganese—2.00 max
Phosphorous—0.05 max
Sulfur—0.15 max
Silicon—1.00 max
Chromium—19.00/21.00
Molybdenum—1.50/2.50
Lead—added (0.10/0.30)
Tellurium—added (0.03 min)

K-M35FL

Carbon—0.015 max
Silicon—0.70/1.00
Manganese—0.40 max
Phosphorous—0.04 max
Sulfur—0.03 max
Nickel—0.30 max
Chromium—12.50/14.00
Lead—0.10/0.30
Aluminum—0.20/0.35

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7221.00.0005, 7221.00.0015, 7221.00.0030, 7221.00.0045, and 7221.00.0075 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Antidumping Duty Order

On September 8, 1998, in accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) notified the Department that a U.S. industry is materially injured by reason of imports of stainless steel wire rod from Spain, pursuant to section 735(b)(1)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct the

United States Customs Service to assess, upon further advice by the Department, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the constructed export price of the merchandise for all relevant entries of stainless steel wire rod from Spain. These antidumping duties will be assessed on all

unliquidated entries of stainless steel wire rod from Spain entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after March 5, 1998, the date on which the Department published its preliminary determination notice in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 10849).

On or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, U.S.

customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties, the cash deposits listed below for the subject merchandise. The "All Others" rate applies to all exporters of stainless steel wire rod not specifically listed below.

The revised final weighted-average margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Original final margin percentage	Revised final margin percentage
Roldan, S.A.	4.72	4.73
All Others	4.72	4.73

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to stainless steel wire rod from Spain, pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.211.

Dated: September 10, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 98-24772 Filed 9-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-829]

Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Korea

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 15, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Thomson, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4793.

The Applicable Statute

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 of Commerce's (Department's) regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Amendment to the Final Determination

On July 20, 1998, in accordance with section 735(a) of the Act, the Department made a final determination that stainless steel wire rod (SSWR) from Korea is being, or likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Korea*, 63 FR 40404 (July 29, 1998) (final determination). On July 27 and 30, 1998, Dongbang Special Steel Co. Ltd. (Dongbang)/Changwon Specialty Steel Co. Ltd. (Changwon)/Pohang Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. (POSCO) (collectively, respondent) and petitioners (AL Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Carpenter Technology Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Talley Metals Technology, Inc., and the United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC), respectively, filed timely allegations that the Department had made ministerial errors in its final determination. The respondent's allegation asserts that the Department did not incorporate necessary adjustments to the cost of materials figures utilized on the sales tape (*i.e.*, the variable cost of manufacture field). Respondent alleges that the Department's failure to adjust the cost of materials resulted in incorrect difference in merchandise (DIFMER) adjustments on the sales file. The respondent notes that the Department correctly made the necessary adjustments to the cost of materials figures in the cost files. As a result, the respondent claims that the DIFMER adjustment utilized by the Department in the final determination does not accurately reflect the costs as

adjusted by the Department. To correct this alleged error, the respondent suggests that the Department recalculate the materials, labor, and variable overhead figures (both for home market and the U.S. market) used to derive the DIFMER adjustment for both Dongbang and Changwon's calculations. For Dongbang's home market and U.S. variable cost of manufacturing calculation, the respondent claims the Department should include Dongbang's cost of materials less the fixed cost portions, POSCO's cost of materials, and POSCO's general and administrative expenses. For Changwon's home market and U.S. variable cost of manufacturing calculation, the respondent asserts that the Department should include Changwon's cost of materials less the fixed cost portions, and POSCO's cost of production, which includes POSCO's general and administrative expenses.

Petitioners' July 30, 1998, submission addressed the respondent's ministerial error allegation and contained one additional ministerial error allegation. Petitioners agreed with the respondent that an error occurred in the calculation of the DIFMER adjustment. However, in addition to the respondent's proposed solution, petitioners also claim that for Dongbang's variable cost of manufacture calculation, the Department should also add POSCO's interest expense for both the home and U.S. market calculations. Petitioners also allege that the Department inadvertently used an incorrect home market diameter variable when conducting the product concordance.

On August 4, 1998, the respondent filed comments addressing petitioners' ministerial error allegations. The respondent agrees with petitioners' proposed changes regarding Dongbang and Changwon's variable cost of manufacturing calculations, with one exception. The respondent asserts that the Department should not include