

Initiation of Review

Pursuant to the Department's regulations at 19 (CFR 351.214(b), Kohap and HRI certified in their June 30, 1998 submissions that they did not export merchandise to the United States during the period of the investigation (POI) (November 1, 1989 through April 30, 1990), and that they were not affiliated with any exporter or producer of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. Kohap and HRI submitted documentation establishing the date on which the merchandise was first entered for consumption in the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act and section 351.214(d) of the Department's regulations, we are initiating new shipper reviews of Kohap and HRI for the antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea. These reviews cover the period June 1, 1997 through May 31, 1998. We intend to issue the final results of the review no later than 270 days from the date of publication of this notice.

We will instruct the Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting, until completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise exported by Kohap and HRI, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(e).

Interested parties may submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 353.305(b).

This initiation and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and section 351.214 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 351.214).

Dated: July 10, 1998.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-19018 Filed 7-15-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-824]

Polyvinyl Alcohol From Taiwan: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Amended Final
Results of the Administrative Review of

the Antidumping Duty Order on
Polyvinyl Alcohol from Taiwan.

SUMMARY: On June 16, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the final results in this administrative review (63 FR 32810). Subsequent to the publication of the final results, we received timely comments from E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. alleging a ministerial error. After analyzing the comments submitted, we agree and are amending our final results to correct this ministerial error. This amendment to the final results is published in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c) (April 1997).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Brian Smith at (202) 482-1766, or
Everett Kelly at (202) 482-4194, Import
Administration, International Trade
Administration, U.S. Department of
Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution
Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230.

APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS:
Unless otherwise indicated, all citations
to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), as
amended, 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"). Additionally,
unless otherwise indicated all citations to
the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR
Part 353 (April 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 16, 1998, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order covering the period of May 15, 1996, through April 30, 1997, on polyvinyl alcohol from Taiwan. See, *Polyvinyl Alcohol from Taiwan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 32810. Subsequently, on June 18, 1998, respondent E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. ("DuPont") submitted a ministerial error allegation. The petitioner, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., did not submit comments concerning DuPont's clerical error allegation.

A summary of the allegation along with the Department's response is discussed below. We are hereby amending our final results, pursuant to Section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.28(c), to reflect the correction of the error which is clerical in nature.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is polyvinyl alcohol ("PVA"). PVA is a

dry, white to cream-colored, water-soluble synthetic polymer. Excluded from this review are PVAs covalently bonded with acetoacetyl, carboxylic acid, or sulfonic acid uniformly present on all polymer chains in a concentration equal to or greater than two mole percent, and PVAs covalently bonded with silane uniformly present on all polymer chains in a concentration equal to or greater than one-tenth of one mole percent. PVA in fiber form is not included in the scope of this review.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under subheading 3905.30.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope is dispositive.

Amended Final Results of Review

DuPont alleges that the Department made a ministerial error in calculating constructed export price ("CEP") for its sales of further manufactured PVA. DuPont claims that the alleged ministerial error occurred during the process wherein the Department, after the preliminary results were published, changed the way it calculated CEP for DuPont's sales of further manufactured PVA. In the preliminary results, DuPont states, the Department calculated CEP the same way for sales of imported PVA as it did for sales of further manufactured PVA. In the preliminary results, we calculated CEP for sales of further manufactured PVA by deducting from the starting price discounts and rebates, movement expenses, and direct and indirect selling expenses associated with DuPont's economic activities occurring in the United States. We also deducted an amount for profit and further manufacturing costs (see *Calculation Memorandum for the Preliminary Results for E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.*, dated February 2, 1998).

In its case brief, the petitioner contended that our computer program failed to find comparable matches for PVA sold by DuPont in the United States and Australia because of the omission of a critical conversion factor. The petitioner indicated that since the further manufactured product is comprised of only a fraction of the imported PVA, the amount reported in DuPont's variable manufacturing costs for sales of further manufactured merchandise represented the costs for only that fraction of subject merchandise. Accordingly, the petitioner argued that the Department should adjust the reported variable manufacturing costs for U.S. sales of further manufactured merchandise by

stating the per-unit costs on the same basis as the variable manufacturing costs of the Australian sales (see *Case Brief on behalf of Petitioner Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.* at page 19). DuPont did not object to the petitioner's comment.

Because further manufactured PVA comprises only a percentage of subject merchandise, we agreed with the petitioner that the prices, costs and expenses involved in the further manufactured product should be based on the same percentage of subject merchandise incorporated in the further manufactured sales at issue. Accordingly, in the final results, we adjusted the reported amounts of variable and total manufacturing costs, gross unit price, and CEP selling expenses for further manufactured PVA by a conversion factor (*i.e.*, the value-added ratios reported in DuPont's Section E submission) in order to state the prices, costs, and expenses of further manufactured PVA on a per-unit basis (USD/lb) of imported PVA (see *Calculation Memorandum for the Final Results for E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.*, dated June 9, 1998).

While DuPont agrees that the Department was correct in altering its preliminary calculation of the CEP sales at issue, DuPont claims that because the further manufactured PVA comprises only a percentage of subject merchandise, the quantity involved in the further manufactured product should also have been adjusted to reflect the same percentage of subject merchandise incorporated in the further manufactured sales at issue. Instead, DuPont asserts that for the final results, rather than adjust the quantity to reflect the actual amount of PVA used, the Department converted prices from units of dollars per kilogram of further manufactured PVA to dollars per kilogram of imported PVA by dividing the unit prices of further manufactured PVA by the above-mentioned value-added ratios (see *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 42835, 42845 (August 17, 1995) (where the Department made the same type of adjustment to CEP calculation for sales of further manufactured merchandise). Thus, DuPont contends, the effect of multiplying these converted prices (in dollars per kilogram of the imported PVA) by the total quantity of further manufactured PVA was a significant overstatement of the quantity of merchandise subject to antidumping duties (*i.e.*, subject merchandise) and, therefore, the amount of dumping. Thus,

DuPont claims that the Department should make this adjustment to the reported quantity for its sales of further manufactured products.

We agree that a ministerial error was made in our margin calculation as alleged by DuPont. Without adjusting the reported quantity for DuPont's sales of further manufactured PVA to reflect the amount of subject merchandise actually used in the further manufactured sales, we incorrectly multiplied the value of imported PVA by the quantity of further manufactured PVA when we should have used the percentage of subject merchandise incorporated in the further manufactured PVA. For a detailed discussion, see *Memorandum to Louis Apple, Office Director, from Team*, dated July 6, 1998. See also, *Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 2200 (January 14, 1998), in which the Department amended its final results due to a ministerial error in calculating interest expense, which resulted in an overstatement of the interest expense factor and, consequently, of the dumping margin.

Accordingly, we are amending our final results. We hereby determine the following weighted-average margin existed for the period May 15, 1996, through April 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/pro- ducer/exporter	Original margin (percent)	Revised margin (percent)
E.I. duPont de Ne- mours & Co.	9.46	4.20

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated an importer-specific duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of AD duties calculated for the examined transactions in the POR to the total entered value of the same transactions. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning the respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

The amended cash deposit requirement will be effective upon publication of this notice of amended final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided

for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, at the cash deposit rate for DuPont indicated above.

This deposit requirement shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

The amended final results of this administrative review are in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.28. This amendment to the final results is published in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: July 9, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-18886 Filed 7-15-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-504]

Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware From Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On January 9, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico (63 FR 1430). The review, the tenth review of the underlying order, covers Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. and Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V., manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period December 1, 1995, through November 30, 1996. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received and the correction of certain clerical and computer program errors, we have changed the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the section "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kate Johnson or David J. Goldberger, Office 5, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: