

### Case History

On February 25, 1998, the Department preliminarily determined that SSWR from Taiwan is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (63 FR 10836, March 5, 1998). On March 5, 1998, we disclosed our calculations for the preliminary determination to counsel for Walsin Cartech Specialty Steel Corporation (Walsin), Yieh Hsing Enterprise Corporation, Ltd. (Yieh Hsing) and the petitioners.

On March 12, 1998, we received a submission, timely filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(2), from Yieh Hsing, alleging ministerial errors in the Department's preliminary determination. In its submission, Yieh Hsing requested that these errors be corrected and an amended preliminary determination be issued reflecting these changes. We did not receive ministerial error allegations from the other respondent or from the petitioners.

### Amendment of Preliminary Determination

The Department's regulations provide that the Department will correct any significant ministerial error by amending the preliminary determination. See 19 CFR 351.224(e). A significant ministerial error is an error the correction of which, either singly or in combination with other errors:

(1) Would result in a change of at least five absolute percentage points in, but not less than 25 percent of, the weighted-average dumping margin calculated in the original (erroneous) preliminary determination; or

(2) Would result in a difference between a weighted-average dumping margin of zero (or *de minimis*) and a weighted-average dumping margin of greater than *de minimis*, or vice versa. See 19 CFR 351.224(g).

After analyzing Yieh Hsing's submission, we have determined that ministerial errors were made in the margin calculation for Yieh Hsing in the preliminary determination. Specifically, we inadvertently used programming language that incorrectly applied a second billet cost adjustment factor for certain steel grades after these grades had already been correctly adjusted with grade-specific adjustments. Furthermore, we also inadvertently double-counted interest revenue in calculating normal value.

Yieh Hsing also alleged that the Department made ministerial errors by double-counting another billet cost adjustment; double-counting the billet cost for a specific grade of billets; triple-counting a grinding loss adjustment;

and failing to use weighted-average U.S. prices. The Department has determined that these are not ministerial errors under 19 CFR 351.224(f). See Memorandum To Holly Kuga From The Team, dated March 26, 1998, for a detailed discussion of Yieh Hsing's ministerial errors allegations and the Department's analysis.

Because the correction of the two ministerial errors results in a change of at least five absolute percentage points in, and not less than 25 percent of, the weighted-average dumping margin calculated for Yieh Hsing in the original (erroneous) preliminary determination, the Department hereby amends its preliminary determination to correct these errors. In addition, we have recalculated the "All Others Rate." The revised weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Walsin Cartech Specialty Steel Corporation .....	27.81
Yieh Hsing Enterprise Corporation, Ltd. ....	2.42
All Others .....	12.09

### Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(2) of the Act, the Department will direct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to require a cash deposit or posting of bond on all entries of subject merchandise from Taiwan that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** at the rates indicated above. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The revised company-specific rate for Yieh Hsing and the "All Others" rate, as well as those rates which have not changed, are listed above.

### International Trade Commission Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the International Trade Commission of the amended preliminary determination.

This amended preliminary determination is published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 30, 1998.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-8977 Filed 4-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-834-802, A-835-802]

### Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Price Determination on Uranium from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section IV.C.1. of the agreements suspending the antidumping investigation on uranium from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, as amended, (antidumping suspension agreement on uranium from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan), the Department of Commerce (the Department) calculated a price for uranium of \$11.76/pound of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> for the relevant period, as appropriate.<sup>1</sup> Under Section IV.A, exports from Kazakhstan to the U.S. are subject to quotas determined based on price levels as outlined in Appendix A. On the basis of this price and Appendix A of the suspension agreement with Kazakhstan, there is no quota for uranium from Kazakhstan for the period April 1, 1998, through September 30, 1998.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 1, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Letitia Kress or Jim Doyle, Office of Antidumping Countervailing Duty Enforcement—Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6412 or (202) 482-0159, respectively.

### Price Calculation

#### Background

Section IV.C.1. of the antidumping suspension agreements on uranium from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan specifies that the Department will issue its determined market price on April 1, 1997, and use it to determine the quota applicable to imports from Kazakhstan during the period April 1, 1998, to September 30, 1998. Consistent with the February 22, 1993 letter of

<sup>1</sup> Section IV.A. of the agreement with Uzbekistan calls for a quota allocation that is tied to U.S. Production of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>. Pursuant to such provision, the quota for the current relevant period for Uzbekistan, October 13, 1997-October 12, 1998, has been announced separately in the letter, *Production-Based Quota Methodology for Uzbekistan*, dated October 10, 1997 in accordance with Section IV.A of that agreement.

interpretation, the Department provided interested parties with the preliminary price determination on March 20, 1998.

#### Calculation Summary

Section IV.C.1. of these agreements specifies how the components of the market price are reached. In order to determine the spot market price, the Department calculated a simple average utilizing the monthly average of the Uranium Price Information System Spot Price Indicator (UPIS SPI) and the weekly average of the Uranium Exchange Spot Price (Ux Spot). In order to determine the long-term market price, the Department calculated a simple average utilizing the weighted-average long-term price as determined by the Department (see explanation below) on the basis of information provided by market participants (market study) and a simple average of the UPIS U.S. Base Price for the months in which there were new contracts reported.

With regard to the market study, the Department's letters to market participants provided a contract summary sheet and directions requesting the submitter to report his/her best estimate of the future price of merchandise to be delivered in accordance with the contract delivery schedules (in U.S. dollars per pound U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> equivalent). Using the information reported in the market study's proprietary summary sheets, the Department calculated the present value of the prices reported for any future deliveries assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.30 percent. The inflation rate was derived from a rolling average of the annual Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator index from the past four years. The Department then calculated weight-averaged annual price factors according to the specified nominal delivery volumes for each delivery year. These factors are summed to arrive at the long-term price by reported contract. These contract prices are then weight-averaged together to determine one overall long-term contract price for the market study component. The Department then calculated a simple average of the market study long-term contract price UPIS U.S. Base Price.

#### Weighting

The Department used the average spot and long-term volumes of U.S. utility and domestic supplier purchases, as reported by the Energy Information Administration (EIA), to weight the calculated spot and long-term components of the observed price. In this instance, we have used purchase data from the period 1993–1996. During

this period, the spot market accounted for 79.31 percent of total purchases, and the long-term market for 20.69 percent.

As in previous determinations, the Department used the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) *Uranium Industry Annual* to determine the available average spot- and long-term volumes of U.S. utility purchases. We have continued to use data which reflects the period 1993 through 1996. The EIA has withheld certain business proprietary contract data from the public versions of the *Uranium Industry Annual 1993*, *Uranium Industry Annual 1994*, *Uranium Industry Annual 1995* and the *Uranium Industry Annual 1996* (the most recent edition). The EIA, however, provided all business proprietary data to the Department and the Department has used it to update its weighting calculation.

#### Calculation Announcement

The Department determined, using the methodology and information described above, that the observed market price is \$11.76. This reflects an average spot market price of \$11.84, weighted at 79.31 percent, and an average long-term contract price of \$12.29, weighted at 20.69 percent. Since this price is below \$12.00–\$13.99 as defined in Appendix A of the suspension agreement with Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan does not receive an Appendix A quota for the period April 1, 1998, to September 30, 1998.

#### Comments

Consistent with the February 22, 1993, letter of interpretation, the Department provided interested parties the preliminary price determination for this period on March 20, 1998. No interested party submitted comments.

Dated: April 1, 1998.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping Countervailing Duty—Group III.*

[FR Doc. 98–9093 Filed 4–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–549–502]

#### Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative

Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests by Saha Thai Steel Pipe Co., Ltd. ("Saha Thai") and its affiliated exporter, S.A.F. Pipe Export Co., Ltd., ("SAF"), and two importers, Ferro Union Inc. ("Ferro Union"), and ASOMA Corp. ("ASOMA"), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. This review covers Saha Thai/SAF, a manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that the respondent sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV) during the POR. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties based on the differences between the export price and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding should also submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 7, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Totaro or Dorothy Woster, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1374 or (202) 482–3362, respectively.

#### Applicable Statute

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 of 1930 (hereinafter, "the Act") by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the old regulations (19 C.F.R. Part 353 (1997)), as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995, (60 FR 25130). Although the Department's new regulations, codified at 19 CFR 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997) ("Final Regulations"), do not govern this administrative review, citations to those regulations are provided, where appropriate, as a statement of current departmental practice.