

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On July 27, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping finding (37 FR 11773, June 14, 1972) on large power transformers from Japan in the Federal Register (57 FR 53468). The Department has now completed that administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of large power transformers; that is, all types of transformers rated 10,000 kVA (kilovolt-amperes) or above, by whatever name designated, used in the generation, transmission, distribution, and utilization of electric power. The term "transformers" includes, but is not limited to, shunt reactors, autotransformers, rectifier transformers, and power rectifier transformers. Not included are combination units, commonly known as rectiformers, if the entire integrated assembly is imported in the same shipment and entered on the same entry and the assembly has been ordered and invoiced as a unit, without a separate price for the transformer portion of the assembly. This merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 8504.22.00, 8504.23.00, 8504.34.33, 8504.40.00, and 8504.50.00. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of transformers, Fuji Electric Co., Ltd. (Fuji). The period of review is June 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994.

Final Results of Review

Although we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results, we did not receive any comments. Because Fuji reported, and the Department verified through the Customs Service, that Fuji made no shipments to the United States during the period of review, a cash deposit rate of 5.90 percent, which is Fuji's rate from the final results of the last review period

in which Fuji made shipments, will remain in effect for Fuji.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate as listed above; (2) 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; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value 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, and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 10.63 percent (*see Large Power Transformers from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 59 FR 44498, August 23, 1993).

These cash deposit requirements 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). 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 Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 20, 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-24601 Filed 10-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Georgia State University, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95-047. *Applicant:* Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303. *Instrument:* Laser Ablation System, Model 266. *Manufacturer:* Finnigan MAT, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 33190.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* This is a compatible accessory for an instrument previously imported for the use of the applicant.

The accessory is pertinent to the intended uses and we know of no domestic accessory which can be readily adapted to the previously imported instrument.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 95-24599 Filed 10-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-F

University of Rhode Island, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95-028. *Applicant:* University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI 02882. *Instrument:* Chlorophyll Fluorescence Measuring System, Model PAM 101. *Manufacturer:*

Heinz Walz GmbH, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 24838, May 10, 1995.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, could have been made available to the applicant without excessive delay within the meaning of Subsection 301.5(d)(4) of the regulations at the time the foreign article was ordered (February 8, 1995).

Reasons: Subsection 301.5 (d)(4), of the regulations provides as follows: "Excessive delivery time. Duty-free entry of the instrument shall be considered justified without regard to whether there is being manufactured in the United States an instrument of equivalent scientific value for the intended purposes if excessive delivery time for the domestic instrument would seriously impair the accomplishment of the applicant's intended purposes. ... In determining whether the difference in delivery times cited by the applicant justifies duty-free entry on the basis of excessive delivery time, the Director shall take into account (A) the normal commercial practice applicable to the production of the general category of instrument involved; (B) the efforts made by the applicant to secure delivery of the instruments (both foreign and domestic) in the shortest possible time; and (C) such other factors as the Director finds relevant under the circumstances of a particular case."

In response to a purchase order dated November 16, 1993, a domestic manufacturer quoted an instrument with a July 15, 1994 delivery schedule. The foreign manufacturer quoted delivery within 6 weeks of initial order. At the time of order (February 8, 1995), the foreign article was a standard catalog instrument, several of which had already been constructed, tested, and delivered. The instrument proposed by the domestic manufacturer was to be a standard catalog instrument requiring modification to accommodate the applicant's needs.

Problems on the part of the domestic manufacturer delayed the delivery schedule, first to January 1995, then to July 1995. As a result, the applicant declined purchase of the domestic instrument. The applicant identified important funding constraints (requiring purchase of the instrument by April 1995) which precluded purchase of the domestic instrument. Subsequently, the applicant claims that the domestic company had gone out of business.

The National Institutes of Health in its memorandum dated July 11, 1995, advised that although an acceptable domestic source had been identified, it was in the process of developing the instrument and to date had

manufactured no instrument for delivery.

Accordingly, we find that the domestic manufacturer's inability to deliver a comparable instrument within the time required by the applicant's project funding requirements amounts to "excessive delivery" within the meaning of 301.5(d)(4). A delay of 6 months or more would have seriously impaired the accomplishment of the applicant's purposes.

Frank W. Creel,
Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.
[FR Doc. 95-24600 Filed 10-2-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title, Applicable Form, and OMB Control Number: Air Force Academy Precandidate Questionnaire; USAFA Form 149; OMB Control Number 0701-0087.

Type of Request: Expedited Processing—Approval date requested: Not later than 30 days following publication in the Federal Register.

Number of Respondents: 11,250.
Responses per Respondent: 1.
Annual Responses: 11,250.
Average Burden per Response: 24 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 4,500.
Needs and Uses: The information collected hereby, is utilized in the screening process to conduct a preliminary assessment of a candidate's eligibility status, qualifications, and prospects for formal application and selection for entry into the United States Air Force Academy.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Frequency: One time.
Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.
OMB Desk Officer: Mr. Edward C. Springer.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Springer at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer

for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.
DOD Clearance Officer: Mr. William Pearce.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Pearce, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302.

Dated: September 27, 1995.
Patricia L. Toppings,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.
[FR Doc. 95-24465 Filed 10-2-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5000-04-P

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title, Applicable Form, and OMB Control Number: Unescorted Entry Authorization Certificate; Air Force Form 2586; OMB Control Number 0701-0042.

Type of Request: Expedited Processing—Approval date requested: Not later than 30 days following publication in the Federal Register.

Number of Respondents: 20,000.
Responses per Respondent: 1.
Annual Responses: 20,000.
Average Burden per Response: 3 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 1,000.
Needs and Uses: The information collected hereby, is utilized to administer the physical security program on military installations worldwide. It enables commanders to make informed decisions in allowing unescorted entry of personnel into controlled and restricted areas.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; State, local, or tribal government.
Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.
OMB Desk Officer: Mr. Edward C. Springer.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Springer at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.
DOD Clearance Officer: Mr. William Pearce.