Antidumping duty proceedings	Period
Suspension agreements	
KAZAKHSTAN: Uranium (A–834–802)	10/01/94–09/30/95
KRYGYZSTAN: Uranium (A–835–802)	10/01/94–09/30/95
RUSSIA: Uranium (A–821–802)	10/01/94–09/30/95
RUSSIA: Uranium (A–844–802)	10/01/94–09/30/95
Countervailing duty proceedings	
ARGENTINA: Leather (C–357–803)	01/01/94–12/31/94
BRAZIL: Certain Agricultural Tillage Tools (C–351–406)	01/01/94–12/31/94
INDIA: Certain Iron-Metal Castings (C–533–063)	01/01/94–12/31/94
IRAN: Roasted In-Shell Pistachios (C–507–610)	01/01/94–12/31/94
NEW ZEALAND: Certain Steel Wire Nails (C–614–701)	01/01/94–12/31/94
SWEDEN: Certain Carbon Steel Products (C–401–401)	01/01/94–12/31/94
THAILAND: Certain Steel Wire Nails (C–549–701)	01/01/94–12/31/94

In accordance with §§ 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interested party as defined by § 353.2(k) may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. The Department has changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25137 (May 11, 1995)), an interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order for which they are requesting a review. Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping Compliance, Attention: Pamela Woods, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping (Countervailing) Duty Administrative Review,'' for requests received by October 31, 1995. If the Department does not receive, by October 31, 1995, a request for review of entries covered by an order or finding 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.

Dated: September 28, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–24809 Filed 10–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–412–602]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts From the United Kingdom

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian C. Smith or John Beck, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1766 or (202) 482–3464, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Case History

On May 4, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its 1992–93 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged steel crankshafts (crankshafts) from the United Kingdom (60 FR 22045). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter. The review period is September 1, 1992, through August 31, 1993. On June 5, and 12, 1995, both parties submitted their case and rebuttal briefs, respectively. There was no request for a hearing. On July 26, 1995, the Department requested comments from both parties regarding the issue of the 20 percent weight criterion it intended to use in making its product comparisons. On August 9, 1995, both parties submitted their comments. On August 22, 1995, both parties submitted rebuttal comments. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). The final margin for United Engineering & Forging (UEF) is listed below in the section ''Final Results of Review.''

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Scope of the Review

The products covered in this review are certain forged steel crankshafts. The term ''crankshafts,'' as used in this review, includes forged carbon or alloy steel crankshafts with a shipping weight between 40 and 750 pounds, whether machined or unmachined. The products are currently classifiable under items 8483.10.10.10, 8483.10.10.30, 8483.10.30.10, and 8483.10.30.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Neither cast crankshafts nor forged crankshafts with shipping weights of less than 40 pounds or more than 750 pounds are subject to this review. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our

written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Such or Similar Merchandise

In determining similar merchandise comparisons, we considered the following physical characteristics, which appear in order of importance: (1) Twisted vs. untwisted; (2) number of throws; (3) forging method; (4) engine type; (5) number of bearings; (6) number of flanges; and (7) number of counterweights. We applied weight separately based on a range of plus or minus 20 percent of the weight of the U.S. model. We applied weight as we did to ensure that we would consider all of the matching criteria in making our product comparisons (see *Comment 1* in the ''Interested Party Comments Section'' of this notice). We did not consider cost as a matching criterion (see *Comment 2*).

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether UEF's sales of crankshafts from the United Kingdom to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared United States price (USP) to foreign market value (FMV), as specified in the ''United States Price'' and ''Foreign Market Value'' sections of this notice.

United States Price

We calculated USP according to the methodology described in our preliminary results.

Foreign Market Value

As stated in the preliminary results, we found that the home market was viable for sales of crankshafts and based FMV on home market sales.

We calculated FMV according to the methodology described in our preliminary results.

For four U.S. products, we found no home market product comparisons after applying the model matching methodology, the contemporaneity test, and the difference-in-merchandise (difmer) test. For the four products, we based FMV on CV. We calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's submitted cost of materials, fabrication, general and administrative (G&A) expenses, U.S. packing and profit.

We reduced G&A expenses for certain plant redundancy expenses because such expenses were already included in the cost of manufacture (COM) (see *Comment 6* for a further discussion).

In accordance with section 773(e)(1)(B) (i) and (ii) of the Act, we included the actual general expenses, which exceeded the statutory minimum of ten percent of the COM. We used the statutory minimum profit, which is eight percent of the sum of COM and general expenses, because the actual profit amount was less than the statutory minimum (see *Comment 7* for a further discussion).

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.60(a). All currency conversions were made at the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Interested Party Comments

Comment 1: Application of the Weight Criterion

The petitioner contends that when matching sales of U.S. to home market merchandise, the Department has always applied the weight criterion in its matching hierarchy only to avoid comparisons of models of greatly disparate weight. Moreover, the petitioner contends that the Department's application of the weight criterion in the preliminary results was flawed because the Department's methodology did not consider all matching criteria. Therefore, the petitioner supports the use of a 20 percent weight range in the matching hierarchy.

The respondent argues that the Department should not apply the weight criterion only to avoid comparisons of greatly disparate weight and should keep using the method from the preliminary results. The respondent argues that use of a 20 percent weight range would be arbitrary, too narrow, and would treat differences in weight erratically. The respondent further argues that if the Department must change the application of the weight criterion from the method used in the preliminary results, it should use weight differences only to ''break ties'' between models that are equally similar in terms of primary characteristics.

DOC Position

We agree, in part, with the petitioner. In past reviews, we applied the weight criterion to avoid comparisons of models that were ''greatly disparate'' in weight. See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom (56 FR 5975, 5979, Feb. 14, 1991)(Second Review). We did not, however, define the term ''greatly disparate'' in those reviews. In the final results of this review, we sought to increase the predictability of our matching hierarchy by clarifying what we consider ''greatly disparate.''

In the preliminary results, we considered weight as the third matching criterion and applied the criterion by selecting the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model. This was consistent with the matching methodology outlined in a February 1993 memorandum prepared during the third review, and in furtherance of our efforts to increase the predictability of our matching hierarchy. However, we then discovered two flaws in our methodology for applying the weight criterion, which compelled us to seek an alternative methodology to that used in the preliminary results.

First, we realized that in the preliminary results, by applying weight as the third criterion of a descending hierarchy and selecting the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model, our methodology effectively nullified the remaining matching criteria (*i.e.,* forging method, engine type, bearings, flanges and counterweights). This problem would be avoided only in the rare instance where two or more home market models were identical in weight. Thus, our methodology in the preliminary results frustrated the proper operation of our matching hierarchy.

Second, we realized that simply choosing the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model did not prevent us from comparing models that were greatly disparate in weight, because the methodology failed to address situations where all home market models were greatly disparate in weight compared to the U.S. model. In such cases, one home market model could be ''closest'' in weight to the U.S. model, but still greatly disparate. This would violate our established practice of not comparing models that are greatly disparate in weight. See Second Review (56 FR 5979). The 20 percent difmer test would not necessarily prevent such comparisons because, in past crankshafts reviews, we have found that the relatively high material costs of heavier crankshafts may be offset by the relatively high cost of producing the other physical differences in lighter crankshafts.

As a result, two products could appear on paper (*i.e.,* according to the difmer test) to be more similar than they actually were. *Id.*

Due to these problems, on July 26, 1995, we indicated to both interested parties that we were considering applying the weight criterion as a 20 percent weight range rather than by choosing the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model. Under our proposed methodology, the weight of a home market model would have to be within 20 percent of the weight of the U.S. model to be

considered ''similar'' for purposes of the weight criterion. We also invited the interested parties to suggest an alternative methodology and explain why their proposed methodology would be more reasonable than our proposed 20 percent weight range.

We proposed the 20 percent weight range for two reasons. First, we wanted to define the phrase ''greatly disparate,'' and the only way to do so with any kind of predictability was to assign a specific value to the term. Second, we used a 20 percent range rather than any other percentage range because the Department uses a 20 percent range in similar circumstances when applying its difmer test. As discussed above, the function of the weight criterion in these reviews is similar to that of the difmer test, and ensures that we do not make unreasonable comparisons.

We disagree with the respondent's claim that the Department's 20 percent weight range treats differences in weight erratically. By applying the weight criterion as a range, we are simply setting an outside parameter for acceptable weight differences. Within that range, the Department applied the remaining criteria to find the most similar matches. If there was more than one potential home market match after applying the remaining criteria, the Department chose the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model. Applying weight as a specific percentage range, and then choosing the model that is closest in weight if there is more than one potential match after applying the remaining criteria, makes the criterion's operation predictable, not erratic.

The Department would be treating differences in weight erratically if it were to apply the weight criterion only to choose the home market model that is ''closest'' in weight to the U.S. model, because in some cases the potential home market comparisons may be very close in weight to the U.S. model, and in other cases the potential home market comparisons may all be far from the weight of the U.S. model. Simply choosing the home market model that is ''closest'' in weight, without also setting an outside limit for acceptable weight differences, would thus treat differences in weight differently in analogous circumstances. The respondent's proposed solution of making weight the fifth criterion or using it only to ''break ties'' would not avoid this problem. Moreover, each of the respondent's proposed alternative methodologies would, like the Department's preliminary methodology, effectively nullify any remaining matching criteria.

We also disagree with the respondent's contention that a 20 percent range is too narrow. As discussed above, we solicited comments from the parties on our proposed methodology. If the respondent believed that a 20 percent range was too narrow, it had an opportunity to suggest a broader range and explain why that broader range would have been more appropriate than the Department's proposal. While the respondent suggests the range should have been ''much'' broader than 20 percent, it declined our invitation to quantify what that range should be.

Moreover, after asserting that the range should have been much broader than 20 percent, the respondent then asserted that any percentage ''cutoff'' would be inappropriate. While the respondent seems to believe that there is no point at which the differences in weight between the home market and U.S. models would be so great as to make comparisons ipso facto unreasonable, we disagree. If the Department were to accept the respondent's argument, we would be required to make ad hoc determinations of what constitutes a ''great disparity'' in weight each time we made a comparison. This would frustrate our intent to ensure greater predictability in our application of the weight criterion.

We also disagree with the respondent's argument that the Department has previously determined that a range approach would be inappropriate for comparing crankshafts. In the original investigation, we simply declined to group crankshafts according to size because crankshafts are not sold in specific sizes. Our methodology in this review does not create ''groups'' of U.S. and home market models; it merely establishes boundaries for comparing individual U.S. models to all potential home market comparisons.

Finally, we disagree with the respondent's assertion that our methodology is inconsistent with the Act and our prior determinations. First, the respondent claims that there are no compelling reasons to change our methodology from the preliminary determination, because there were no ''unreasonable'' matches in this review. As noted above, however, the methodology we applied in the preliminary results was flawed in several respects. Thus, the matches may not be those that are truly most similar when all of the criteria are considered. It would undermine our attempts to make our matching hierarchy more accurate and predictable if we were to continue applying that methodology in this review, only to change the methodology in a future review when the flaws manifested themselves in unreasonable matches.

Second, the respondent claims there is no evidence that our preliminary methodology was unpredictable, and that a 20 percent range will not increase predictability. We disagree. Our preliminary methodology, while ''predictable,'' was flawed; applying the weight criterion as a range will increase predictability without invalidating the remaining matching criteria.

Third, the respondent argues that applying the weight criterion as a 20 percent range will require the use of CV for certain models. However, as discussed below in *Comment 3*, the goal in establishing a model match methodology is not simply to yield the greatest number of matches, the goal is to identify matches of ''similar'' products. We have determined that products are not similar if the difference between the U.S. and home market weights are more than 20 percent; in such situations, resort to CV would be appropriate.

Finally, the respondent's argument that our methodology will permit the use of more than one home market comparison for a single U.S. model is incorrect. As discussed above, if there were two or more potential home market matches after applying each of the Department's matching criteria, we chose the model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model because that model was, objectively speaking, ''most'' similar to the U.S. model.

Comment 2: Excluding Certain Models from Use in Matching

The petitioner contends that the Department should have excluded, as potential matches, all home market crankshaft models that appeared to have been sold at prices below their COP. The petitioner argues that the Department has the information necessary for initiating a COP investigation in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act and should have done so. Furthermore, the petitioner argues that if the Department is applying the 90/60 rule and difmer test in order to limit the pool of possible home market comparisons, then the Department should also take into account whether models are sold at or above their costs of production.

The respondent contends that the Department should not disregard any sales of home market models when selecting its matches because no authority cited by the petitioner supports disregarding them in this case. The respondent maintains that: 1) the

petitioner never requested a COP investigation as set out in section 773(b) of the Act; and 2) the use of COP as a matching criterion is contrary to both the Department's practice and section 773(b) of the Act.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. We have rejected the petitioner's argument for initiating a COP investigation for the reasons stated below.

According to 19 CFR 353.31(c)(ii), in an administrative review, the Department will not consider any allegation of sales below the COP that is submitted by the petitioner more than 120 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, unless a relevant response is considered untimely or incomplete. If the response is received more than 120 days after initiation, however, the Department may use its discretion in determining what constitutes a reasonable amount of time for the petitioner to make a sales below cost allegation.

In this case, on June 9, 1994, the petitioner submitted a letter expressing its concern that specific home market models appeared to be sold at below COP. We spoke with the petitioner's counsel on June 14, 1994, and asked whether the letter was a sales below cost allegation (see June 15, 1994, memorandum from Brian Smith to the file). Rather than answer the question, the petitioner's counsel simply urged the Department to consider cost when making its LTFV comparisons. The petitioner made a submission on that same day which stated, among other things, that it was not making a "typical" allegation of sales below cost. Because the petitioner said it was not making a typical allegation of sales below cost, the Department did not investigate whether initiation of such an inquiry would have been appropriate. We disagree with the petitioner's suggestion that the June 9, 1994, letter "could have been" considered a sales below cost allegation.

Even if the March 9, 1994 letter could have been considered an allegation of sales below cost, the letter did not contain sufficient information to support initiation of a COP inquiry. For example, the petitioner made no attempt to provide fixed cost information for the two specific models it mentioned in its letter. Rather, the petitioner merely claimed there was "reason to question" whether sales of these two models were made above the COP.

Moreover, if the petitioner's case brief was intended to represent such an allegation, the allegation was untimely, and could not serve as the basis for initiating a sales below cost investigation. In the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfur Dyes, Including Sulfur Vat Dyes, From the United Kingdom, 58 FR 3253, 3255–56 (Comment 2)(Jan. 8, 1993), the petitioner had access to the raw data necessary to support a sales below cost allegation, but chose not to make an allegation until it filed its case brief. The Department noted that the petitioner could have filed an allegation after receiving the respondent's supplemental response, and that the allegation would not necessarily have been considered untimely. Because the petitioner waited to make the allegation until it filed its case brief, the Department found the allegation to be untimely.

We disagree with the petitioner's argument that the Department should have self-initiated a COP inquiry based on the June 9, 1994 letter. As the CIT has stated,

> [G]iven the burdens placed on ITA by the statute it is not reasonable to expect ITA in every case to pursue all investigative avenues, even such important areas as less than cost of production sales, without some direction by petitioners. It should be remembered that cost of production need not be investigated in every case, but only where reasonable grounds are present. Part of whether ITA has "reasonable grounds to believe or suspect" that a less than cost of production analysis is needed is whether it has been requested.

Floral Trade Council v. *United States*, 704 F. Supp. 233, 236 (CIT 1988). In this case, the petitioner did not request a sales below cost investigation; in fact, it affirmatively stated that its June 9, 1994 letter was not a typical allegation. The CIT has stated that the Department "may be relieved of its duty to utilize certain information potentially favorable to a party, if that party has acted in a manner which directs the investigation in another direction." *Floral Trade Council of Davis* v. *United States*, 698 F. Supp. 925, 926 (CIT 1988).

Finally, we disagree with the petitioner's argument that the Department should have considered cost as a factor in choosing between various home market models in making its FMV calculations, because cost is not a criterion for determining what is most similar merchandise under the statute. See, *e.g.*, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada, 59 FR Reg. 18791, 18793 (Apr. 20, 1994); Policy Bulletin 92/4, The Use of Constructed Value in COP Cases 3–4 (Dec. 15, 1992).

Comment 3: Improper Use of CV

The petitioner contends that the Department improperly used CV because it placed undue importance on the twisted/untwisted criterion. The petitioner argues that in the second administrative review, the Department indicated that all crankshafts were one "such or similar" category and that crankshafts would be compared if reasonable adjustments could be made for physical differences in merchandise. In this case, the petitioner argues that the Department resorted to CV even though there were untwisted home market models (which passed the difmer test) which the Department could have matched to the U.S. twisted model. The petitioner argues that the Department's resort to CV in this case is inconsistent with its clear preference for price-to-price comparisons found in its own regulations.

The respondent maintains that comparing twisted to untwisted crankshaft models is contrary to the law of this case. The respondent points out that in the second administrative review of crankshafts, the Department declined to match twisted and untwisted models and used CV as the basis for FMV because it could not adjust for the difference between twisted and untwisted crankshafts.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. We have not compared twisted with untwisted cranshafts and vice-versa because we cannot adjust for physical differences between twisted and untwisted crankshafts. In the original LTFV investigation, we examined the issue of whether a twisted crankshaft was sufficiently similar to a non-twisted crankshaft to allow comparison. See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom, (52 FR 32951, 32952, 32954, September 1, 1987). In the Second Review, we revisited the issue. We determined in both cases that it was inappropriate to compare twisted with untwisted crankshafts. Furthermore, we concluded in the second review that we could not adjust for the physical differences between twisted and untwisted crankshafts.

We disagree with the petitioner's argument that the Department was unjustified, because of the statutory preference for price-to-price comparisons, in resorting to CV rather than match a twisted to an untwisted crankshaft. Section 773(a)(2) of the Act specifically provides that when neither identical merchandise nor similar

merchandise is available for comparison, the Department may resort to CV as FMV. The goal in establishing a model match methodology is not simply to set up a method that yields the greatest number of matches between U.S. and home market models; the goal, rather, is to set up a method that identifies matches of reasonably ''similar'' merchandise. The statute clearly permits the use of CV where the Department determines that there are no models in the two markets that constitute ''similar'' merchandise. Because the Department has determined that it would be inappropriate to compare a twisted crankshaft to an untwisted crankshaft, resorting to CV is justified.

Comment 4: Use of the CV Data

The petitioner argues that the Department cannot rely on certain COM data for two die numbers because the reported data is flawed. The petitioner argues that the Department should have sent a supplemental CV questionnaire for the two die numbers and then verified that data if it was to be used.

The respondent maintains that the COM data in question has been verified by the Department and is reliable.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. Contrary to the petitioner's allegation, the information necessary to calculate CV for the two die numbers in question was contained in the respondent's questionnaire response. We verified this information and have used it for purposes of the final results.

Comment 5: Treatment of the Difmer

The respondent contends that the Department should revise its calculation of the dumping margin by subtracting the difmer adjustment from FMV, rather than adding the difmer to the FMV. The respondent maintains that all of the home market products are more costly to produce than the U.S. products. Therefore, the respondent alleges that the Department should have subtracted the difmer from FMV instead of adding it to FMV. The respondent cites to the Import Administration Antidumping Manual, chapter 9, pages 21–22, (Antidumping Manual) in support of its argument.

The petitioner maintains that the Antidumping Manual states that the Department is to add difmer adjustments to FMV and this is what the Department has done in this case. Therefore, the petitioner maintains that the Department properly added the difmer adjustment to FMV in the SAS computer program.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. We have changed the SAS instructions in our computer program such that we now subtract the difmer from FMV. We have made this change because it is the Department's practice to decrease FMV by the difmer if the home market materials, labor and overhead costs are greater than the U.S. materials, labor and overhead costs. In the preliminary results, we incorrectly added the difmer amount to FMV in the SAS computer program.

Comment 6: Redundancy Expenses

The respondent alleges that the Department erroneously included certain plant redundancy expenses in its G&A calculation because these costs were already reported in its submitted cost of manufacturing.

The petitioner contends that all redundancy expenses should be included in calculating G&A expenses rather than UEF's submitted COM.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. We find that the respondent included certain plant redundancy expenses in its submitted COM (*see* pages 12–13 of the June 20, 1994, submission and cost verification exhibit 1). Therefore, we have reduced the G&A expense by the amount of plant redundancy expenses.

Comment 7: Profit

The respondent asserts that the Department miscalculated profit by excluding fixed overhead costs. According to the respondent, its home market profit with the adjustment for fixed overhead costs was less than the statutory minimum of eight percent. Therefore, the respondent maintains that the Department should apply the statutory minimum profit of eight percent.

The petitioner contends that the respondent's fixed overhead cost calculation and revised profit argument is untimely and unsupported. Thus, the petitioner maintains that the Department should not revise the respondent's profit in the final results.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. We have now applied the statutory minimum profit. Contrary to petitioner's claim, we find that the respondent demonstrated that its average home market profit was less than the statutory minimum of eight percent and that the argument for revising the profit calculation is not untimely (see August 18, 1994, Constructed Value Verification Report, p. 11 and the respondent's case brief).

Final Results of Review

As a result of the comments received, we have revised our preliminary results and determine that the following margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Review period	Margin (percent)
UEF	9/01/92–8/31/93	0.02

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirement will be effective for all shipments of crankshafts from the United Kingdom entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for UEF will be zero because the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis;* (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 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; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 6.55 percent, which is the amended ''all others'' rate from the LTFV investigation. It is not 14.67 percent, as was erroneously published in the preliminary results.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 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 the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) in this investigation of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

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 29, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–24806 Filed 10–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–428–811]

Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From Germany; Termination of Anticircumvention Inquiry of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of anticircumvention inquiry.

SUMMARY: On August 31, 1995, Inland Steel Bar Company and USS Kobe Steel Company, petitioners in this proceeding, withdrew their petition, filed on August 23, 1994, in which they requested that the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiate an investigation to determine whether imports of certain leaded steel products are circumventing the antidumping order issued against certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany. The Department is now terminating this anticircumvention inquiry.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Blaskovich or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–5831/4114.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 23, 1994, pursuant to section 781(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Tariff Act) and 19 CFR 353.29 (b) and (f), the Department received a request from petitioners to investigate whether imports of certain leaded steel products from the Netherlands are circumventing the antidumping duty order issued against certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany.

Petitioners alleged that Thyssen AG, a German steel producer, is shipping leaded steel billets to its wholly-owned subsidiary Nedstaal BV (Nedstaal), located in the Netherlands, hot-rolling the billets into bars and rods and then exporting them from the Netherlands to the United States.

On February 7, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of initiation of the anticircumvention inquiry (60 FR 7166). Subsequently, petitioners withdrew their anticircumvention petition on August 31, 1995. Because withdrawal by petitioners does not unfairly burden the Department or other interested parties, we have determined that it is reasonable to terminate this anticircumvention inquiry.

Dated: September 28, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–24808 Filed 10–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–841]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Manganese Sulfate From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 5, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Grebasch, Dorothy Tomaszewski or Erik Warga, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3773; (202) 482–0631 or (202) 482–0922, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Final Determination

We determine that manganese sulfate from the People's Republic of China (PRC) is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The estimated margins are shown in the ''Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since the preliminary determination on May 9, 1995 (59 FR 25885, May 16, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On May 12, 1995, the Department issued an additional supplemental questionnaire to respondents China National Nonferrous Metals Import and Export Company (''CNIEC'') and its U.S. subsidiary, Hunan Chemicals Import and Export Company (''Hunan Chemicals''), Xian Lu Chemical Factory, and Yan Jiang Chemical Factory. The Department received responses and subsequent revisions to those submissions from respondents in June 1995.

Petitioner, American Microtrace Corporation, submitted clerical error allegations following the Department's preliminary determination. The Department found that clerical errors were made in the preliminary determination; however, these errors did not result in a combined change of at least 5 absolute percentage points in, and no less than 25 percent of, any of the original preliminary dumping margins. Accordingly, no revision to the preliminary determination was made (see Notice of Amended Preliminary Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Antidumping Duty Investigations of Pure and Alloy Magnesium from the Russian Federation and Pure Magnesium from Ukraine, (60 FR 7519, February 8, 1995)).

In June and July 1995, we verified the respondents' questionnaire responses. Additional publicly available published information on surrogate values was submitted by petitioner and respondents on August 4, 1995, and comments from the respective parties were submitted on August 11, 1995. Petitioner and respondents filed case briefs on August 18, 1995, and rebuttal briefs on August 25, 1995.

Scope of Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is manganese sulfate, including manganese sulfate monohydrate ($MnSO_4H_2O$) and any other forms, whether or not hydrated, without regard to form, shape or size, the addition of other elements, the presence of other elements as impurities, and/or the method of manufacture. The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheading 2833.29.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). Although the