in fewer than three months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales of that model in each month sold. If a model was sold in three or more months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were sales below cost in at least three of the months in which the model was sold.

We compared individual home market prices with the monthly COP. We tested the home market prices on the basis of the six physical criteria used for product matches, and found that, for certain models, between 10 and 90 percent of home market sales were made at below-COP prices. Since the respondent provided no indication that these sales were at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time and in the normal course of trade, we disregarded the below-cost sales for those models, if those sales were made over an extended period of time. We used the remaining above-cost sales for comparison purposes.

For certain models, we used constructed value (CV) as the basis for FMV when there were no contemporaneous home market sales of such or similar merchandise.

We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials, labor, and factory overhead in our calculations. The respondent reported selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A) greater than the statutory minimum of 10 percent of the cost of manufacture (COM). Therefore, we used the respondent's reported SG&A expenses. The respondent reported actual profit greater than the statutory minimum of eight percent of the sum of the COM and SG&A. Therefore, we used the respondent's reported profit amounts. We adjusted the CV for warranty and credit expenses, and the lesser of home market indirect selling expenses or U.S. commissions.

No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Preliminary Results of the Reviews

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV, we preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the periods of review:

Review period	Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (Percent)
3/1/90–2/28/91	Wieland	3.33
3/1/91–2/29/92	Wieland	2.07
3/1/92–2/28/93	Wieland	0.36

Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the publication date of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of these administrative reviews, which will include the results of its analyses of issues raised in any such case briefs or hearing.

The following deposit requirements shall be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed company shall be those rates established in the final results of these reviews; (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 these reviews, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate shall be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 8.87%, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 these review periods. 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.

These administrative reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: December 23, 1994.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 95–347 Filed 1–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–549–809]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Thailand

Correction

In notice document 94–24539 beginning on page 50568, in the issue of Tuesday, October 4, 1994, make the following corrections:

1. On page 50568, in the third column, under *Case History*, in the third paragraph, in the third line, ''Asahi'' should read ''Awaji.''

2. On page 50570, in the second column, under *Suspension of Liquidation*, after the second paragraph, under the heading ''Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter,'' ''Asahi'' should read ''Awaji.''

Dated: December 26, 1994.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–348 Filed 1–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–570–820]

Certain Compact Ductile Iron Waterworks Fittings and Glands From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision; Exclusion From the Application of the Antidumping Duty Order, in Part; Termination of Administrative Review in Part; and Amended Final Determination and Order

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

ACTION: Notice of amendment to final determination of sales at less-than-fair-value, exclusion from the application of the Antidumping Duty Order, and termination of administrative review in accordance with decision upon remand.

SUMMARY: On November 15, 1994, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the Department's September 30, 1994, remand determination which was not contested by defendant-intervenor, The U.S. Waterworks Fittings Producers Council, *et al.*; and entered Final Judgment with prejudice. See *China National Metal Products Import and Export Corporation*