Dated: January 12, 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–1759 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–428–817]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Germany; Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of termination of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is terminating the administrative review of the countervailing duty order covering certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany initiated on September 8, 1994.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anne D'Alauro or Richard Herring, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 31, 1994, AG der Dillinger Huttenwerke (Dillinger), a German manufacturer and exporter of cut-to-length carbon steel plate, and its parent company, DHS-Dillinger Hutte Saarstahl AG (DHS), requested an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Germany for the period December 7, 1992, through December 31, 1993. No other interested party requested a review. On September 8, 1994, the Department published a notice initiating the administrative review for that period (59 FR 46391). On November 15, 1994, Dillinger and DHS submitted a timely withdrawal of their request for review. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR § 355.22(a)(3), the Department is terminating the review.

This notice is published in accordance with 19 CFR § 355.22(a)(3).

Dated: January 11, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–1760 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–533–063]

Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration/Import Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India for the period January 1, 1990 through December 31, 1990. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 10.16 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for certain firms which have significantly different aggregate benefits. A complete listing of the net subsidies for these firms can be found in the ''Preliminary Results of Review'' section of this notice. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Copyak or Lorenza Olivas, Office of Countervailing Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 2, 1991, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (56 FR 49878) of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India (45 FR 68650; October 16, 1980). On October 23, 1991, the Municipal Castings Fair Trade Council and individually-named members, all of which are interested parties, requested an administrative review of the order. In addition, various respondent companies submitted timely requests for review. We initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1990 through December 31, 1990, on November 22, 1991 (56 FR 58878). The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of Indian manhole covers and frames, clean-out covers and frames, and catch basin grates and frames. These articles are commonly called municipal or public works castings and are used for access or drainage for public utility, water, and sanitary systems. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers 7325.10.0010 and 7325.10.0050. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review period is January 1, 1990 through December 31, 1990. This review involves 14 producers/exporters and 14 programs.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Deposit Purposes

Pursuant to *Ceramica Regiomontana, S.A.* v. *United States,* 853 F. Supp. 431 (CIT 1994), Commerce is required to calculate a country-wide CVD rate, *i.e.,* the all-other rate, by ''weight averaging the benefits received by all companies by their proportion of exports to the United States, inclusive of zero rate firms and *de minimis* firms.'' Therefore, we first calculated a subsidy rate for each company subject to the administrative review. We then weight-averaged the rate received by each company using as the weight its share of total Indian exports to the United States of subject merchandise. We then summed the individual companies' weight-averaged rates to determine the subsidy rate from all programs benefitting exports of subject merchandise to the United States.

Since the country-wide rate calculated using this methodology was above *de minimis,* as defined by 19 CFR § 355.7 (1993), we proceeded to the next step and examined the net subsidy rate calculated for each company to determine whether individual company rates differed significantly from the weighted-average country-wide rate, pursuant to 19 CFR § 355.22(d)(3). Three companies received significantly different net subsidy rates during the review period pursuant to 19 CFR § 355.22(d)(3). These companies are treated separately for assessment and cash deposit purposes. All other companies are assigned the country-wide rate.

Analysis of Programs

1. Pre-Shipment Export Financing

The Reserve Bank of India, through commercial banks, provides pre-shipment financing, or ''packing credit,'' to exporters. With these pre-shipment loans, exporters may purchase raw materials and packing materials based on presentation of a confirmed order or letter of credit. In addition, exporters may establish pre-shipment credit lines under this program with limits contingent upon the value of exports. In prior administrative reviews of this order, this program was determined to be countervailable because receipt of the loans under this program is contingent upon export performance and the interest rates were preferential. (*See, e.g., Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India* (56 FR 41658; August 22, 1991) (1987 *Indian Castings Final Results*); *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India* (56 FR 52515; October 21, 1991) (1988 *Indian Castings Final Results*); and *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India* (56 FR 52521; October 21, 1991) (1989 *Indian Castings Final Results*).) There has been no new information or evidence of changed circumstances in this review to warrant reconsideration of this program's countervailability.

During the review period, there were two types of pre-shipment export financing arrangements. For pre-shipment loans with periods of 180 days or less, the interest rate was 7.5 percent per annum. For loans with periods exceeding 180 days, the interest rate was 9.5 percent per annum. In either case, a ''penalty'' interest rate of 15.5 percent was charged on an unpaid balance from the end of the loan period forward.

In the case of a short-term loan provided by a government, the Department will use as a benchmark the average interest rate for an alternative source of short-term financing in the country in question. In determining this benchmark, the Department will normally rely upon the predominant source of short-term financing in the country in question. (*See Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* section 355.44(b)(3)(i) (*Proposed Rules*) (54 FR 23380; May 31, 1989).

The Government of India classifies the manufacturers and exporters subject to this review as small-scale industries. Since the interest rates on loans to small-scale industries were set by the Reserve Bank of India, we used the small-scale industry short-term interest rates published in the Reserve Bank of India periodicals ''Report on Trend and Progress in India: 1989–90'' and ''Reserve Bank of India Bulletin October 1989 (Supplement)'' to calculate a benchmark interest rate of 15.08 percent. Because the Reserve Bank of India devised different interest rates for the latter months of the review period, this 15.08 percent benchmark is a weighted-average of the highest rate for small-scale industry loans between 200,000 and 2,500,000 rupees for the period January 1 through September 21, 1990, and the rate for small-scale industry loans over 50,000 rupees for the period September 22 through December 31, 1990. We compared this benchmark to the interest rate charged on pre-shipment loans and found that the interest rate charged under this program was lower than the benchmark. The use of this benchmark rate is consistent with prior reviews of this order. (*See* 1988 and 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results*).

During the review period, 12 of the 14 respondent companies made payments on pre-shipment export loans for shipments of subject castings to the United States. While all 12 of these companies provided specific loan information as requested in our questionnaires, the submission containing the pre-shipment loan information for Super Castings (India) Private Ltd. was untimely and therefore returned. (*See* the April 21, 1994 memorandum titled Removal of Information from the Administrative Record for the 1990 Administrative Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Iron-metal Castings from India, on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099.) To calculate the benefit from these loans to the other 11 companies, we compared the actual interest each company paid during the review period with the interest that would have been paid on these loans using the benchmark rate of 15.08 percent. The difference is the benefit. We divided the benefit by either total exports or total exports of subject merchandise to the United States, depending on how the pre-shipment financing was reported. That is, if a company was able to segregate pre-shipment loans applicable to subject merchandise exported to the United States, we divided the benefit derived from only those loans by total exports of subject merchandise to the United States. If a firm reported aggregate pre-shipment financing, we divided the benefit from all pre-shipment loans by total exports. For Super Castings (India) Private Ltd., we used the highest individual company benefit rate from this program as best information available. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 1.11 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for those firms listed below which have significantly different aggregate benefits. The net subsidies for those firms are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundary	0.00
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	5.27
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	0.41

2. Post-Shipment Export Financing

The Reserve Bank of India, through commercial banks, provides post-shipment loans to exporters upon presentation of export documents. Post-shipment financing also includes bank discounting of foreign customer receivables. As with pre-shipment financing, exporters may establish post-shipment credit lines with their commercial banks. In general, post-shipment loans are granted for a period of up to 180 days. In prior administrative reviews of this order, this program was determined to be countervailable because receipt of the loans under this program is contingent upon export performance and the interest rates were preferential. (*See* 1988 and 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results.*) There has been no new information or evidence of changed circumstances in this review to warrant reconsideration of this program's countervailability. The interest rate for post-shipment financing was 8.65 percent during the review period. For reasons stated above for pre-shipment financing, we are using 15.08 percent as our short-term interest rate benchmark.

During the review period, 12 of the 14 respondent companies made payments on post-shipment export loans for shipments of subject castings to the United States. Only 11 of those 12 companies, however, provided specific loan information as requested in our questionnaires. Super Castings (India) Private Ltd. stated in its response to our original questionnaire that its information about its post-shipment loans was forthcoming; despite another request for the information in our supplemental questionnaire, the company never submitted it. To calculate the benefit from these loans to the other 11 companies, we followed the same short-term loan methodology discussed above for pre-shipment financing. We divided the benefit by either total exports or exports of subject merchandise to the United States, depending on whether the company was able to segregate the post-shipment financing on the basis of destination of the exported good. For the company that did not submit specific loan information, we used the highest individual company benefit rate from this program as best information available. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 1.49 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for those firms listed below which have significantly different aggregate benefits. The net subsidies for those firms are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundry	0.00
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	2.83
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	1.85

3. Income Tax Deductions Under Section 80HHC

Under section 80HHC of the Income Tax Act, the Government of India allows exporters to deduct from taxable income profits derived from the export of goods and merchandise. In prior administrative reviews of this order, this program has been determined to be countervailable because receipt of benefits under this program is contingent upon export performance. (*See* 1988 and 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results.*) There has been no new information or evidence of changed circumstances in this review to warrant reconsideration of this program's countervailability.

To calculate the benefit to each company, we subtracted the total amount of income tax the company actually paid during the review period from the amount of tax the company would have paid during the review period had it not claimed any deductions under section 80HHC. We then divided this difference by the value of the company's total exports. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 2.59 percent ad valorem for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for those firms listed below which have significantly different aggregate benefits. The net subsidies for those firms are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundry	0.05
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	6.18
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	15.82

4. Cash Compensatory Support (CCS) Program

In 1966, the Government of India established the CCS program which provides a cumulative tax rebate paid upon export and is calculated as percentage of the f.o.b. invoice price. We verified that the rebate rate for exports of castings was set at a maximum of five percent for the review period.

As stated in § 355.44(i)(4)(ii) of the *Proposed Rules* (54 FR 23382), the Department will find that the entire amount of any such rebate is countervailable unless the following conditions are met: (1) The program operates for the purpose of rebating prior stage cumulative indirect taxes and/or import charges; (2) the government accurately ascertained the level of the rebate; and (3) the government reexamines its schedules periodically to reflect the amount of actual indirect taxes and/or import charges paid. In prior administrative reviews of this order, the Department determined that these conditions have been met, and, as such, the entire amount of the rebate has not been countervailed (*see, e.g.*, the 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results*).

However, once a rebate program meets this threshold, the Department must still determine in each case whether there is an overrebate; that is, the Department must still analyze whether the rebate for the subject merchandise exceeds the total amount of indirect taxes and import duties borne by inputs that are physically incorporated into the exported product. If the rebate exceeds the amount of allowable indirect taxes and import duties, the Department will, pursuant to § 355.44(i)(4)(i) of the *Proposed Rules*, find a countervailable benefit equal to the difference between the rebate rate and the allowable rate determined by the Department (*i.e.*, the overrebate).

Since the last completed review of this order, the Indian manufacturers of castings have moved from domestic pig iron to imported pig iron as the basic raw material used in the production of exports destined for the U.S. market. In this review, the manufacturers presented a tax incidence calculation based on the Indian government's rebate system on castings. The companies also provided information on the taxes paid. Based on our examination of the indirect tax incidence on inputs of castings, we preliminarily determine that two items listed as taxes, the port tax and harbor tax (incurred with respect to imported pig iron), were charges for services rather than indirect taxes. At verification, the information we examined shows that the port tax included in the indirect tax incidence is a wharfage charge. The documentation submitted at verification on the harbor tax indicates that this item included berthage, port dues, pilotage, and towing charges. (*See* February 25, 1994 report titled *Verification of Information Submitted by RSI India Pvt. Ltd. for the 1990 Administrative Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Iron-Metal Castings from India* which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).)

Since the information we verified was at the company level, we afforded the Government of India the opportunity to provide information which demonstrates that the port and harbor collections discussed above were actually indirect taxes rather than charges for services and, if so, that they were accurately reflected in the rebate rate authorized for subject castings. We received a response from the Government of India on April 25, 1994. The information provided did not demonstrate that these charges, which were used in the calculation of tax incidence, are indirect taxes or fiscal charges. Therefore, we determine that the charges for wharfage, berthage, pilotage, and towage are service charges rather than import charges. For further discussion of this analysis, see the May 26, 1994 briefing paper titled Cash Compensatory Support (CCS) Program which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B009 of the Main Commerce Building).

Because these claimed charges on the physically incorporated items are service charges rather than indirect taxes or import charges, we have preliminarily disallowed these items in the calculation of the indirect tax incidence. Therefore, we recalculated the indirect tax incidence incurred on the items physically incorporated in the manufacture of castings. We then compared that recalculated tax incidence rate to the rebates authorized on castings exports under the CCS program. Based on this comparison, we preliminarily determine that this program provides an overrebate of indirect taxes. The amount of the overrebate is a countervailable benefit provided to exporters of the subject castings. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 4.24 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings.

On February 1, 1991, manufacturers and exporters of castings agreed to stop applying for CCS rebates on exports of the subject castings to the United States. We also verified that the Government of India terminated the program effective July 3, 1991. However, exporters have two years in which to file applications for CCS rebates for exports made prior to July 3, 1991. To ascertain whether castings exporters received any residual benefits from this terminated program, we reviewed the companies' accounting ledgers through September 1993 (the time of our verification). We found no evidence of any application for or receipt of residual benefits under this program as of that date, which exceeded the two year period following the termination of the program during which castings exporters could file CCS applications. Therefore, we plan not to include the subsidy conferred by this program in the cash deposit rate to be established in the final results of this review. (*See* section 355.50(a) of the *Proposed Rules.*)

5. The Sale of Import Licenses

The GOI allows companies to transfer certain types of import licenses to other companies in India. During the review period, castings manufacturers/ exporters sold additional licenses and replenishment licenses. Because the companies received these licenses based on their status as exporters, we preliminarily determine that the sale of these licenses is countervailable. See the 1988 and 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results.* There has been no new information or evidence of changed circumstances in this review to warrant reconsideration of this program's countervailability.

A company receives an additional license based on its total export earnings from the previous year. Therefore, we calculated the subsidy by dividing the total amount of proceeds a company received from sales of additional licenses by the total value of its exports of all products to all markets.

A company receives replenishment licenses based on individual export shipments. Therefore, we calculated the subsidy by dividing the amount of proceeds a company received from sales of replenishment licenses that was attributable to shipments of subject castings to the United States by the total value of the company's exports of subject castings to the United States.

We preliminarily determine the net subsidy from sales of import licenses to be 0.45 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for those firms listed below which have significantly different aggregate benefits. The net subsidies for those firms are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundry	0.00
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	0.00

6. Advance Licenses

Generally, a company can receive an advance license if it has received a foreign purchase order or if it has an established history of exporting. Products imported under an advance license enter the country duty-free, and companies importing under advance licenses are obligated to export the products made using the duty-free imports. A product imported under an advance license does not necessarily have to be physically incorporated into the exported product. The amount of imports allowed under an advance license is closely linked to the amount of exports to be produced.

During the review period, eight of the respondent castings manufacturers/ exporters used advance licenses to import pig iron, an input which is physically incorporated into the subject iron-metal castings exported to the United States. We consider the use of advance licenses in this case to be the equivalent of a duty drawback program: customs duties were not paid on imported products that were physically incorporated in the subject castings which were exported to the United States. *See* the 1988 and 1989 *Indian Castings Final Results,* and the *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Steel Wire Rope from India (Steel Wire Rope),* (56 FR 46293, September 11, 1991). Therefore, we preliminarily determine that the use of advance licenses for the importation of pig iron is not countervailable.

Other Programs

We also examined the following programs and preliminarily determine that exporters of certain iron-metal castings did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs with respect to exports of the subject merchandise to the United States during the review period: (1) Market Development Assistance; (2) International Price Reimbursement Scheme; (3) Free Trade Zones; (4) Preferential Freight Rates; (5) 100 Percent Export-Oriented Units Program; (6) Exim Scrip; and (7) Income Tax Deductions under sections 80GGA, 80HH, 80HHA, and 80I of the Income Tax Act. Moreover, we verified that the exporters did not purchase diesel fuel at a discount, and that a program designed to provide preferentially priced oil for running generators was never funded. This program was abolished on April 1, 1993, and we did not find any evidence of residual benefits.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following net subsidies exist for the period January 1, 1990 through December 31, 1990:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundry	4.29
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	18.52
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	22.32
Country-wide All-other Rate	10.16

If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the Customs Service to assess countervailing duties at the above percentages of the f.o.b. invoice price on shipments of the subject merchandise exported on or after January 1, 1990, and on or before December 31, 1990.

The Department also intends, as a result of the termination of benefits attributable to the CCS program, to instruct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties at the following rates:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Nandikeshwari Iron Foundry	0.05
Overseas Iron Foundry Pvt. Ltd	14.28
Sitaram Madhogarhia & Sons Pvt. Ltd	18.08
Country-wide All-other Cash Deposit Rate	5.92

The country-wide all-other cash deposit rate of 5.92 percent applies to all but the above-listed companies on shipments of this merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of the calculation methodology and interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after date of publication of this notice. In accordance with 19 CFR 355.38(c)(1)(ii), interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 355.38(e).

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs are due under 19 CFR 355.38(c).

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal briefs.

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 355.22.

Dated: January 9, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–1761 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–533–063]

Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India for the period January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 5.54 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers and exporters in India of certain iron-metal castings, except for certain firms which have significantly different aggregate benefits. A complete listing of the net subsidies for these firms can be found in the ''Preliminary Results of Review'' section of this notice. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorenza Olivas or Alexander Braier, Office of Countervailing Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 8, 1992, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (57 FR 46371) of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India (45 FR 68650; October 16, 1980). On October 27, 1992, the Municipal Castings Fair Trade Council and individually-named members, all of which are interested parties, requested an administrative review of the order. We initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991, on November 27, 1992 (55 FR 56318). The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of Indian manhole covers and frames, clean-out covers and frames, and catch basin grates and frames. These articles are commonly called municipal or public works castings and are used for access or drainage for public utility, water, and sanitary systems. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers 7325.10.0010 and 7325.10.0050. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review period is January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991. This review involves 14 producers/exporters and 12 programs.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Deposit Purposes

Pursuant to *Ceramica Regiomontana, S.A.* v. *United States,* 853 F. Supp. 431 (CIT 1994), Commerce is required to calculate a country-wide CVD rate, *i.e.,* the all-other rate, by ''weight averaging the benefits received by all companies by their proportion of exports to the United States, inclusive of zero rate firms and *de minimis* firms.'' Therefore, we first calculated a subsidy rate for each company subject to the administrative review. We then weight-averaged the rate received by each company using as the weight its share of total Indian exports to the United States of subject merchandise. We then summed the individual companies' weight-averaged rates to determine the subsidy rate from all programs benefitting exports of subject merchandise to the United States.

Since the country-wide rate calculated using this methodology was above *de minimis,* as defined by 19 CFR 355.7 (1993), we proceeded to the next step and examined the net subsidy rate calculated for each company to determine whether individual company rates differed significantly from the weighted-average country-wide rate, pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(d)(3). Three companies (Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd., Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd., and Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd.) received significantly different net subsidy rates during the review period pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(d)(3). These companies are treated separately for assessment and cash deposit purposes. All other companies are assigned the country-wide rate.

Analysis of Programs

1. Pre-Shipment Export Financing

The Reserve Bank of India, through commercial banks, provides pre-shipment financing, or ''packing credit,'' to exporters. With these pre-shipment loans, exporters may purchase raw materials and packing materials based on presentation of a confirmed order or letter of credit. In addition, exporters may establish pre-shipment credit lines under this program with limits contingent upon the value of exports. In general, the loans are granted for a period of up to 180 days. In prior administrative reviews of this order, this program was determined to be countervailable because receipt of the loans under this program is contingent upon export performance and the interest rates were preferential. (*See e.g., Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India* (56 FR 41658; (August 22, 1991) (1987 *Indian Castings Final Results*); *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India* (56 FR 52515; October 21, 1991) (1988 *Indian Castings Final Results*); and *Final Results of*