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*

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, the rate of interest charged on pre-shipment export loans ranged from 7.50 to 17 percent, depending on the length and date of the loan.

In the case of a short-term loan provided by a government, the Department uses the average interest rate for an alternative source of short-term financing in the country in question as a benchmark. In determining this benchmark, the Department relies 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,* § 355.44(b)(3)(i) (*Proposed Rules*) (54 FR 23380; May 31, 1989).

The Government of India (GOI) classifies the companies under review as small-scale industry companies. Therefore, we used the small-scale industry short-term interest rates published in the Reserve Bank of India periodicals *Reserve Bank of India Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India: 1990–91 (Appendix II)* and *Reserve Bank of India Annual Report 1991–92* that were submitted by the GOI. These publications provided us with the actual short-term small-scale industry interest rate of 14 percent for loans through October 8, 1991. Since they provided only minimum interest rates for October 9, 1991 through December 31, 1991, we used the International Monetary Fund publication *International Financial Statistics* (IFS) for the remainder of the year. The IFS reported that the short-term interest rate in India for the period October 9, 1991 through December 31, 1991 was 20 percent. Therefore, we weight-averaged these two rates based on the number of months of the year each applied, and calculated a benchmark of 15.38 percent for this review.

During the review period, 11 of the 14 respondent companies made payments on pre-shipment export loans for shipments of subject castings to the United States. One of these 11 companies, Super Castings (India) Private Ltd. (Super Castings), provided aggregate pre-shipment loan and post-shipment loan information in its response to our original questionnaire. We were not able to distinguish which entries were pre-shipment loans based on the information submitted by the company. Super Castings did not respond to a second request for information on pre-shipment loans in our supplemental questionnaire. Therefore, in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, we assumed as best information available (BIA) that all reported loans were pre-shipment loans.

To calculate the benefit from the pre-shipment loans to these eleven companies, we compared the actual interest paid on these loans during the review period with the interest that would have been paid using the benchmark interest rate of 15.38 percent. If the benchmark rate exceeded the program rate, the difference between those amounts is the benefit. We then divided the benefit by either total exports or by total exports of the 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 financing 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 was unable to segregate pre-shipment financing, we divided the benefit from all pre-shipment loans by total exports. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be one 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 subsidy for those firms is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	23.00
Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd ..	0.68

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. The interest rate for post-shipment financing was 8.65 percent during the review period.

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* 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. For reasons stated above for pre-shipment financing, we are using 15.38 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. One of these 12 companies, Super Castings, provided aggregate post-shipment loan and pre-shipment loan information in its response to our original questionnaire. Our treatment of Super Castings is described under our analysis of pre-shipment financing. 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 the 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. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 0.42 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 subsidy for those firms is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd ..	0.00

3. Income Tax Deductions Under Section 80HHC

Under section 80HHC of the Income Tax Act, the GOI allows exporters to deduct profits derived from the export of goods and merchandise from taxable income. 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* 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.

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 1.47 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 subsidy for those firms is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	18.75
Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd ..	15.46

4. Cash Compensatory Support (CCS) Program

In 1966, the GOI established the CCS program which provides a cumulative tax rebate paid upon export and is calculated as a 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, even if a rebate program meets one of these conditions, the Department must still determine in each case whether there is an over-rebate; 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 over-rebate).

During this review period, the Indian manufacturers of castings have replaced domestic pig iron with imported pig iron as the basic raw material used in the production of exports destined for the U.S. market. Therefore, 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. During the verification of the 1990 administrative review, the information we examined showed that the port tax included in the indirect tax incidence is a wharfage charge. The documentation submitted at the 1990 verification on the harbor tax indicated 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 (public version), which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).)

We afforded the GOI the opportunity to provide information to demonstrate 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 GOI on April 26, 1994. The information provided did not demonstrate that the port tax and the harbor tax, which were used in the calculation of tax incidence, are indirect taxes. Therefore, we determine that the port dues and 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 B099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Because these two 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 over-rebate of indirect taxes. The amount of the over-rebate is a countervailable benefit provided to exporters of the subject castings.

We verified that on February 1, 1991, manufacturers and exporters of castings stopped applying for CCS rebates on exports of subject castings to the United States. Thus, to calculate the ad valorem benefit to each company which applied for CCS rebates, we multiplied the over-rebate rate by each company's exports of subject castings to the United States during the month of January, 1991. We then divided this amount by each company's total exports of subject castings to the United States during the period of review. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 0.41 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)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd ..	0.50

During the 1990 review, we verified that the GOI terminated the CCS program effective July 3, 1991. (*See* the Verification of the Government of India (GOI) Questionnaire Responses for the 1990 Administrative Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Iron-Metal Castings from India (public version).) 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 1990 verification) (see verification report, *Id*). We found no evidence of any applications for or receipts 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 § 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 the sale of all import licenses to be 0.18 percent *ad valorem* for all manufactures 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)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Kajaria Iron Castings 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) the International Price Reimbursement Scheme; (3) Free Trade Zones; (4) Preferential Freight Rates; (5) a Preferential Diesel Fuel Program; and (6) the 100 Percent Export-Oriented Units Program.

We also determined that exporters did not apply for or receive benefits from a seventh program, called Exim Script. This program was introduced on July 4, 1991 to replace the replenishment license. The Exim Scrip program was terminated on March 1, 1992.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following net subsidies exist for the period January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991:

Manufacturer/exporter	Net subsidy (percent)
Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd	0.00
Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd	41.75
Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd ..	16.14
All Others	5.54

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, 1991, and on or before December 31, 1991. Because the total net subsidy for Dinesh Brothers Pvt., Ltd. is determined to be zero, we intend to instruct the Customs Service not to assess countervailing duties on shipments of the subject merchandise with respect to that company.

The Department also intends, as a result of the termination of benefits attributable to the CCS program, to instruct the Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties of 5.13 percent for all firms except Dinesh Brothers, Pvt. Ltd., Super Castings (India) Pvt. Ltd., and Kajaria Iron Castings Pvt. Ltd, 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. Because Super Castings and Kajaria did not use the CCS program, the cash deposit rates for those companies will equal the calculated net subsidies of 41.75 percent and 16.14 percent, respectively. Because the net subsidy for Dinesh Brothers Pvt., Ltd. is zero, the Department intends to instruct the Customs Service not to collect cash deposits on shipments of this merchandise from this company entered or withdrawn 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 ten 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 ten 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. 95–1762 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

C–433–806

Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determinations: Oil Country Tubular Goods (''OCTG'') From Austria

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Yeske or Daniel Lessard, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189.

Preliminary Determination

The Department preliminarily determines that benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters of OCTG in Austria. For information on the estimated net subsidies, please see the *Suspension of Liquidation* section of this notice.

Case History

Since the publication of the notice of initiation in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 37028, July 20, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On August 1, 1994, we issued a countervailing duty questionnaire to the Government of Austria (''GOA'') in Washington, DC, concerning petitioners' allegations. On August 16, 1994, the GOA responded to the first section of our questionnaire informing us that Voest-Alpine Stahlrohr Kindberg (''Kindberg''), an Austrian OCTG producer, accounted for 100 percent of Austrian exports of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI.

The Department initiated this investigation based in part on an allegation that Kindberg was benefitting from subsidies given to a related party from whom Kindberg purchased inputs for OCTG production (''upstream subsidy allegation''). On August 22, 1994, the GOA and Kindberg submitted information pertaining to the upstream subsidy allegation. On August 29 and 30, 1994, we conducted a verification relating solely to this information. A report was issued concerning this verification on October 13, 1994.

On September 15, 1994, the GOA and Kindberg submitted questionnaire responses. On November 23, 1994, we issued a deficiency questionnaire to Kindberg and the GOA. We received their responses on December 16, 1994. On January 6, 1995, we requested that respondents submit the proprietary versions of certain exhibits from *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products from Austria*, 58 FR 37217 (July 9, 1993) (''*Certain Steel*''). We received this information on January 9, 1995.

On August 24, 1994, we postponed the preliminary determination in this investigation until November 23, 1994, pursuant to section 703(c)(1) of the Act, on the grounds that the case was extraordinarily complicated (59 FR 43554, August 24, 1994). The preliminary determination was again extended until January 17, 1995, pursuant to section 703(g)(1) of the Act (59 FR 60774, November 28, 1994).

On December 5, 1994, we received a request from petitioner to postpone the final determination in this investigation until the date of the final antidumping determination in the companion antidumping investigation of OCTG from Austria, in accordance with 19 CFR 355.20(c)(1).

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are OCTG, which are hollow steel products of circular cross-section. These products include oil well casing, tubing, and drill pipe, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both carbon and alloy), whether or not conforming to American Petroleum Institute (''API'') or non-API specifications, whether finished or unfinished (including green tubes). These investigations do not cover casing, tubing, or drill pipe containing 10.5 percent or more of chromium. The OCTG subject to these investigations are currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (''HTS'') under these item numbers:

7304.20.10.00	7304.20.40.10	7304.20.10.20
7304.20.30.80	7304.20.10.30	7304.20.10.40
7304.20.10.50	7304.20.10.60	7304.20.10.80
7304.20.20.00	7304.20.20.10	7304.20.20.20
7304.20.20.30	7304.20.20.40	7304.20.20.50
7304.20.20.60	7304.20.20.80	7304.20.30.00
7304.20.30.10	7304.20.30.20	7304.20.30.30
7304.20.30.40	7304.20.30.50	7304.20.30.60
7304.20.30.80	7304.20.40.00	7304.20.40.10
7304.20.40.20	7304.20.40.30	7304.20.40.40
7304.20.40.50	7304.20.40.60	7304.20.40.80
7304.20.50.10	7304.20.50.15	7304.20.50.30
7304.20.50.45	7304.20.50.50	7304.20.50.60
7304.20.50.75	7304.20.60.10	7304.20.60.15
7304.20.60.30	7304.20.60.45	7304.20.60.50
7304.20.60.60	7304.20.60.75	7304.20.70.00
7304.20.80.00	7304.20.80.30	7304.20.80.45
7304.20.80.60	7305.20.20.00	7305.20.40.00
7305.20.60.00	7305.20.80.00	7306.20.10.30
7306.20.10.90	7306.20.20.00	7306.20.30.00
7306.20.40.00	7306.20.60.10	7306.20.60.50
7306.20.80.10	7306.20.80.50	