

costs should reflect only those costs attributable to seamless pipe used in manufacturing the subject merchandise.

AST states that its pipe consumption was calculated based on its normal accounting inventory subledgers which do not track welded and seamless pipe separately. Furthermore, the Department verified that welded pipe accounted for a small percentage of total pipe costs and the price of seamless pipe was not always higher than welded pipe. Therefore, AST argues that excluding welded pipe would not materially alter the weighted average cost of pipe used to produce the subject merchandise.

**DOC Position**

In computing COP and CV, it is the Departments's practice to include only those costs incurred in manufacturing the subject merchandise. Therefore, we adjusted AST's reported material costs to exclude the costs incurred for welded pipe and pipe inputs that were used to produce merchandise outside the scope of this investigation.

**Suspension of Liquidation**

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act, we are directing the U.S. Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of butt-weld pipe fittings from Thailand, as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, that are produced and sold by AST and that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 4, 1994.

The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the estimated weighted-average amount by which the foreign market value of AST's subject merchandise exceeds the United States price as shown below. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margin is as follows:

Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter	Margin percent	Deposit percent
Awaji Sangyo (Thailand) Co., Ltd. ....	38.41	37.67

**Adjustment of Deposit Rate for Countervailing Duties**

Article VI, paragraph 5 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides that "[no] product . . . shall be subject to both antidumping and countervailing duties to compensate for the same situation for dumping or export subsidization." This provision is implemented by section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act. Because antidumping duties cannot be assessed on the portion of the

margin attributable to export subsidies, there is no basis to require a cash deposit or bond for that amount.

Accordingly, the level of export subsidies as determined in the most recent administrative review of the countervailing duty order, *Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Thailand; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (57 FR 5248, February 13, 1992), which was 0.74 percent, will be subtracted from the margin for cash deposit or bonding purposes. This results in a deposit rate of 37.67 percent for AST. We did not determine an "all others" rate in this investigation, because all other producers and exporters of butt-weld pipe fittings from Thailand are already subject to an antidumping duty order on this merchandise, which was published in the Federal Register on July 6, 1992 (57 FR 29702).

**ITC Notification**

In accordance with section 735(b) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination.

**Notice to Interested Parties**

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.35(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671(d)).

Dated: February 16, 1995.  
Barbara R. Stafford,  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-4727 Filed 2-24-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

**[A-412-816]**

**Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From the United Kingdom**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 27, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julie Anne Osgood or Todd Hansen, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230;

telephone (202) 482-0167 or 482-1276, respectively.

**Final Determination**

We determine that certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from the United Kingdom are being sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act"). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

**Case History**

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the Federal Register on October 4, 1994 (59 FR 50571), the following events have occurred:

On October 3, 1994, pursuant to the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.20(b)(1) (1994)), BKL Fittings, Ltd. ("BKL"), requested that the final determination in this case be postponed. On November 14, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice postponing the final determination in this case until February 16, 1995 (59 FR 56461). From November 21 through 23, and November 29 and 30, 1994, we verified the further manufacturing operations and exporter's sales price information of BKL's related entity in Union, New Jersey. From December 12 through 23, 1994, we verified BKL's responses to the Department's antidumping duty questionnaire at company headquarters in Redditch, England. On January 23 and 30, 1995, petitioner and respondent submitted case and rebuttal briefs to the Department. The Department held a public hearing in this investigation on February 2, 1995.

**Scope of the Investigation**

The products covered by this investigation are certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("pipe fittings") having an inside diameter of less than fourteen inches (355 millimeters), imported in either finished or unfinished condition. Pipe fittings are formed or forged steel products used to join pipe sections in piping systems where conditions require permanent welded connections, as distinguished from fittings based on other methods of fastening (e.g., threaded, grooved, or bolted fittings). Butt-weld fittings come in a variety of shapes which includes "elbows," "tees," "caps," and "reducers." The edges of finished pipe fittings are beveled, so that when a fitting is placed against the end of a pipe (the ends of which have also been beveled), a shallow channel is created to accommodate the "bead" of the weld

which joins the fitting to the pipe. These pipe fittings are currently classifiable under subheading 7307.93.3000 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

#### *Period of Investigation*

The period of investigation ("POI") is September 1, 1993, through February 28, 1994.

#### *Such or Similar Comparisons*

In making our fair value comparisons, we first compared sales of merchandise identical in all respects, in accordance with the Department's standard methodology. If no identical merchandise was sold, we compared sales of the most similar merchandise, as determined by the model-matching criteria contained in Appendix V of the questionnaire ("Appendix V") (on file in Room B-099 of the main building of the Department of Commerce ("Public File")).

#### *Fair Value Comparisons*

To determine whether BKL's sales for export to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the United States price ("USP") to the foreign market value ("FMV"), as specified in the "United States Price" and "Foreign Market Value" sections of this notice. For those U.S. sales compared to sales of similar merchandise, we made an adjustment, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.57, for physical differences in the merchandise.

We compared U.S. sales, where possible, with sales in the home market at the same level of trade, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.58.

We made revisions to BKL's reported data, where appropriate, based on verification findings.

#### *United States Price*

Where BKL's U.S. sales of pipe fittings were made to an unrelated distributor in the United States prior to importation, and the exporter's sales price ("ESP") methodology was not indicated by other circumstances, we based USP on the purchase price sales methodology in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act.

We calculated purchase price based on packed, c.i.f. import prices to an unrelated customer in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign brokerage, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage and U.S. duty.

Where sales to the first unrelated purchaser took place after importation of the subject merchandise into the United States, we calculated USP using the ESP methodology, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act.

For ESP sales, we made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts, foreign brokerage, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. duty, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. brokerage and handling. In addition, we deducted credit expense, indirect selling expense, inventory carrying costs, and commissions to an unrelated agent.

We made an adjustment to USP for value-added tax ("VAT") assessed on comparison sales in the U.K. in accordance with our practice, pursuant to the Court of International Trade ("CIT") decision in *Federal-Mogul, et al v. United States*, 834 F. Supp. 1391. See *Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determination: Color Negative Photographic Paper and Chemical Components from Japan*, 59 FR 16177, 16179 (April 6, 1994), for an explanation of this methodology.

For pipe fittings that were further manufactured in the United States, we deducted all value added in the United States, pursuant to section 772(e)(3) of the Act. The value added consists of the cost of fabrication and general expenses associated with the further manufacturing operations, as well as a proportional amount of profit or loss attributable to the further manufacture. (See, e.g., *Notice of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from France*, 58 FR 37125 (July 9, 1993).) We calculated profit or loss by deducting from the sales price of the further manufactured merchandise the related production costs and selling expense incurred by the company in both the U.K. and the United States. We then allocated total profit or loss proportionately to all components of cost. We included only the profit or loss allocated to the further manufacturing portion of total cost in our calculation of value added. We adjusted BKL's allocation of general and administrative ("G&A") expenses for further manufactured sales to an allocation based on cost of sales rather than weight.

#### *Foreign Market Value*

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis

for calculating FMV, we compared the volume of home market sales of subject merchandise to the volume of third country sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. BKL's volume of home market sales was greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of third country sales. Therefore, we determined that the home market constituted a viable basis for calculating FMV, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.48(a).

For purposes of calculating FMV, we used BKL's sales to its home market customers and constructed value ("CV"), as described below. We excluded from the home market database any sales of fittings not manufactured by BKL.

#### *Cost of Production*

Petitioner alleged that BKL made home market sales during the POI at prices below the cost of production ("COP"). In the course of this investigation, we gathered and verified data on production costs.

In order to determine whether home market prices were below the COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, we performed a product-specific cost test, in which we examined whether each product sold in the home market during the POI was priced below the COP of that product. We calculated COP based on the sum of BKL's cost of materials, fabrication, general expenses, and packing, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.51(c). For each product, we compared this sum to the home market unit price, net of movement expenses and rebates. We made changes, where appropriate, to submitted COP data, as discussed in the "Interested Party Comments" section of this notice, below.

In accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, we also examined whether the home market sales of each product were made at prices below their COP in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade.

For each product where less than ten percent, by quantity, of the home market sales during the POI were made at prices below the COP, we included all sales of that model for the computation of FMV. For each product where ten percent or more, but less than 90 percent, of the home market sales during the POI were priced below the COP, we did not include in the calculation of FMV those home market sales which were priced below the COP, provided that the below-cost sales of

that product were made over an extended period of time. Where we found that more than 90 percent of respondent's sales were at prices below the COP, and such sales were over an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, we disregarded all sales of that product and instead based FMV on CV.

In order to determine whether below-cost sales had been made over an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we compared the number of months in which below-cost sales occurred for each product to the number of months in the POI in which that product was sold. If a product was sold in three or more months of the POI, we did not exclude below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales in at least three months during the POI. When we found that sales of a product only occurred in one or two months, the number of months in which the sales occurred constituted the extended period of time; *i.e.*, where sales of a product were made in only two months, the extended period of time was two months, where sales of a product were made in only one month, the extended period of time was one month.

BKL provided no evidence that the disregarded sales were at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time and in the normal course of trade. (See Section 773(b)(2); 19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2).)

#### Constructed Value

We calculated CV based on the sum of the cost of materials, fabrication, general expenses, U.S. packing costs and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(1)(B)(i) and (ii) of the Act we: (1) included the greater of BKL's reported general expenses or the statutory minimum of ten percent of the cost of manufacture ("COM"), as appropriate; and (2) used the greater of BKL's actual profit on sales in the home market or the statutory minimum profit of eight percent of the sum of COM and general expenses.

#### Price-to-Price Comparisons

For price-to-price comparisons, we calculated FMV based on ex-factory or delivered prices, inclusive of packing to home market customers. We deducted rebates, where appropriate, on home market sales. We deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act. We also made adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise in

accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act.

In light of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's decision in *Ad Hoc Committee of AZ-NM-TX-FL Producers of Gray Portland Cement v. United States*, 13 F.3d 398 (Fed. Cir., January 5, 1994), the Department can no longer deduct home market movement charges from FMV pursuant to its inherent power to fill in gaps in the antidumping statute. Instead, we adjust for those expenses under the circumstance-of-sale provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a) and the exporter's sales price offset provision of 19 CFR 353.56(b)(2), as appropriate. Accordingly, in the present case, we deducted post-sale home market movement charges from the FMV under the circumstance-of-sale provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a). This adjustment included home market inland freight.

For both price-to-price comparisons and comparisons to CV, we also made circumstance-of-sale adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2).

We adjusted for VAT in the home market in accordance with our practice. (See the "United States Price" section of this notice, above.)

#### Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (19 CFR 353.60).

#### Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances

Petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of pipe fittings from the U.K. In our preliminary determination, pursuant to section 733(e)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.16, we analyzed the allegations using the Department's standard methodology. Because no additional information has been submitted since the preliminary determination, the Department is using the same analysis as explained in its preliminary determination and finds, in accordance with section 735(a)(3) of the Act, that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from the U.K.

#### Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we verified information provided by the respondent using standard verification procedures, including the examination of relevant sales, cost and financial records, and selection of original source documentation. Our

verification results are outlined in detail in the public version of the verification report (Public File).

#### Interested Party Comments

*Comment 1:* BKL contends that the methodology used for the preliminary determination where sales made below the cost of production were excluded in calculating profit for CV is not in accordance with law. According to BKL, Section 773(e)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, provides that profit will be "equal to that usually reflected in sales of merchandise of the same general class or kind as the merchandise under consideration which are made by producers in the country of exportation, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade\*\*\*" BKL claims that the statute neither explicitly nor implicitly authorizes CV profit to be calculated solely upon above-cost sales. Further, BKL cites to *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France; et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 57 FR 28360, 28374 (June 24, 1992) ("*AFBs from France*") where the Department rejected the argument that the calculation of profit should be based only on sales at prices above the cost of production. BKL contends that excluding below-cost sales would be contrary to law because the Department would be excluding a portion of sales "of the same class or kind of merchandise."

Petitioner maintains that the law leaves the decision of whether to include below-cost home market sales in calculating the profit element of CV to the discretion of the Department. While the statute does state that profit is to be calculated based on home market sales of the same general class or kind of merchandise, it also states that such sales must be made "in the ordinary course of trade." According to petitioner, it is entirely consistent with the purpose of the statutory provision to determine that below-cost sales are made outside the ordinary course of trade. Petitioner asserts that this approach advances the statute's purpose by preventing a foreign exporter from indirectly reducing FMV through below cost sales. Finally, petitioner argues that the fact that Commerce has included below-cost sales in the profit calculations in other proceedings does not dictate that the Department must do so in this investigation.

*Department's Position:* We agree with respondent. The Department's practice has been to calculate profit for constructed value using above- and below-cost home market sales. (See

AFBs from France.) Therefore, we have included below-cost sales in our calculation of profit for constructed value in the final determination, and used the greater of the average profit on both above- and below-cost sales or the statutory eight percent minimum profit.

*Comment 2:* BKL maintains that sales made below cost in one month of the POI do not constitute sales made below cost over an extended period of time. BKL cites to *Tapered Roller Bearings, and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 4960, 4965 (February 11, 1992) ("*TRBs from Japan*") where the Department stated: "[W]e use a period of three months to define extended period of time since three months is commonly used to measure corporate, financial, and economic performance." According to BKL, this rationale is inconsistent with defining a single month as an "extended period of time."

In addition, BKL contends that the Department's position that a single month comprises an "extended period of time" is inconsistent with the Department's definition of the term "relatively short period" in connection with critical circumstances. BKL argues that for critical circumstances the Department defines the term "relatively short period" as covering at least three months.

BKL also contends that if the frequency of below-cost sales is limited to one month of the period of investigation, then that is *prima facie* evidence of sporadic or possibly seasonal sales. Hence, according to the legislative history of the COP provision, these sales should not be disregarded.

Petitioner maintains that the Department's position is clear that if sales are made in less than three months of the POI, then an extended period is the number of months in which sales occur. In support of this argument, petitioner also cites to *TRBs from Japan*. In addition, petitioner argues that respondent has provided no evidence that the sales that occurred in only one month of the POI involved obsolete products or end-of-year sales.

*Department's Position:* In determining whether sales below cost were made over an extended period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, the Department has consistently considered an extended period of time to be the lesser of the number of months during the POI in which sales occur or three months for the reason stated in *TRBs from Japan*: "[T]he use of only a three month time measurement is incomplete since it excludes models

that were only sold in one or two months of the review period."

BKL's contention that the Department is inconsistent in defining a "relatively short period" is misguided. It ignores the Department's rationale of needing to preserve the possibility of disregarding below-cost sales in cases where such sales have occurred in only one or two months. This is not a consideration that applies to critical circumstances.

*Comment 3:* Petitioner contends that by not reporting a portion of its parent's G&A, BKL has understated its total G&A expense for the subject merchandise. Additionally, petitioner argues that the Department should adjust reported G&A expense for the further manufacturing operations to include the other operating expenses which are related to the activities of the company as a whole.

BKL disagrees that any of the G&A expense of its parent company should be allocated to BKL because BKL's entire manufacturing, sales, and R&D activities are conducted without assistance from its parent. The parent company receives periodic operational reports from BKL only for the purpose of evaluating its investment in its capacity as a shareholder. BKL states that allocating its parent company's G&A to subsidiaries when the books and records are not consolidated is inconsistent with the Department's professed policy of relying upon respondent's cost and financial records in COP investigations.

*Department's Position:* We agree with petitioner that a portion of the G&A expense of BKL's parent company should be allocated to BKL. It is clear from the information on the record of this case that BKL's parent company's involvement in BKL is more than that of a passive investor. The parent company's Overseas Department monitors the operations of BKL through monthly reports from BKL and provides strategic planning and management services to BKL. Accordingly, we have allocated to BKL a proportionate share of the expenses from the Overseas Department of the parent company based on the cost of sales of its overseas affiliates.

Additionally, we have increased the further manufacturing G&A cost to include other operating expenses incurred that had not been included in the reported costs.

*Comment 4:* Petitioner maintains that the Department should allocate total G&A for the further manufacturing operations based on cost of sales rather than weight of finished fittings because an allocation of G&A based on weight is contrary to the Department's long-standing practice.

*Department's Position:* For calculations used in our final determination, we have allocated G&A expense based on cost of sales rather than weight. Allocating the G&A costs of the further manufacturing operations based on weight of finished fittings produces a less representative result than allocating based on cost. The weight of fittings varies markedly for fittings of different thicknesses, but the process of finishing the fittings does not vary proportionately to weight. (See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain All-Terrain Vehicles from Japan*, 54 FR 4864, 4867 (January 31, 1989).)

*Comment 5:* Petitioner claims that BKL understated its costs through incorrect reporting of its financing expenses. According to petitioner, the finance expense ratios reported by BKL understate the total cost of subject merchandise because, where BKL combined its interest expense with its parent, it did not reduce the cost of sales for the combined group by the intercompany transactions. As a result, the denominator of the calculation (total cost of sales) was inflated. Similarly, petitioner contends that the Department should adjust respondent's financing costs to include its other borrowing not reported, and that interest expense for the further manufacturing operations should be allocated on the basis of cost of sales rather than weight.

BKL claims it has correctly calculated financing expense by combining BKL's financing expense with that of its parent company and dividing by the combined cost of sales. BKL suggests that for purposes of computing net interest expense for CV, the Department should adjust the parent company's interest expense to account for finished goods inventory and trade accounts receivable.

*Department's Position:* We agree with petitioner that combining the financing expense and cost of sales of BKL and its parent creates a distorted financial expense ratio unless intercompany transactions are eliminated from the calculation. The Department generally calculates net financing expense from the financial statements of the consolidated entity because of the fungible nature of capital. (See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand*, 57 FR 21065, 21069 (May 18, 1992).) In this investigation, however, the parent company and its subsidiaries do not prepare consolidated financial statements. Additionally, we cannot consolidate the financial data of BKL and its parent company because we are unable to quantify all intercompany

transactions. Since the parent company ultimately controls the capital of all affiliates in which it holds a controlling interest, and due to the nature of certain intercompany transactions, we have used the parent company's financing expense rate as a reasonable surrogate for purposes of our final determination.

We have also adjusted the parent company's CV financing expense rate to allow an offset for credit expenses and inventory carrying cost as is our normal practice.

For purposes of our final determination, we have allocated financing expense of the further manufacturing operations based on cost of sales rather than weight. (See *Final Determinations of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the Federal Republic of Germany*, 54 FR 18992, 19076, May 3, 1989.)

*Comment 6:* Petitioner contends that BKL understated total cost through the incorrect reporting of pension costs. Petitioner argues that BKL excluded certain pension costs in reporting its cost for the subject merchandise, claiming that the pension costs do not reflect the actual costs that will be incurred. According to petitioner, because generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") in the U.K. required BKL to include an additional amount for pension costs in its audited financial statements, such costs must be included in the COP and CV of subject merchandise in order to accurately reflect BKL's fully absorbed cost for subject merchandise.

*Department's Position:* We agree with petitioner, and have adjusted labor costs to reflect pension expense in conformity with U.K. GAAP for purposes of our final determination. To be in conformity with U.K. GAAP, an entity is required to perform an annual recalculation of pension expense to account for fluctuations in investment performance. The purpose of this recalculation is to more accurately reflect an entity's year-end pension liability. Not adjusting the pension liability to conform with U.K. GAAP would result in an understatement of per-unit costs of production. (See *Calculation Memorandum* from Theresa L. Caherty and Peter S. Scholl to Christian B. Marsh, dated February 9, 1995, ("Proprietary Document").)

*Comment 7:* Petitioner states that the Department may not have properly adjusted FMV to account for VAT for any calculations where FMV is based on CV. As a result, petitioner maintains that USP was overstated and BKL's dumping margin was understated.

Respondent cites to *Federal-Mogul Corp. v. U.S.*, 813 F. Supp 856 (CIT 1993), stating the Department is authorized to "add only the amount of tax actually paid on each home market sale." Respondent states that CV is not associated with an amount of VAT actually paid, because CV is not based on actual sales. Thus, an imputed amount for VAT cannot be included in CV.

*Department's Position:* In accordance with the statute, our practice is to exclude indirect taxes on component materials from CV if the taxes are rebated upon export. Once we have excluded the VAT on component materials from the constructed value, we cannot add the VAT to USP because section 772(d)(1)(C) of the Act requires that we add internal taxes to USP only to the extent that those taxes are included in the FMV.

*Suspension of Liquidation*

We are directing the U.S. Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of butt-weld pipe fittings from the U.K., as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after July 6, 1994, the date 90 days prior to the date of publication of our preliminary determination, pursuant to section 735(c)(4)(A) of the Act.

The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the estimated weighted-average amount by which the foreign market value of the subject merchandise exceeds the U.S. price as shown below. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
BKL Industries, Ltd .....	48.85
All other producers/exporters ...	48.85

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination.

Notice to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning 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 determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671(d)).

Dated: February 16, 1995.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-4726 Filed 2-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-307-812]

**Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Venezuela**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 27, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sue Strumbel, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. 20230; telephone (202) 482-1442.

Final Determination

The Department of Commerce (the Department) determines that certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings (pipe fittings) are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1673b). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings having an inside diameter of less than fourteen inches (355 millimeters), imported in either finished or unfinished condition. Pipe fittings are formed or forged steel products used to join pipe sections in piping systems where conditions require permanent welded connections, as distinguished from fittings based on other methods of fastening (e.g., threaded, grooved, or bolted fittings). Butt-weld fittings come in a variety of shapes which include "elbows," "tees," "caps," and "reducers." The edges of finished pipe fittings are beveled, so that when a fitting is placed against the end of a pipe (the ends of which have also been beveled), a shallow channel is created to accommodate the "bead" of the weld which joins the fitting to the pipe. These pipe fittings are currently classifiable under subheading 7307.93.3000 of the Harmonized Tariff