Peaks Purchase Unit, 404 acres, more or less, Monterey County, California; also 924.59 acres, more or less, were added to the existing Sur Sur Purchase Unit, Monterey County, California. Copies of the establishment documents, which include the legal description of the lands within these purchases units, appear at the end of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of these purchase units was March 9, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the maps showing these purchase units are on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of Lands, Forest Service, Auditor's Building, 201 14th Street, SW, Washington, DC. 20090–6090.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ralph Bauman, Lands Staff, Forest Service, USDA, P.O. Box 96090, Washington, DC. 20090–6090, (202) 205–1248.

Sterling J. Wilcox,

Acting Associate Deputy Chief.

Leeds Island Purchase Unit

Douglas County, Oregon

Pursuant to the Secretary of Agriculture's authority under Section 17, P.L. 94–588 (90 Stat. 2949), the Leeds Island Purchase Unit is being created in Douglas County, Oregon. The lands within the purchase unit are described as follows:

Douglas County, Oregon, Willamette Meridian

T. 21 S., R. 12 W.
Sec. 27: Pt. W½; SW¼SE¼
Sec. 28: E½E½
Sec. 34: E½W¼; Lots 1, 2, 3

The area described contains 283 acres, more or less.

These lands are well suited for watershed protection and meet the requirements of the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended.

Twin Peaks Purchase Unit, Monterey County, California

Pursuant to the Secretary of Agriculture's authority under Section 17, P.L. 94–588 (90 Stat. 2949) a purchase unit is being established and is described as follows:

Monterey County, California, Mount Diablo Meridian

T.18S., R.1E.
Sec. 2 N½

The area described aggregate 404 acres, more or less, and are adjacent to the Los Padres National Forest, California.

These lands are well suited for watershed protection and meet the requirements of the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended.

Sur Sur Purchase Unit Addition, Monterey County, California

Pursuant to the Secretary of Agriculture's authority under Section 17, P.L. 94–588 (90 Stat. 2949) the following described lands are being added to the Sur Sur Purchase Unit which was created May 21, 1993 (58 FR 35427):

Mount Diablo Meridian, Monterey County, California

T. 24 S., R. 5 E.
Sec. 4: SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 9: Lot 2 except the westerly 700′ thereof measured at right angles to the westerly line of said lot, Lot 3, Lot 4, Lot 5, NE¼NE¼
Sec. 10: NW¼NW¼; (215.93 ac)
Sec. 14: Lot 2, Lot 3, NE¼SW¼W½SE¼
Sec. 23: Lot 1; (182.62 ac)
T. 24 S., R. 6 E.,
Sec. 31: Lot 5, NE¼NE¼; (77.81 ac)
Sec. 32: Lot 1, Lot 2, W¼NE¼, NE¼NE¼, NW¼, E½SW¼, NW¼SE¼; (448.23 ac)

The area described aggregates 924.59 acres, more or less, and the lands are adjacent to the Los Padres National Forest, California.

These lands are well suited for watershed protection and meet the requirements of the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Adela Backiel,

Deputy Under Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–7614 Filed 3–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–810]

High-Tenacity Rayon Filament Yarn From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On June 22, 1994, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of review of the antidumping duty order on rayon filament yarn from Germany. The review covers the subsidiaries of one producer/importer, Akzo Faser N.V. Its subsidiaries are Akzo Fibers, Inc., in the United States, and Akzo Faser A.G., in Germany.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, and the correction of clerical errors, we have changed the final results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 28, 1995.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 29, 1993, Akzo Faser N.V. and its subsidiaries (Akzo) requested that the Department of Commerce (the Department) conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on high-tenacity rayon filament yarn from Germany. We initiated the review, which covers the period February 20, 1992 through May 31, 1993, on July 21, 1993 (58 FR 39007). On June 22, 1994, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review (59 FR 32181). The Department has now completed the administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this administrative review is high-tenacity rayon filament yarn from Germany. High-tenacity rayon filament yarn is a multifilament single yarn of viscose rayon with a twist of five turns or more per meter, having a denier of 1100 or greater, and a tenacity greater than 35 centinewtons per tex. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 5403.10.30.40. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from North American Rayon Corporation (the petitioner) and the respondent on July 22, 1994. We received rebuttal comments from the petitioner and the respondent on July 29, 1994. At the request of the respondent, we held a public hearing on August 5, 1994.

General Comments

Comment 1

Petitioner argues that significant issues within this review could have been resolved during a verification, and challenges the accuracy of the dumping margin because of the lack of verification. Petitioner contends that key issues addressed in the following comments, such as Research and Development expenses (R&D), General and Administrative (G&A) expenses, and restructuring costs, could have been reconciled through verification. Petitioner argues that the Department should not assume that information relating to these issues is accurate simply because it was verified during the investigation, as the issues and calculations change between investigations and reviews.

Akzo states that the absence of verification does not undermine the integrity of its responses, and that verification was not required in this review. Referring to the statute and regulations, Akzo claims that verification is required only if it was not performed in either of the two immediately preceding reviews and it was requested by an interested party within 120 days from publication of the notice of initiation of the review. Akzo contends that neither element was satisfied in this review. Moreover, Akzo asserts that it submitted all of its responses with appropriate certifications of accuracy and completeness as required by statute and regulation. Akzo cities Calcium Aluminate Cement, Cement Clinker and Flux from France (59 FR 14,136, 14,140, March 25, 1994), as an example of the Department's verification practices.

Department's Position

The Department agrees with respondent that, in accordance with section 776(b)(3) of the Tariff Act, in conducting an administrative review, the Department will verify all information relied upon in making a determination (1) if verification is timely requested and no verification was made during the two immediately preceding reviews, or (2) if good cause exists for verification. This administrative review is the first review of the antidumping duty order in this case, and verification was not timely requested. The Department has undertaken verification for good cause only in exceptional circumstances. In conducting this review, the Department determined that there was not good cause for a verification. Section 776(b)(3) of the Tariff Act, and the Department's regulations do not require verification under these circumstances. See Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (57 FR 4953, February 11, 1992), and Calcium Aluminate Cement, Cement Clinker and Flux from France (59 FR 14136, March 25, 1994).

Comment 2

Petitioner argues that Akzo did not provide cost data maintained in the normal course of business; rather, petitioner contends that Akzo generated this data solely for purposes of this review. Petitioner maintains that, with respect to fixed costs, Akzo claimed that differences between actual and standard costs were not maintained in the normal course of business. It is the petitioner's viewpoint that Akzo does maintain records of actual costs for its fixed costs, but has not provided this information. Also, petitioner claims that Akzo did not provide the information necessary for the Department to calculate an actual per-unit cost on a product-specific or plant basis. Petitioner asserts that Akzo instead provided the Department with a plant-wide ''variance'' used to calculate cost of manufacture.

Respondent states that it reported actual costs by calculating the product-specific per-unit costs through the application of plant-wide variances, according to questionnaire instructions and Departmental practice. Therefore, respondent argues that the costs, as reported, are correct and valid.

Department's Position

We agree with Akzo, in that there is no evidence that Akzo's costs were incorrectly reported. Akzo stated in its questionnaire response that it based its costs on the standard cost system used in its normal course of business. As Akzo explained in its rebuttal brief and questionnaire submission, it based its costs on the standard costs system, and deviated from this basis only when necessary to comply with certain calculations as required by the Department's questionnaire. The plant-wide variance was calculated as the difference between total standard costs and total actual costs of production. The Department has accepted the use of plant-wide variances in similar cases. See Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (57 FR 4956, February 11, 1992).

General and Administrative Expenses

Comment 3

Petitioner argues that the extraordinary costs incurred by Akzo Faser N.V. due to plant closure are not fully reflected in the cost of manufacture. Petitioner believes that the Department handled these expenses correctly when it reallocated all of the industrial rayon-specific shutdown expenses to the product under review. The petitioner contends that Akzo has two facilities in Germany which produce the subject merchandise, and that one of them was in the process of closing during the period of review (POR). Petitioner adds that such a dramatic change in operations results in higher product-specific costs. Petitioner also contends that the methodology used by the respondent virtually eliminates these costs by allocating them over all of the production of Akzo Faser N.V.

Akzo states that it included the extraordinary loss associated with the plant closure in its reported G&A expenses, using the methodology it used in the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation. See High Tenacity Rayon Filament Yarn from Germany (57 FR 21773, May 22, 1992). Akzo argues that it is inappropriate to allocate all of the expenses of a plant closure solely to industrial rayon yarn when such expenses relate to the operations of the entire corporation. Akzo also contends that an expense can be applied solely to rayon yarn operations only if it is not extraordinary and, as a plant closure has not occurred in years, this expense qualified as ''extraordinary.'' Akzo cites Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from the Federal Republic of Germany (54 FR 18992, 1976, May 5, 1989), as an example of the Department's practice regarding extraordinary expenses.

Department's Position

We disagree with Akzo's characterization of the plant closing costs as extraordinary losses and with the company's contention that extraordinary losses cannot be charged specifically to the subject merchandise. The fact that plant closings are infrequent in occurrence does not necessarily make the costs associated with such events extraordinary. Nor does it dictate how the Department will treat these costs for purposes of computing COP and CV.

Nonetheless, after further examination of the record, it is not evident that the plant closing losses reported by Akzo relate solely to the company's rayon

yarn production. Consequently, the Department regards these costs as general in nature rather than specific to the subject merchandise. For the final results, the Department has, therefore, accepted Akzo's plant closing cost calculation which was based on an allocation across all products manufactured by the company.

Comment 4

Akzo disagrees with the Department's re-allocation of its G&A expenses in the preliminary results. Akzo argues that the Department should not have disregarded Akzo's submitted G&A costs, which were allocated to different groups based on specific allocation methodologies.

Akzo states that the Department's re-allocation of G&A expenses across all operations was not in accordance with Departmental practices, and that the ratios, as submitted by Akzo, are in accord with Departmental practice and case precedent. Akzo states that, because of the organizational structure and the integrated nature of its operations across national borders, the reported ratios are clearly more accurate than any overall average ratios for Akzo Faser. Akzo also states that the G&A expense ratios it reported are in accord with the audited financial statements of Akzo N.V., and have been reconciled to the audited financial statements.

Akzo argues further that the expenses accumulated at each organization unit do not relate to operations outside that unit. According to Akzo, the Department's allocation methodology attributes to Akzo Faser itself G&A expenses incurred solely by Akzo Fibers B.V. (an affiliate of Akzo Faser not involved in the review). Akzo also argues that if the Department follows its position in Certain Hot Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan (58 FR 37154, July 9, 1993), it should reject Akzo's methodology only if the facts specific to the situation indicate that the divisional G&A expenses are not accurate.

Petitioner argues that the Department's recalculation of the G&A expenses is the most accurate and transparent method, and is in accord with Akzo's financial statement and the Department's standard practices. Petitioner argues further that there are discrepancies between Akzo's three-tiered G&A expense levels and Akzo's financial statements. Petitioner asserts that the best methodology of measuring G&A expenses is using Akzo's financial statements and not the tier methodology that Akzo used for the response.

Department's Position

We agree with the petitioner. Akso submitted company-specific G&A expenses based on a three-tiered calculation methodology consisting of the company's business, divisional, and corporate levels. Akzo's G&A calculation, however, did not reconcile to Akzo Faser AG's audited financial statements. Nor did the Akzo's submitted G&A expense include amounts for certain miscellaneous items that were treated as G&A in the company's annual report. Because of these inconsistencies, for the final results, the Department computed Akzo's G&A expenses using the company's unconsolidated audited financial statements and including an amount representing an allocated share of G&A incurred by companies related to Akzo and involved in the production of the subject merchandise. The Department calculated per unit G&A expenses for the subject merchandise based on a factor derived as the ratio of Akzo's total G&A to the company's cost of sales. This method is consistent with our past practice. See Certain Hot Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value (58 FR 37154, July 9, 1993), and Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value (52 FR 8329, March 17, 1987).

Research and Development

Comment 5

Akzo disagrees with the Department's allocation of its R&D expenses over all of its product lines, and asserts that a product-specific breakdown of R&D expenses would be more accurate and in accordance with prior Department decisions. Akzo allocates R&D expenses on a product-specific or product-line basis, according to the nature of the research being performed. Akzo explains that the vast majority of R&D expenses listed in Akzo Faser AG's annual report are specifically related to products other than industrial rayon, and thus are not general in nature and do not relate to all operations. Akzo contends that it acted properly and in accordance with precedent by not allocating these R&D costs to subject merchandise. Akzo cites 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 Flats From France (58 FR 37125, July 9, 1993), and Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and United Kingdom (58 FR 39729, July 26, 1992).

Petitioner argues that the Department's recalculation of R&D expenses in the preliminary results of review was the most accurate and transparent, and is in accord with Akzo's financial statement and the Department's standard practices.

Department's Position

The Department agrees with Akzo. The R&D expenses submitted by Akzo were allocated on a product-specific or product line basis, according to the nature of the research being performed. The methodology used to allocate the R&D is that used in Akzo's normal course of business and reconciles to the financial statements. Further, the Department has accepted the submitted methodology in similar cases. See 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), and Antifriction Bearings (Other than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and United Kingdom (58 FR 19729, July 26, 1992).

Foreign Market Value Adjustments

Comment 6

Petitioner disagrees with the Department's decision in the preliminary results to allow an adjustment to FMV for a third-party payment. Petitioner contends that this payment is based on the sale of a further-manufactured product, rather than the subject merchandise, unprocessed yarn, which Akzo sells to a converter. In the petitioner's viewpoint, the payment appears to have no impact on the price of the unprocessed yarn.

According to Akzo, it sells rayon in the home market to a converter, who alters the rayon yarn for a specific use and then sells the rayon to a third party. Akzo provides a rebate directly to this third party. Akzo argues that, in the preliminary results, the Department treated the third-party payments in a manner consistent with the final determination of sales at LTFV in the original investigation. Akzo asserts that there can be no other purpose for the third-party payment except to encourage certain third parties to use the

respondent's merchandise. Therefore, Akzo contends that the third-party payment represents a price decrease for the third party, and that the payment does have an impact on the price of the yarn when sold to the first unrelated party.

Department's Position

We agree with respondent. Based upon the record evidence for this review, the Department has concluded that these expenses should be considered direct expenses to be deducted from the FMV.

When making adjustments attributable to differences in circumstances of sale, it is incumbent upon the Department to ensure that such adjustments account only for those expenses that have a direct impact upon any existing U.S. and home market price differentials. Section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act states that an adjustment shall be made only ''if it is established to the satisfaction of the administering authority that the amount of any difference between United States price and foreign market value'' is due to differences in circumstances of sale.

Since Akzo's third party payments qualify as variable and reasonably attributable to the subject merchandise, Akzo met the Department's criteria for identifying whether an expense can have a direct impact upon price. Therefore, Akzo's payments can qualify as a circumstance of sale adjustment.

In the LTFV verification report, the Department, indicated that:

> Akzo makes payments to tire manufacturers based upon their purchases of Akzo-sourced yarn from converter-customers of Akzo's. The converters provided additional finishing to the Akzo yarn.

Given that those expenses fluctuate depending on a tire company's purchases from a converter and correspondingly, such expenses would not have been incurred were it not for certain sales of the subject merchandise, those payments are then considered variable. Furthermore, the Department is in agreement with Akzo's assertion that the third party payments are primarily made as an inducement to purchase responsent's merchandise. In this regard, these expenses are promotional in nature and thereby have a direct relationship to Akzo's sales to the converter.

As the respondent established its claim to the adjustments with record evidence, the Department will adjust FMV for this expense in the final results.

Differences in Merchandise

Comment 7

Petitioner argues that, if the third party payment for the converted rayon yarn (as discussed above in Comment 6) is allowable, then a difference-in-merchandise calculation should be conducted in order to compare the converted rayon yarn (and not the unprocessed rayon yarn) to similar U.S. sales.

Akzo argues that a difference-in-merchandise calculation is not warranted, as the merchandise, when sold to the first unrelated party, is subject merchandise; Akzo maintains that it is only after sale to the first unrelated party that the merchandise undergoes further manufacturing.

Department's Position

We agree with Akzo in that a difference-in-merchandise calculation would be necessary, in this case, only when the product sold to the first unrelated purchaser in the home market differs physically from the product sold in the United States. (See 19 CFR 353.57.) However, as the Department determined that the third party payment expense was directly attributable to the subject merchandise and applicable as a deduction to the FMV, a difference-in-merchandise calculation is unnecessary.

Ministerial Errors

Comment 8

The respondent asserts that the Department made a clerical error with respect to the extraordinary expenses of Akzo N.V., in that the Department calculated a ratio of extraordinary expenses, denominated in guilders, to the cost of sales, which is denominated in Deutschemarks. Further, the respondent asserts that the Department should capture these costs at the corporate level using the methodology submitted in the response, and not at the company level as the Department did for the preliminary results. The respondent states these costs relate to the operations of the entire corporation and not solely to industrial yarn.

While petitioner does not specifically address this clerical error, petitioner does state that it supports the Department's position of allocating the plant closure expenses directly to the product under review. Petitioner further states that the Department has not fully applied the actual cost of restructuring Akzo's yarn production facilities to Akzo's actual costs, and that the calculations for G&A expenses presented by Akzo were not useable.

Department's Position

We agree with Akzo that we calculated the ratio in two different currencies. However, as discussed in our response to Comment 3, we have disregarded this ratio for these final results, and have instead used Akzo's submitted plant closure costs and extraordinary losses. Therefore, although we agree with respondent, this issue is moot.

We also agree with Akzo that its extraordinary expenses should be captured at the corporate level because, as discussed in our response to Comment 3, there is no evidence on the record to indicate that the extraordinary losses, as reported, relate solely to rayon yarn. Therefore, we adjusted for the expenses at a corporate level, and not at a product-specific level. As Akzo submitted its expenses at a corporate level, no adjustment to its reported plant closure and extraordinary losses was deemed necessary.

Comment 9

The respondent asserts that the Department made a clerical error with respect to the foreign unit price in dollars (FUPDOL) calculations, in that the Department treated U.S. packing costs as a Deutschemark per pound expense, rather than a Deutschemark per kilogram expense, and that the Department should divide the reported packing costs by the pounds-to-kilograms conversion rate to arrive at the correct unit amount.

Petitioner does not contest this clerical error.

Department's Position

We agree that the calculation should be corrected to reflect the metric measurement, and have changed the calculation accordingly.

Final Results of Review

Based on our analysis of comments received and the correction of ministerial errors, we have determined that a final margin of 0.56 percent exists for Akzo for the period February 20, 1992, through May 31, 1993.

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price (USP) and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the

publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Akzo will be 0.56 percent; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the rate published in the most recent final determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the original investigation; and (4) the ''all others'' rate will be 24.58 percent, established in the LTFV investigation, and in accordance with the Department's practice. See *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States*, 822 F. Supp. 766 (2993), and *Federal Mogul Corp.*, 822 F. Supp. (1993).

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

This notice services as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred, and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: March 16, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–7609 Filed 3–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

Department of the Interior, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 94–141. *Applicant:* Department of the Interior, Menlo Park, CA 94025. *Instrument:* SIR Mass Spectrometer, Model PRISM. *Manufacturer:* Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 442, January 4, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an adjustable multicollector with four deep Faraday buckets, (2) an electromagnetic sector analyzer with a 50 cm dispersion and (3) an online elemental analyzer.

Docket Number: 94–148. *Applicant:* Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, Palisades, NY 10964. *Instrument:* Isotope Ratio-Gas Source Mass Spectrometer, Model PRISM. *Manufacturer:* Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 443, January 4, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an adjustable multicollector with four deep Faraday buckets, (2) an electromagnetic sector analyzer with a 50 cm dispersion and (3) an automatic cold finger for samples as small as 0.2 ml.

These capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above is pertinent to each applicant's intended purposes. We know of no instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to either of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 95–7610 Filed 3–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–F

[C–549–501]

Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipe and tubes from Thailand. We have preliminary determined the net subsidy to be 0.73 percent ad valorem for Saha Thai Pipe and Tube Company and all other companies for the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. customs to assess countervailing duties as indicated above.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 28, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Penelope Naas and Gary Bettger, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3534 or 482–2239, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 3, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' (58 FR 41239) of the countervailing duty order on pipes and tubes from Thailand (50 FR 32751; August 14, 1985). On August 31, 1993, the respondents, the Royal Thai Government (RTG) and Saha Thai Pipe and Tube Company (Saha Thai), requested an administrative review of this order. We initiated a review of the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992, on September 30, 1993 (58 FR 51053). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise and nine programs. The final results of the last administrative review in this case were published October 9, 1991 (56 FR 50852).