Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
Illovo Sugar Limited	15.48
All Others	15.48

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 45 days of the publication of this notice. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or canceled.

However, if the ITC determines that such injury does exist, we will issue an antidumping duty order directing the Customs Service officers to assess an antidumping duty on furfuryl alcohol from South Africa, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of suspension of liquidation, equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise exceeds the United States price.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

Dated: May 1, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–11261 Filed 5–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–549–812]

Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Furfuryl Alcohol From Thailand

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Brinkmann or Greg Thompson, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–5288 or 482–2336, respectively.

Final Determination

We determine that furfuryl alcohol from Thailand is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), 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 preliminary determination of sales at LTFV on December 9, 1994 (59 FR 65014, December 16, 1994), the following events have occurred.

At the request of the petitioner, QO Chemicals, the Department postponed the final determination until May 1, 1995 (59 FR 66901, December 28, 1994). Pursuant to the Department's request, on January 17, 1995, the respondent, Indo-Rama Chemicals (Thailand) Ltd. (IRCT), submitted additional information pertaining to its potential exports sales price (ESP) transactions. In addition, IRCT submitted its response to Section D of the questionnaire, which requests information on the cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV). The petitioner commented on this response, which IRCT later supplemented pursuant to our request on February 6, 1995.

Verification of IRCT's sales and COP/CV questionnaire responses was conducted during the months of February and March, 1995. The Department issued reports concerning these verifications on March 21, 1995.

IRCT and the petitioner submitted case briefs on March 29, 1995, and rebuttal briefs on March 31, 1995. At the petitioner's request, the Department held a hearing on April 4, 1995.

Scope of Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is furfuryl alcohol ($C_4H_3OCH_2OH$). Furfuryl alcohol is a primary alcohol, and is colorless or pale yellow in appearance. It is used in the manufacture of resins and as a wetting agent and solvent for coating resins, nitrocellulose, cellulose acetate, and other soluble dyes.

The product subject to this investigation is classifiable under subheading 2932.13.00 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 proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) is December 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Such or Similar Comparisons

For purposes of the final determination, we have determined that furfuryl alcohol constitutes a single ''such or similar'' category of merchandise. Since the respondent sold merchandise in the home market identical to that sold in the United States during the POI, we made identical merchandise comparisons.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of furfuryl alcohol from Thailand 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. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.58 (1994), we made comparisons at the same level of trade, where possible.

United States Price

We based USP on purchase price, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to an unrelated purchaser before importation into the United States and because exporter's sales price methodology was not otherwise indicated (*see* Comment 2 below).

With regard to the calculation of movement expenses, we made deductions from the U.S. sales price, where appropriate, for foreign brokerage, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, and marine insurance in accordance with section 772(d)(2)(A) of the Act.

Since IRCT discounts all account receivables pertaining to its U.S. sales, we calculated U.S. credit expenses based on IRCT's average short-term interest rate. In accordance with section 772(d)(1)(B) of the Act, we added to USP the amount of the Thai import duties, not collected on material inputs, by reason of exportation of the subject merchandise to the United States.

In accordance with our standard practice, pursuant to the decision of the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company* v. *United States*, 834 F. Supp. 1391 (CIT 1993), our calculations include an adjustment to U.S. price for the consumption tax levied on comparison sales in Thailand (*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).

Cost of Production

As we indicated in our preliminary determination, the Department initiated an investigation of potential below-cost home market sales on November 21, 1994. In order to determine whether home market sales prices were below COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, general expenses and packing, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.51(c). We made the following adjustments to the respondent's reported COP data:

1. We recalculated IRCT's corn cob consumption based on the weighted-average cost of corn cobs used in the production of furfuryl alcohol during the POI;

2. We recalculated depreciation expense based on the fixed asset lives reported in IRCT's 1993 audited financial statements; and

3. We allocated annual general and administrative expenses based on annual cost of sales.

After computing COP, we added the sales-specific VAT and home market packing to the COP figure. We compared COP to reported prices that were net of movement charges, direct and indirect selling expenses, and inclusive of VAT and home market packing. In accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, we followed our standard methodology to determine whether the home market sales of each product were made at prices below 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.

To satisfy the requirement of section 773(b)(1) that below-cost sales be disregarded only if made in substantial quantities, we apply the following methodology. Where we find that over 90 percent of a respondent's sales were at prices above the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales because we determine that a respondent's below-cost sales are not made in substantial quantities. If between ten and 90 percent of a respondent's sales were at prices above the COP, we disregard only the below-cost sales if made over an extended period of time. Where we find that more than 90 percent of a respondent's sales were at prices below the COP and were sold over an extended period of time, we disregard all sales and calculate FMV based on CV, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act. In this case, we found that between ten and 90 percent of the sales were made below the COP. As a result, we tested whether those below cost sales had been made over an extended period of time.

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in order to determine whether below-cost sales had been made over an extended period of time, we compare the number of months in which below-cost sales occurred to the number of months in the POI in which the product was sold. If a product was sold in three or more months of the POI, we do not exclude below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales in at least three months during the POI. When we find that sales occurred in one or two months, the number of months in which the sales occurred constitutes the extended period of time; *i.e.*, where sales were made in only two months, the extended period of time was two months, where sales were made in only one month, the extended period of time was one month. (*See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the United Kingdom* (60 FR 10558, 10560, February 27, 1995)). In this case, we found that the respondent had made sales of furfuryl alcohol at prices below the COP in two of the months that sales were made. As a result, none of the sales made below the COP were disregarded.

Foreign Market Value

As stated in the preliminary determination, we found that the home market was viable for sales of furfuryl alcohol, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.48(a). We calculated FMV based on delivered prices, and deducted home market inland freight, unloading charges and insurance in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a).

FMV was reduced by home market packing costs and increased by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act. The Department also made circumstance-of-sale adjustments for home market direct selling expenses, which included imputed credit expenses and technical services in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2). We also deducted commissions incurred on home market sales and added total U.S. indirect selling expenses, capped by the amount of home market commissions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b). The total U.S. indirect selling expenses included U.S. inventory carrying costs, and indirect selling expenses incurred in Thailand on U.S. sales.

We adjusted for the consumption tax in accordance with our practice (*see* ''United States Price'' section of this notice).

Currency Conversion

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

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we verified the information used in making our final determination.

Interested Party Comments

What follows are summaries of the parties' arguments, followed by the Department's positions on each of the issues raised.

Comment 1: Using Best Information Otherwise Available (BIA)

The petitioner states that the Department should use BIA for purposes of the final determination because IRCT impeded the conduct of the investigation by failing to divulge the extent of its relationship with the U.S. importer, Indo-Rama Chemicals (America), Inc. (IRCA). The petitioner claims that IRCT should have reported its U.S. sales as ESP rather than on a purchase price basis, and only reported ESP data after the Department specifically requested it to do so.

The respondent states that it provided the Department with all the necessary ESP data in a timely manner when it was requested and, further, that it fully cooperated in the investigation regarding the relationship between IRCA and IRCT.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent that IRCT and IRCA cooperated with the Department throughout this investigation. They submitted all requested information, and documented it during verification. Because IRCT did not impede our investigation, we have used the respondent's data for purposes of the final determination.

Comment 2: ESP or Purchase Price

IRCT contends that its categorization of IRCA as an unrelated party is consistent with the Department's definition of related parties pursuant to section 771(13), was verified by the Department, and that the U.S. price should be based upon the purchase price methodology. The respondent's argument is fully discussed in the proprietary version of its case brief.

The petitioner argues that the record evidence indicates that IRCT and IRCA are related parties and, therefore, if the Department decides not to resort to BIA, it should base USP on ESP. The petitioner's argument is fully discussed

in the proprietary version of its case brief. The following are some of the non-proprietary points that the petitioner raises: (1) The owner of IRCA is also president and director to a sister company of IRCT; and (2) the ESP response was filed on behalf of IRCT by, and the entire response was certified only by, IRCT's counsel.

DOC Position

We determined that the information on the record, as verified by the Department, does not satisfy the criteria set forth in section 771(13) of the Act for recognizing the U.S. sales as ESP transactions. An analysis of the individual criteria considered requires reference to proprietary information and is discussed in the proprietary version of the concurrence memorandum, dated May 1, 1995. Because we found that IRCA does not act as IRCT's principal or agent, under 771(13), at least one of the parties would have to own or control an interest in the other, or some other person or persons would have to own or control sufficient interest in both, for the Department to determine USP on the basis of ESP data (*see Small Business Telephone Systems from Korea*, 54 FR 53141 (1989) and/or *Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from Japan*, 52 FR 36984 (1987)). The Department confirmed at verification that there was no ownership or controlling interest between IRCT and IRCA, and no common ownership or controlling interest by a third party. Therefore, we have based the USP on purchase price.

Comment 3: Indirect Selling Expenses

The petitioner argues that, because the respondent failed to provide the Department with information concerning additional indirect selling expenses and storage charges incurred in the United States, the Department should use BIA to determine the indirect selling expenses for the POI. As BIA, the petitioner requests that the Department rely on information in the petition.

The respondent asserts that it did not understate any selling expenses incurred in the importation, storage, or sale of furfuryl alcohol. The respondent argues that the Department verified both IRCT and IRCA with respect to these expenses. Therefore, in the event the Department makes its final determination based on ESP, the respondent argues that the Department should calculate U.S. indirect selling expenses on the information provided. The respondent further states that many of the indirect selling expenses that the petitioner referenced simply do not exist.

DOC Position

Based on the Department's decision to use the purchase price methodology, this issue has been rendered moot.

Comment 4: Interest Rate

The petitioner argues that the Department should use the appropriate interest rate from IRCA's response in computing any credit expenses and inventory carrying cost. The petitioner's argument is fully discussed in the proprietary version of its March 29, 1995 case brief.

The respondent states that it is not related to IRCA. However, should the Department base its determination on ESP sales, the respondent argues that the Department should not use IRCA's interest rate. The respondent's argument is fully discussed in the proprietary version of its case brief.

DOC Position

The use of the importers's interest rate in the calculation of credit expense and inventory carrying cost for U.S. sales is not at issue because the calculation of USP is based on the purchase price methodology. Therefore, the interest rate used to calculate both expenses for U.S. sales is based on IRCT's short-term borrowing experience. Because the U.S. sales are made in U.S. dollars, the interest rate used to calculate the credit expense and inventory carrying cost is the rate that IRCT incurs for its U.S. dollar denominated short-term borrowing for the POI (*see Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Disposable Pocket Lighters from Thailand*, 51 FR 14270, 14265 (March 16, 1995)).

Comment 5: Technical Service

IRCT contends that home market ''outside'' technical service expenses are directly related to specific sales, and are properly deductible as direct selling expenses.

DOC Position

This issue is moot because the expenses were incurred on sales which are not included in our final calculations, having occurred at a level of trade different than that of the U.S. sales.

Comment 6: Home Market Sale Outside the Ordinary Course of Trade

In its original sales listing, IRCT categorized one home market sale as outside of the ordinary course of trade. IRCT states that the sale was inadvertently reported as a normal sale in the revised sales listing. IRCT states that this sale was (1) a single isolated trial sale for a different application, (2) of a quantity far smaller than the standard quantity sold for all other home market sales, and (3) at a price substantially higher than that charged to IRCT's regular customers.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. Section 771(15) of the Act defines ''ordinary course of trade'' as those conditions and practices which are ''normal in the trade under consideration.'' The documents for this sale were verified and the sale was found to be an isolated, non-recurring sale, and at a quantity inconsistent with the standard quantity shipped. Therefore, because the sale was not normal in the trade under consideration, we found it to be made outside the ordinary course of trade under section 771(15) of the Act. Accordingly, we have not included it in our margin analysis.

Comment 7: Allocation of Indirect Selling Expenses

IRCT argues that the Department should use the revised allocation percentages for unassigned indirect selling expenses (*e.g.*, office rental, phone, etc.) that were presented during verification because these percentages more accurately reflect the actual time spent by the sales personnel.

The petitioner contends that this revised allocation constitutes a submission of untimely, unsupported data in the middle of verification and, therefore, should not be relied upon by the Department.

DOC Position

Based on the fact that neither IRCT's original allocation nor its revised allocation of indirect selling expenses was supported by documentation, neither was used in our final determination. Instead, the Department allocated these expenses based on the quantity of furfuryl alcohol sold in the domestic and export markets. Given the lack of information, this was the most reasonable allocation methodology available (*see* concurrence memorandum dated, May 1, 1995).

Comment 8: Corn Cob Costs

The petitioner asserts that the cost of corn cobs, a primary direct material of furfuryl and furfuryl alcohol, should be calculated based on the respondent's actual corn cob expenses incurred during the POI, rather than on the annual weighted-average methodology submitted by IRCT. Further, the petitioner argues for the use of actual expenses because the respondent's corn cob prices vary according to competitive

market conditions, rather than the seasonality of corn production claimed by the respondent.

The respondent contends that its methodology accurately reflects corn cob consumption because it eliminates seasonal trends in pricing, availability, and purchases. Additionally, the respondent states its submission methodology is consistent with its normal accounting system. Moreover, the petitioner's proposed methodology ignores the value of corn cob in beginning inventory. Therefore, the respondent argues that the Department should reject the petitioner's claim.

DOC Position

The most appropriate cost calculation methodology for corn cobs used in the production of furfuryl alcohol should take into account the actual corn cobs used during the POI based on IRCT's normal weighted-average inventory cost flow assumption. Therefore, we have recalculated IRCT's corn cob cost based on the weighted-average cost of corn cob inventories at the beginning of the POI, plus all purchases of the input made during the POI.

Comment 9: Depreciation

The petitioner argues that the Department should reject IRCT's claimed increase in the useful lives of its buildings and machinery which was submitted in accordance with a change in IRCT's depreciation policy. According to the petitioner, IRCT's proposed change in its depreciation policy was approved after the initiation of this case. It maintains that, at a minimum, the Department should recompute depreciation expense for IRCT's buildings and machinery based on the original useful lives of the assets. However, the petitioner claims that even these useful lives, as well as the useful lives of other assets owned by IRCT, are inconsistent with U.S. generally accepted accounting principals (GAAP) and thus distort the costs associated with the production of furfuryl alcohol.

IRCT argues that its submitted depreciation expense reflects its normal record keeping for the period that most closely corresponds to the POI. It claims that it extended the useful lives of its buildings and machinery because the assets were constructed of ''high-quality, long-lasting'' materials. The decision to change the estimated useful lives of its assets, IRCT states, was made prior to the initiation of this investigation.

DOC Position

In computing COP for the subject merchandise, the Department generally relies on the accounting records maintained by respondent in the normal course of its operations. These records, however, must be kept in accordance with respondent's home country GAAP if those GAAP reasonably reflect the costs associated with producing the subject merchandise.

In IRCT's case, the change in the useful lives of buildings and machinery assets, although reflected in the company's accounting records during 1994, had yet to be approved by the company's independent auditors or the Thai government as of the date of our verification. Thus, we believe that it is inappropriate for us to determine whether IRCT's change in the useful lives of these assets reasonably reflects the company's depreciation expense for the POI since it is impossible for us to conclude that the new policy is in accordance with Thai GAAP.

We disagree with the petitioner's argument that the original useful lives of IRCT's assets are not in accordance with U.S. GAAP and thus distort furfuryl alcohol production costs. U.S. GAAP allows companies to determine the useful lives of production assets based on the estimated economic lives of those assets. In IRCT's case, we have no reason to believe that the depreciable lives historically utilized by the company fail to reflect the economic lives of the underlying assets. Therefore, we have calculated depreciation expense based on the original useful lives of the assets.

Comment 10: General and Administrative Expense (''G&A'') Allocation

The petitioner contends that IRCT provided no justification for deviating from the Department's normal G&A calculation methodology by allocating G&A expenses to non-productive cost centers. According to the petitioner, IRCT's methodology distorts the cost of production for furfuryl alcohol. Therefore, as BIA, the petitioner asserts the Department should allocate all G&A expenses solely to furfuryl alcohol.

IRCT argues that its G&A allocation methodology is consistent with GAAP and appropriate for this investigation. According to IRCT, the Department's normal methodology of allocating G&A, on the basis of cost of sales, overstates furfuryl alcohol production costs. IRCT contends that, its G&A allocation methodology more properly matches benefits received from G&A expenditures to the appropriate business cost centers.

DOC Position

We agree with the petitioner that IRCT did not adequately support is G&A allocation methodology. To compute G&A expense for COP, IRCT allocated its G&A expense equally among its four cost centers. Two of those cost centers did not produce any products during the POI.

During verification, IRCT provided no evidence to support its allocation methodology for G&A expenditures, nor did IRCT demonstrate that the allocation methodology was used in its normal accounting system. Instead, we found that IRCT's submitted G&A allocation methodology was based on subjective factors. We have, therefore, recalculated IRCT's G&A expenses by allocating reported fiscal year 1993 company-wide G&A expense based on the company's cost of sales for that year. This is in accordance with our normal G&A methodology, as stated in section D of the Department's questionnaire.

Comment 11: G&A Expense Calculation Period

IRCT reported G&A expenses based on the six-month POI rather than on an annual basis. IRCT contends its six-month G&A expense calculation accurately reflects the actual G&A costs incurred during the POI.

DOC Position

Ordinarily, G&A expenses are considered to be period costs for accounting purposes. As such, they differ from product costs like direct materials, labor, and overhead in that G&A expenses are not included in inventory costs but, instead, are accounted for as expenses during the period in which they are incurred. This is because, unlike product costs, G&A can neither be easily nor accurately matched to the revenues generated from the sales of an individual unit of production. Instead, G&A expenses are typically incurred in connection with a company's overall operations. Many expenses categorized as G&A, such as insurance and bonus payments, are incurred sporadically throughout the fiscal year. Moreover, G&A expenses are often accrued during the fiscal year based on estimates that are then adjusted to actual expenses at year-end. Because of their nature as period costs, and due to the irregular manner in which many companies record G&A expenses, the Department generally looks to a full-year period in computing G&A expenses for COP and CV. Such a period encompasses operating results over a longer time span than the POI and typically reports the results of at

least one business cycle. Under ordinary circumstances, the most appropriate full-year G&A period is that represented by the latest fiscal year for which the respondent has complete and audited financial statements.

IRCT provided no evidence to justify deviating from the Department's normal practice of using annual financial data for G&A. As of the last day of verification, IRCT's 1994 audited financial statements were not available. Consequently, we calculated G&A expense based on IRCT's 1993 annual audited financial statements.

Comment 12: Waste Water

The petitioner states that IRCT excluded certain waste water treatment expenses from its submitted COP. As BIA, the petitioner suggests that the Department include the accounts payable amount reported in IRCT's May 1994 Trial Balance.

The respondent asserts that it has properly included all waste water treatment costs in its submitted COP. It states that the particular account noted by the petitioner reflects costs associated with the purchase of waste water treatment equipment.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. The respondent included all waste water treatment expenses incurred during the POI in its COP submission. Therefore, no adjustment is required.

Comment 13: Insurance Proceeds

IRCT offset its submitted COP for furfuryl alcohol by insurance proceeds received due to an unexpected equipment failure during the POI. IRCT contends that it properly included insurance revenue received for both equipment repair costs and for the increase in per-unit costs resulting from the equipment failure.

The petitioner concedes that IRCT tied part of the insurance settlement directly to equipment repair costs and should be allowed a partial offset for these costs. According to the petitioner, however, IRCT did not show how the remaining proceeds relate to the company's claimed increase in per-unit costs.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent that the insurance proceeds should be used to offset IRCT's furfuryl alcohol costs. During verification, we found that the insurance proceeds were paid to IRCT for equipment failure and overhead costs incurred during the period in which the equipment was under repair. Thus, these proceeds relate directly to the equipment failure which occurred during the POI. Due to this equipment failure, IRCT incurred higher per-unit production costs in addition to the cost of repairs. Accordingly, we consider it reasonable for IRCT to offset its submitted COP by all proceeds received for the insurance claim.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of furfuryl alcohol from Thailand, as defined in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of our final determination [1] in the **Federal Register**.

The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond on all entries equal to the estimated amount by which the FMV exceeds the USP, as shown below. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
IRCT	5.94
All Others	5.94

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 45 days of the publication of this notice. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or cancelled.

However, if the ITC determines that such injury does exist, we will issue an antidumping duty order directing the Customs Service officers to assess an antidumping duty on furfuryl alcohol from Thailand, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of suspension of liquidation, equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise exceeds the United States price.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

[1] The preliminary determination was negative in this case.

Dated: May 1, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–11263 Filed 5–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–588–807]

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Japan; Partial Termination and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of partial termination and preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from Mitsuboshi Belting Limited (MBL) and Nakamichi America Corporation (Nakamichi), the respondents, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial belts and components and parts thereof, whether cured or uncured (hereinafter referred to as industrial belts), from Japan. Subsequently, Nakamichi made a timely request to withdraw its request for an administrative review, and since there were no other requests for review of Nakamichi's exports to the United States, the Department is terminating its 1993/94 administrative review of Nakamichi. Therefore, this review covers one manufacturer/exporter, MBL, during the period June 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994.

As a result of this review, the Department has preliminarily determined to assess antidumping duties for MBL based upon the best information otherwise available (BIA). Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results of this administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Vannatta in the Office of Antidumping Compliance; Import Administration; International Trade Administration; 14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.; U.S. Department of Commerce; Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone number (202) 482–5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references