

Department should increase the submitted COP and CV for the two products sold in the U.S. during the POI, but produced prior to the POI, because Dalmine was less profitable in 1993.

The respondent maintains that it calculated the average COP and CV for CONNUM's 45 and 108 by using a simple average of the cost of the products that comprise each CONNUM rather than a weighted average with a weighting factor for the cost of products not produced during the POI. Thus, the respondent contends that it properly reported actual contemporaneous cost information.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. Dalmine used a simple average of the cost of the products that comprised CONNUM's 45 and 108 and our statement in the verification report that the respondent used a weighting factor for some of the products in its cost calculation for CONNUM's 45 and 108 is inaccurate. We calculated COP/CV by weight averaging the average costs of products classified within those CONNUM's by the production quantities which we obtained at verification.

We disagree with the petitioner's claim that the Department should increase the submitted cost data for the products produced prior to the POI because the company was less profitable in the prior year. The Department tested Dalmine's standard costs as adjusted to actual costs at verification and determined that these costs actually reflect the costs incurred during the POI.

Comment 19

The petitioner contends that Dalmine understated its reported general and administrative (G&A) expenses as it failed to include an allocation of G&A expenses incurred by ILVA and IRI. Because Dalmine failed to disclose that it was consolidated with ILVA and IRI, the petitioner believes that, as BIA, the Department should add the G&A expenses calculated from ILVA's 1992 financial statements and IRI's 1993 financial statements to the amounts reported by Dalmine.

The respondent maintains that the Department verified that an appropriate share of parent company management costs was included in the submitted COP/CV data.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. It is the Department's practice to include a portion of the G&A expenses incurred

by affiliated companies on the reporting entity's behalf in total G&A expenses for COP/CV purposes. *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value:*

Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Malaysia, 59 Fed. Reg. 4023, 4027 (Jan. 28, 1994); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Ferrosilicon from Venezuela*, 58 Fed. Reg. 27524 (May 10, 1993); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sweaters from Hong Kong*, 55 Fed. Reg. 30733 (July 27, 1990); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Small Business Telephones and Subassemblies Thereof from Korea*, 54 Fed. Reg. 53141 (Dec. 27, 1989). In the present case, the respondent included a portion of Dalmine's G&A expenses and the G&A expenses of its producing subsidiary in the submitted G&A expenses. We identified no parent company costs allocable to Dalmine.

Comment 20

The petitioner questions whether all steel mill variances have been captured because steel bar costs have been reported exclusively on the basis of standard costs. The petitioner claims that price and efficiency variances for the steel mill were excluded from the ratio used to allocate variances to each product.

The respondent claims that the Department verified that the steel mill variance was properly allocated to the subject merchandise.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. The steel mill net profit reported on the respondent's management report was zero after all steel mill costs were allocated to producing mills, based on steel usage by the mills. Therefore, all steel mill activity, including variances, was properly allocated to the producing mills.

Suspension of Liquidation

Pursuant to the results of this final determination, we will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated final dumping margin, as shown below, for entries of seamless standard, line and pressure pipe from Italy that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Producer/manufacturer exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Dalmine	1.84
All Others	1.84

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 will be refunded or cancelled. However, if the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protection order ("APO") in these investigations of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.4(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. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

Dated: June 12, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14939 Filed 6-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-475-815]

Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe ("Seamless Pipe") From Italy

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Wilkniss, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0588.

FINAL DETERMINATION: The Department determines that benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning

of section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Italy of seamless pipe. For information on the estimated net subsidies, please see the Suspension of Liquidation section of this notice.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994. References to the *Countervailing Duties: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (*Proposed Regulations*), which has been withdrawn, are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's CVD practice.

Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 60774, November 28, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On December 23, 1994, we aligned the final countervailing duty determination in this investigation with the final determination in the companion antidumping investigation of seamless pipe from Italy (59 FR 66296).

We conducted verification of the responses submitted on behalf of the Government of Italy ("GOI"), and Dalmine S.p.A. ("Dalmine") from January 22 through January 27, 1995.

On April 19, 1995, we postponed the final determination in this case to June 12, 1995 (60 FR 19571).

On May 2, 1995 we received a case brief from respondent. Neither petitioner or respondent requested a hearing in this investigation.

Scope of Investigation

The following scope language reflects certain modifications made for purposes of the final determination, where appropriate, as discussed in the "Scope Issues" section of the final determination in the companion antidumping case of seamless pipe from Italy.

The scope of this investigation includes seamless pipes produced to the ASTM A-335, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L specifications and meeting the physical parameters described below, regardless of application. The scope of this investigation also includes all products used in standard, line, or pressure pipe applications and meeting the physical parameters below, regardless of specification.

For purposes of this investigation, seamless pipes are seamless carbon and alloy (other than stainless) steel pipes, of circular cross-section, not more than 114.3 mm (4.5 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, manufacturing process (hot-finished or cold-drawn), end finish (plain end, bevelled end, upset end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or surface finish. These pipes are commonly known as standard pipe, line pipe or pressure pipe, depending upon the application. They may also be used in structural applications. Pipes produced in non-standard wall thicknesses are commonly referred to as tubes.

The seamless pipes subject to these investigations are currently classifiable under subheadings 7304.10.10.20, 7304.10.50.20, 7304.31.60.50, 7304.39.00.16, 7304.39.00.20, 7304.39.00.24, 7304.39.00.28, 7304.39.00.32, 7304.51.50.05, 7304.51.50.60, 7304.59.60.00, 7304.59.80.10, 7304.59.80.15, 7304.59.80.20, and 7304.59.80.25 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

The following information further defines the scope of this investigation, which covers pipes meeting the physical parameters described above:

Specifications, Characteristics and Uses: Seamless pressure pipes are intended for the conveyance of water, steam, petrochemicals, chemicals, oil products, natural gas and other liquids and gasses in industrial piping systems. They may carry these substances at elevated pressures and temperatures and may be subject to the application of external heat. Seamless carbon steel pressure pipe meeting the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard A-106 may be used in temperatures of up to 1000 degrees fahrenheit, at various American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) code stress levels. Alloy pipes made to ASTM standard A-335 must be used if temperatures and stress levels exceed those allowed for A-106 and the ASME codes. Seamless pressure pipes sold in the United States are commonly produced to the ASTM A-106 standard.

Seamless standard pipes are most commonly produced to the ASTM A-53 specification and generally are not intended for high temperature service. They are intended for the low temperature and pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air and other liquids and gasses in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses. Standard pipes (depending on type and code) may carry liquids at elevated temperatures but must not

exceed relevant ASME code requirements.

Seamless line pipes are intended for the conveyance of oil and natural gas or other fluids in pipe lines. Seamless line pipes are produced to the API 5L specification.

Seamless pipes are commonly produced and certified to meet ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L specifications. Such triple certification of pipes is common because all pipes meeting the stringent A-106 specification necessarily meet the API 5L and ASTM A-53 specifications. Pipes meeting the API 5L specification necessarily meet the ASTM A-53 specification. However, pipes meeting the A-53 or API 5L specifications do not necessarily meet the A-106 specification. To avoid maintaining separate production runs and separate inventories, manufacturers triple certify the pipes. Since distributors sell the vast majority of this product, they can thereby maintain a single inventory to service all customers.

The primary application of ASTM A-106 pressure pipes and triple certified pipes is in pressure piping systems by refineries, petrochemical plants and chemical plants. Other applications are in power generation plants (electrical-fossil fuel or nuclear), and in some oil field uses (on shore and off shore) such as for separator lines, gathering lines and metering runs. A minor application of this product is for use as oil and gas distribution lines for commercial applications. These applications constitute the majority of the market for the subject seamless pipes. However, A-106 pipes may be used in some boiler applications.

The scope of this investigation includes all seamless pipe meeting the physical parameters described above and produced to one of the specifications listed above, regardless of application, and whether or not also certified to a non-covered specification. Standard, line and pressure applications and the above listed specifications are defining characteristics of the scope of this investigation. Therefore, seamless pipes meeting the physical description above, but not produced to the A-335, A-106, A-53, or API 5L standards shall be covered if used in a standard, line or pressure application.

For example, there are certain other ASTM specifications of pipe which, because of overlapping characteristics, could potentially be used in A-106 applications. These specifications generally include A-162, A-192, A-210, A-333, and A-524. When such pipes are used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, such products are

covered by the scope of this investigation.

Specifically excluded from this investigation are boiler tubing and mechanical tubing, if such products are not produced to A-335, A-106, A-53 or API 5L specifications and are not used in standard, line or pressure applications. In addition, finished and unfinished OCTG are excluded from the scope of this investigation, if covered by the scope of another countervailing duty order from the same country. If not covered by such an OCTG order, finished and unfinished OCTG are included in this scope when used in standard, line or pressure applications. Finally, also excluded from this investigation are redraw hollows for cold-drawing when used in the production of cold-drawn pipe or tube.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Dalmine has raised a scope issue in this investigation. The Department has addressed all scope issues in the final determination of the companion antidumping investigation of seamless pipe from Italy.

Injury Test

Because Italy is a "country under the Agreement" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, the U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC") is required to determine whether imports of seamless pipe from Italy materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry. On August 3, 1994, the ITC preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports from Italy of the subject merchandise (59 FR 42286, August 17, 1994).

Corporate History of Respondent Dalmine

Prior to its liquidation in 1988, Finsider S.p.A. ("Finsider") was the holding company for all state-owned steel companies in Italy, including Dalmine. Dalmine was an operating company wholly owned by Finsider. After Finsider's liquidation, a new government-owned holding company, ILVA S.p.A. ("ILVA"), was created. ILVA took over the former Finsider companies, among them Dalmine, which became a subsidiary of ILVA in 1989 when Finsider's shareholding in Dalmine was transferred to ILVA.

Between 1990 and 1993, Dalmine itself was radically restructured. Dalmine became a financial holding company, with industrial, trading, and

service shareholdings. As part of its restructuring, Dalmine made several asset purchases, sold two of its subsidiaries to private parties, and closed several manufacturing facilities. As of December 31, 1993, the Dalmine Group consisted of a holding company (Dalmine S.p.A.), four wholly-owned, and one majority-owned, manufacturing companies, and a number of sales and service subsidiaries.

During the POI, ILVA was owned by the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale ("IRI"), a holding company which was wholly-owned by the GOI.

Spin-offs

In its questionnaire response, Dalmine reported that between 1990 and 1991, as part of its overall restructuring process, the company twice sold "productive units" to private buyers. According to Dalmine, these sales involved facilities that do not produce the subject merchandise. In the preliminary determination, we determined that the amount of potentially spun-off benefits was insignificant. We did not learn anything at verification that would lead us to reverse this determination. Therefore, we have not reduced the subsidies allocated to sales of the subject merchandise. (See Final Concurrence Memorandum dated June 12, 1995).

Equityworthiness

Petitioner has alleged that Dalmine was unequityworthy in 1989, the year it received an indirect equity infusion from the GOI, through ILVA S.p.A. ("ILVA"), and that the equity infusion was, therefore, inconsistent with commercial considerations.

In accordance with section 355.44(e)(1) of the Proposed Regulations (Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments ("Proposed Regulations"), 54 FR 23366, May 31, 1989)), we preliminarily determined that ILVA's purchase of Dalmine's shares was consistent with commercial considerations because Dalmine provided evidence that private investors, unrelated to Dalmine or the GOI, purchased a significant percentage of the 1989 equity offering, on the same terms as ILVA. We did not learn anything at verification that would lead us to reverse this finding. Therefore, the Department determines that ILVA's purchase of Dalmine's shares was consistent with commercial considerations.

Creditworthiness

Petitioner has alleged that Dalmine was uncreditworthy in every year

between 1979 and 1993. In accordance with section 355.44(b)(6)(i) of the Proposed Regulations, we preliminarily determined that Dalmine was creditworthy from 1979 to 1993. In making this determination we examined Dalmine's current, quick, times interest earned, and debt-to-equity ratios, in addition to its profit margin. Specifically, although a number of the financial indicators are weak for certain years, none of the indicators are weak over the medium or long term, and when examined together on a yearly basis, the indicators support the determination that Dalmine was creditworthy in every year examined. (See also Creditworthy Memorandum, November 18, 1994). In addition, Dalmine received long-term, commercial loans from private lenders in several of the years examined.

We did not learn anything new at verification that would lead us to reconsider our preliminary determination. Therefore, we continue to find that Dalmine was creditworthy from 1979 to 1993.

Benchmarks and Discount Rates

Dalmine did not take out any long-term, fixed-rate, lire-denominated loans in any of the years of the government loans under investigation. Therefore, in accordance with section 355.44(b)(4) of the Proposed Regulations, in our preliminary determination we used, as the benchmark interest rate, the Bank of Italy reference rate which was determined in Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from Italy ("Certain Steel from Italy"), 58 FR, 37327 (July 9, 1993), to be both the best approximation of the cost of long-term borrowing in Italy and the only long-term fixed interest rate commonly available in Italy. We also used this rate as the discount rate for allocating over time the benefit from non-recurring grants for the same reasons as explained in Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products from Spain, 58 FR 37374, 37376 (July 9, 1993).

At verification, we learned that the Bank of Italy reference rate reflects the cost for Italian banks to borrow long-term funds. Therefore, the reference rate does not incorporate the mark-up a bank would charge a corporate client when making a long-term loan. Long-term corporate interest rate data is not available in Italy. Accordingly, we have adjusted the reference rate used in the preliminary determination upward to reflect the mark-up an Italian bank would charge a corporate customer.

In order to approximate this mark-up, we calculated the difference between the average short-term corporate borrowing rate in Italy and the average interest rate on short-term Italian government debt, for each year in which Dalmine received long-term lire loans or non-recurring grants from the government. We then added this mark-up to the Italian reference rate used in the preliminary determination to approximate an average long-term corporate benchmark interest rate. We also used these rates as the discount rates for allocating over time the benefit from non-recurring grants. See *Certain Steel Products from Spain*, 58 FR at 37376.

For long-term loans denominated in other currencies, we used, as the benchmark interest rate, an average long-term fixed interest rate for loans denominated in the same currency. (See section E—Article 54 Loans below.)

Calculation Methodology

For purposes of this determination, the period for which we are measuring subsidies (the POI) is calendar year 1993. In determining the benefits received under the various programs described below, we used the following calculation methodology. We first calculated the benefit attributable to the POI for each countervailable program, using the methodologies described in each program section below. For each program, we then divided the benefit attributable to Dalmine in the POI by Dalmine's total sales revenue, as none of the programs was limited to either certain subsidiaries or products of Dalmine. Next, we added the benefits for all programs, including the benefits for programs which were not allocated over time, to arrive at Dalmine's total subsidy rate. Because Dalmine is the only respondent company in this investigation, this rate is also the country-wide rate.

Based upon our analysis of the petition, the responses to our questionnaires, verification, and comments by interested parties, we determine the following:

I. Programs Determined To Be Countervailable

A. Benefits Provided Under Law 675/77

Law 675/77 was enacted to bring about restructuring and reconversion in the following industrial sectors: (1) electronic technology; (2) the manufacturing industry; (3) the agro-food industry; (4) the chemical industry; (5) the steel industry; (6) the pulp and paper industry; (7) the fashion sector; and (8) the automobile and aviation

sectors. Law 675/77 also sought to promote optimal exploitation of energy resources, and ecological and environmental recovery.

A primary goal of this legislation was to bring all government industrial assistance programs under a single law in order to develop a system to replace indiscriminate and random public intervention by the GOI. Other goals were (1) to reorganize and develop the industrial sector as a whole; (2) to increase employment in the South; and (3) to maintain employment in depressed areas. Among other measures taken, the Interministerial Committee for the Coordination of Industrial Policy ("CIPI") was created as a result of Law 675/77. CIPI approves individual projects in each of the industrial sectors listed above.

Six main programs were provided under Law 675/77: (1) interest contributions on bank loans; (2) mortgage loans provided by the Ministry of Industry at subsidized interest rates; (3) interest contributions on funds raised by bond issues; (4) capital grants for projects in the South; (5) personnel retraining grants; and (6) VAT reductions on purchases of capital goods by companies in the South. Dalmine reported that it received benefits under items (1), (2), and (5) above.

In its response, the GOI asserts that the steel and automobile industries did not receive a "disproportionate" share of benefits associated with interest contributions when the extent of investment in those industries is compared to the extent of investment in other industries. However, in keeping with past practice, we did not consider the level of investment in the individual industries receiving benefits under Law 675/77. Instead, we followed the analysis outlined in *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel From Italy (Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel)*, 59 FR 18357 (April 18, 1994), and *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From Brazil*, 58 FR 37295, 37295 (July 9, 1993), of comparing the share of benefits received by the steel industry to the collective share of benefits provided to other users of the programs.

According to the information provided by the GOI, of the eight industrial sectors eligible for benefits under Law 675/77, the two dominant users of the interest contribution program were (1) the Italian auto industry which accounted for 34 percent of the benefits, and (2) the Italian steel industry which accounted for 33 percent of the benefits. Likewise,

with respect to the mortgage loans, the two dominant users were the auto and steel industries which received 45 percent and 31 percent of the benefits, respectively.

In light of the above evidence, we determine that the steel industry was a dominant user of both the interest contribution and the mortgage loan programs under Law 675/77. (See section 355.43(b)(2)(iii) of the *Proposed Regulations*). Therefore, we determine that benefits received by Dalmine under these programs are being provided to a specific enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. On this basis, we find Law 675/77 financing to be countervailable to the extent that it is granted on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

Under the interest contribution program, Italian commercial banks provided loans to industries designated under Law 675/77. The interest owed by the recipient companies was partially offset by interest contributions from the GOI. Dalmine received bank loans with interest contributions under Law 675/77 which were outstanding in the POI.

Because the GOI interest contributions were automatically available when the loans were taken out, we consider the contributions to constitute reductions in the interest rates charged, rather than grants (see *Certain Steel From Italy* at 37335).

At verification, we established that Dalmine had repaid each of the loans it received under this program in June 1994. We further found that Dalmine had not yet received a portion of the interest contributions originally owed to it by the GOI under this program, due to delays in GOI approval of several Dalmine internal asset transfers. Finally, we established that Dalmine had paid interest on each of the loans during the loan grace periods, contrary to what Dalmine reported in its questionnaire responses.

Dalmine argues that the GOI terminated the subsidized loan portion of this program in 1982, and that Dalmine repaid each of the loans in June 1994, after the POI, but before the publication of the preliminary determination. Consequently, Dalmine contends, no further benefits can accrue to Dalmine under this program. Therefore, according to Dalmine, the Department should, in accordance with the Department's policy to take program-wide changes into account in setting the duty deposit rate, set Dalmine's deposit rate for this program to zero.

Contrary to Dalmine's assertion, we determine that the termination of the subsidized loan portion of this program

does not constitute a program-wide change as defined in section 355.50(b)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*. Specifically, although Dalmine has repaid the loans it received under the program, there could be other Italian companies with loans that are still outstanding. Therefore, despite termination of the program in 1982, there may still be residual benefits under the program. Under our program-wide change policy, the change at issue cannot be limited to individual firms. Consequently, we determine that the "termination" of the subsidized loan portion of this program does not constitute a program-wide change. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Orders; Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube Products From Argentina (Argentine Pipe)*, 53 FR 37619 (September 27, 1988); Section 355.50(b)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*.

Alternatively, Dalmine claims that the Department should recalculate the benefits under this program to reflect the delayed receipt of GOI interest contributions, as well as Dalmine's payment of grace period interest.

With respect to the grace period, we have adjusted our calculations to reflect that Dalmine paid interest during that time, as established at verification. However, we are treating the interest contributions as countervailable on the date Dalmine made the corresponding interest payments, despite any delay in receipt by Dalmine. This is because Dalmine's entitlement to the interest contributions was automatic when it made the interest payments. Thus, we find, for purposes of benefit calculation, that the interest contributions were received at the time the interest payments were made. See *Steel Wire Nails from New Zealand*, 52 FR 37196 (1987).

Under the mortgage loan program, the GOI provides long-term loans at subsidized interest rates. Dalmine received financing under this program which was outstanding in the POI.

To determine whether these programs conferred a benefit, we compared the effective interest rate paid by Dalmine to the benchmark interest rate, discussed above. Based on this comparison, we determine that the financing provided under these programs is inconsistent with commercial considerations, *i.e.*, on terms more favorable than the benchmark financing.

To calculate the benefit from these programs, we used our standard long-term loan methodology as described in section 355.49(c)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*. We then divided the

benefit allocated to the POI for each program by Dalmine's total sales in 1993. On this basis, we determine the net subsidy from these programs to be 0.46 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters in Italy of the subject merchandise.

With respect to retraining grants provided to Dalmine under Law 675/77, it is the Department's practice to treat training benefits as recurring grants. (See *Certain Steel General Issues Appendix* at 37226). Since the only grant reported under this program was received by Dalmine in 1986, any benefit to Dalmine as a result of this grant cannot be attributed to the POI. Therefore, we determine that retraining benefits provided under Law 675/77 conferred no benefit to Dalmine during the POI.

B. Grants Under Law 193/84

According to the GOI, Articles 2, 3, and 4 of Law 193/84 provide for subsidies to close steel plants. As stated in Art. 20 of Law N. 46 of 17/2/1982, steel enterprises, including enterprises producing seamless pipes, welded pipes, conduits and welded pipes for water and gas, are the recipients of these subsidies. As benefits under this program are limited to the steel industry, we determine that Law 193/84 is *de jure* specific and, therefore, countervailable.

At verification, we found that Dalmine received an additional benefit under this program not reported in its questionnaire responses. We have included this additional benefit in our calculation of the benefits received by Dalmine under this program.

To calculate the benefit during the POI, we used our standard grant methodology (see section 355.49(b) of the *Proposed Regulations*). We then divided the benefits attributable to Dalmine under Law 193/84 in the POI by Dalmine's total sales. On this basis, we determine the estimated net subsidy to be 0.81 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters in Italy of the subject merchandise.

C. Exchange Rate Guarantee Program

This program, which was enacted by Law 796/76, provides exchange rate guarantees on foreign currency loans from the European Coal and Steel Community ("ECSC") and *The Council of European Resettlement Fund* ("CER"). Under the program, repayment amounts are calculated by reference to the exchange rate in effect at the time the loan is agreed upon. The program sets a ceiling and a floor on repayment to limit the effect on the borrower of exchange rate changes over time. For

example, if the lire depreciates five percent against the DM (the currency in which the loan is taken out), borrowers would normally find that they would have to repay five percent more (in lire terms). However, under the Exchange Rate Guarantee Program, the ceiling would act to limit the increased repayment amount to two percent. There is also a floor in the program which would apply if the lire appreciated against the DM. The floor would limit any windfall to the borrower.

In *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, the Department found this program to be not countervailable because of incomplete information regarding the specificity of the program. The Department stated that, because the determination was reached while lacking certain important information, the finding of non-countervailability would not carry over to future investigations.

In this investigation, information provided by the GOI shows that the steel industry received 25% of the benefits under the program. Furthermore, at verification, we found that in the years Dalmine took out loans on which it received exchange rate guarantees under this program, the steel industry received virtually all the benefits under the program. Based on this information, the Department determines that the steel industry was a dominant user of exchange rate guarantees under Law 796/76 and, thus, that benefits received by Dalmine under this law are being provided to a specific enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. (See section 355.43(b)(2)(iii) of the *Proposed Regulations*). Therefore, we determine that the exchange rate guarantees offered under the program are countervailable to the extent they are provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

Dalmine provided information that it could have purchased an exchange rate guarantee from commercial sources. However, Dalmine's information pertained to 1993, not to the period when the government guarantees were provided. The GOI's response indicates that commercial exchange rate guarantees were not available in 1986, the year in which the loans and the guarantees were received. Therefore, we determine the benefit to be the total amount of payments to Dalmine made during the POI by the GOI. (Because the amount the government will pay in any given year will not be known until that year, benefits can only be calculated on a year-by-year basis.) We divided the GOI's payments in 1993 by Dalmine's

1993 total sales. On this basis, we determine the estimated net subsidy from this program to be 0.20 percent ad valorem for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters in Italy of the subject merchandise.

II. Programs Determined To Be Not Countervailable

A. 1988/89 Equity Infusion

In November 1989, Dalmine completed an equity rights offering which allowed existing shareholders to purchase 7 new shares for every 10 shares they already owned. The new shares were offered at a price of LIT 300 per share. At that time, ILVA owned 81.7 percent of Dalmine's equity, with the remaining 18.3 percent owned by private investors. Pursuant to the rights offering, ILVA subscribed to its full allotment of the new shares issued. The remainder of the new shares were purchased by private shareholders. All shares were purchased at LIT 300 per share.

Petitioner argues that, although Dalmine's shares were nominally publicly traded, the vast majority of Dalmine shares were indirectly owned by the GOI and, therefore, shares were not purchased in adequate volume by private investors to establish a valid benchmark. Specifically, petitioner contends that, in 1991, ILVA owned 99.9 percent of Dalmine and, therefore, Dalmine's shares were in fact not publicly traded. Consequently, because essentially no private purchases were being made, the market price at the time of the equity infusion cannot serve as a valid benchmark. Furthermore, petitioner asserts that it is highly likely that the remaining shares not purchased by ILVA were purchased indirectly by the GOI through other holding companies.

In response to our questionnaire, Dalmine provided a list of all purchasers of shares in the 1989 offering. There was no evidence to indicate that the shares not purchased by ILVA were purchased by other government controlled or owned entities, as petitioner suggests.

Moreover, the extent of ILVA's ownership in 1991 is not relevant to the choice of a benchmark for the equity investment in 1989.

Therefore, in our preliminary determination, we determined that, because 18.3 percent of the equity infusion was purchased by private shareholders, the sale of these shares provides the market-determined price for Dalmine's equity. Furthermore, in accordance with section 355.44 (e)(1) of the Department's *Proposed Regulations*,

we preliminarily determined that the equity infusion is not countervailable because the market-determined price for equity purchased from Dalmine is not less than the price paid by ILVA for the same form of equity. We did not learn anything at verification that would lead us to reconsider our preliminary determination. Therefore, we continue to find that the equity infusion is not countervailable.

B. European Social Fund ("ESF") Grants

The ESF was established by the 1957 European Economic Community Treaty to increase employment and help raise worker living standards.

As described in *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, the ESF receives its funds from the EC's general budget of which the main revenue sources are customs duties, agricultural levies, value-added taxes collected by the member states, and other member state contributions.

The member states are responsible for selecting the projects to be funded by the EC. The EC then disburses the grants to the member states which manage the funds and implement the projects. According to the EC, ESF grants are available to (1) people over 25 who have been unemployed for more than 12 months; (2) people under 25 who have reached the minimum school-leaving age and who are seeking a job; and (3) certain workers in rural areas and regions characterized by industrial decline or lagging development.

The GOI has stated that the ESF grants received by Italy have been used for vocational training. Certain regions in the South are also eligible for private sector re-entry and retraining schemes. Since 1990, the vocational training grants have been available to unemployed youths and long-term unemployed adults all over Italy, according to the GOI. Before 1990, however, the GOI gave preference to certain regions in Italy.

In *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, we determined that this program was not regionally specific and not otherwise limited to a specific enterprise or industry, or group of enterprises or industries. Furthermore, we noted that to the extent there is a regional preference (i.e., southern Italy) in the distribution of ESF benefits, it has not resulted in a countervailable benefit to the production of the subject merchandise, which is produced in northern Italy.

Information provided by the GOI in this investigation is consistent with the information provided in *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*. Therefore, we determine that this program is not

limited to a specific enterprise or industry, or group of enterprises or industries, and therefore, is not countervailable.

C. ECSC Article 54 Loans

Under Article 54 of the 1951 ECSC Treaty, the European Commission provides loans directly to iron and steel companies for modernization and the purchase of new equipment. The loans finance up to 50 percent of an investment project. The remaining financing needs must be met from other sources. The Article 54 loan program is financed by loans taken by the Commission, which are then re-lent to iron and steel companies in the member states at a slightly higher interest rate than that at which the Commission obtained them.

Consistent with the Department's finding in *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, we determine that this program is limited to the iron and steel industry. As a result, loans under this program are specific.

Of the Article 54 loans Dalmine had outstanding during the POI, some were denominated in U.S. dollars and others were in Dutch guilders ("NLG"). To determine whether the loans were provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations, we used the benchmark interest rates for the currencies in which the loans were denominated. That is, for the U.S. dollar loans we used the average interest rate on long-term fixed-rate U.S. dollar loans obtained in the United States, as reported by the Federal Reserve. For the NLG denominated loan, we used the average long-term bond rate for private borrowers in the Netherlands, as reported by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development ("OECD").

Because the interest rates paid on Dalmine's Article 54 loans are higher than the benchmark interest rates, the Department determines that loans provided under this program are not inconsistent with commercial considerations and, therefore, not countervailable.

D. 1989 Provisional Payment in Connection With 1989 Equity Infusion

In March 1989, ILVA made a payment to Dalmine in anticipation of purchasing new shares in Dalmine. The payment was provisional in nature because EC authorization of the capital increase was necessary and, if authorization was not granted, the money would have been repaid to ILVA. The capital increase was not finalized until November 1989, due to delays in EC approval. At that time, the payment became equity capital.

Consistent with the Department's position in *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, we determine that the funds provided by ILVA to Dalmine are countervailable.

During the period March-November 1989, Dalmine had use of the money and paid no interest on it. Therefore, we have treated the funds provided by ILVA to Dalmine as an interest-free short-term loan from March 1989 to November 1989.

Because any benefit from this interest-free loan would be allocable entirely to 1989, no benefit is attributable to the POI.

III. Programs Determined To Be Not Used

We established at verification that the following programs were not used during the POI.

1. Preferential IMI Export Financing Under Law 227/77
2. Preferential Insurance Under Law 227/77
3. Retraining Grants under Law 181/89
4. Benefits under ECSC Article 56

Verification

In accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we verified the information used in making our final determination. We followed standard verification procedures, including meeting with government and company officials, examination of relevant accounting records and examination of original source documents. Our verification results are outlined in detail in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the Central Records Unit (Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with our affirmative preliminary determination, we instructed the U.S. Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of seamless pipe from Italy, which were entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after November 28, 1994, the date our preliminary determination was published in the **Federal Register**. This final countervailing duty determination was aligned with the final antidumping duty determination of seamless pipe from Italy, pursuant to section 606 of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984 (section 705(a)(1) of the Act).

Under article 5, paragraph 3 of the GATT subsidies Code, provisional measures cannot be imposed for more than 120 days without a final affirmative determination of subsidization and injury. Therefore, we instructed the U.S. Customs Service to

discontinue the suspension of liquidation on the subject merchandise entered on or after March 28, 1995, but to continue the suspension of liquidation of all entries, or withdrawals from warehouse, for consumption of the subject merchandise between November 28, 1994, and March 27, 1995. We will reinstate suspension of liquidation under section 703(d) of the Act, if the ITC issues a final affirmative injury determination, and will require a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties for such entries of merchandise in the amounts indicated below.

Seamless Pipe

Country-Wide *Ad Valorem* Rate 1.47 percent.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(c) 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 material injury or threat of material injury does exist, the Department will issue a countervailing duty order.

Return of Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice 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 355.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 705(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 355.20(a)(4).

Dated June 12, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14934 Filed 6-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Correction for Notice of Application.

"In the Notice of Application for a Certificate of Review for United Products of America, Inc., Application

No. 95-00004, which was printed in the **Federal Register** on June 7, 1995, page 30064, No. 109, Vol 60, the - Date Deemed Submitted was incorrectly listed as April 30, 1995. In fact, Application No. 95-00004 was deemed submitted on May 30, 1995, not April 30."

Dated: June 30, 1995.

W. Dawn Busby,

Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-14892 Filed 6-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-P

U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee; Closed Meeting

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Closed meeting of U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee (the "Committee") advises U.S. Government officials on matters relating to the implementation of the Fair Trade in Auto Parts Act of 1988. The Committee: (1) Reports annually to the Secretary of Commerce on barriers to sales of U.S.-made auto parts and accessories in Japanese markets; (2) assists the Secretary in reporting to the Congress on the progress of sales of U.S.-made auto parts in Japanese markets, including the formation of long-term supplier relationships; (3) reviews and considers data collected on sales of U.S.-made auto parts to Japanese markets; (4) advises the Secretary during consultations with the Government of Japan on these issues; and (5) assists in establishing priorities for the Department's initiatives to increase U.S.-made auto parts sales to Japanese markets, and otherwise provide assistance and direction to the Secretary in carrying out these initiatives. At the meeting, committee members will receive briefings on the status of ongoing consultations with the Government of Japan and will discuss specific trade and sales expansion programs related to U.S.-Japan automotive parts policy.

DATE AND LOCATION: The meeting will be held on June 27, 1995 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, D.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert Reck, Office of Automotive Affairs, Trade Development, Room 4036, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-1418.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Assistant Secretary for Administration,