

example, "N"), records from an earlier list that now should be deleted (such as, "D"), and the corrected records (for example, "C"). For address records requiring corrections, provide the original depiction of the address in the Other Descriptive Information space allotment (character positions 112-end); this will significantly help the Census Bureau's efforts to identify and remove the superseded version of the address and avoid delivery of more than one questionnaire to the same household.

Dated: August 24, 1995.

**Harry A. Scarr,**

*Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census.*

[FR Doc. 95-21521 Filed 8-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

### International Trade Administration

#### U.S.-Argentina Business Development Council—Commercial Law Initiative

**AGENCY:** International Trade Administration, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Opportunity to Participate in Commercial Law Initiative.

**SUMMARY:** On January 25, 1995, Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown and Argentine Minister of Economy and Public Works and Services Domingo Cavallo signed Terms of Reference establishing the United States-Argentina Business Development Council ("BDC"). The purpose of the BDC, a bilateral, public-private sector council, is to provide a forum for cooperation through which U.S. and Argentine public and private sector representatives can exchange information on commercial matters and encourage discussion on various themes related to bilateral business development and trade promotion. The BDC is comprised of a U.S. section and an Argentine section. The U.S. section is comprised of U.S. government officials and Chief Executive Officers and other top management level employees of U.S. companies with commercial interest in and experience with Argentina. The activities of the BDC may include, but are not limited to, the following: identifying commercial opportunities, impediments and issues of concern to the U.S. and Argentine business communities; improving dissemination of information on U.S.-Argentine market opportunities; developing sectoral or project oriented approaches to expanding business opportunities; implementing trade and business development programs; and other appropriate steps to foster commercial relations between the

United States and Argentina. To implement these activities, the BDC has formed various working groups, one of which is the Commercial Law Working Group ("Law Group"). The Law Group intends to implement a cooperative work program called the Commercial Law Initiative or CLI, including information exchange activities and legal seminars.

**DATES:** In order to receive full consideration, comments must be received no later than: September 13, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Ursula Odiaga Iannone, Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Chief Counsel for International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 5624, 14th and Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20230; FAX (202) 482-4076.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ursula Odiaga Iannone, Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Chief Counsel for International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 5624, 14th and Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-1614.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Commercial Law Initiative

The Law Group is co-chaired by the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce and the Undersecretary of Legal Affairs of the Argentine Ministry of Economy and Public Works and Services. The Law Group intends to implement a cooperative work program, the Commercial Law Initiative, to increase mutual understanding of the U.S. and Argentine legal systems as they affect U.S.-Argentine bilateral commerce ("commercial law"). Possible avenues of cooperation include: (1) Activities to exchange information on commercial law developments, practice and methods, e.g., legal seminars and exchanges of legal experts; (2) cross dissemination of commercial laws of each country; (3) establishing a repository for laws, international conventions and agreements and other legal materials; and (4) stimulating, supporting and monitoring cooperation and direct contacts between concerned organizations, enterprises, private sector attorneys and members of academia of both countries in the area of commercial law.

##### Legal Seminar

As part of the CLI, the Law Group plans to conduct at least two legal seminars, first in Argentina and then in the United States. In accordance with the public sector-private sector partnership embodied in the BDC, the seminars will be organized by the

Department of Commerce and the Argentine Ministry of Economy and Public Works and Services and co-sponsored and largely staffed by private sector attorneys from both countries who are experts in the priority topics to be covered. It is anticipated that the first seminar will take place in Argentina in March of 1996 and the second seminar will be held in the United States in the Fall of 1996. Legal seminar participants may be speakers, audience members and/or drafters of issue papers and will be required to pay a participation fee. As described below, the BDC will identify priority legal issues to be covered by the Law Group and in the legal seminars. The Department of Commerce Office of General Counsel will develop participation criteria for the legal seminars based in part on the priority legal issues identified as discussed below.

##### Opportunity to Provide Input on Priority Legal Issues

As a first step in the CLI, the Co-Chairs of the Law Group will exchange letters identifying and prioritizing the issues that their respective BDC sections desire to be addressed in the following 18 months by the Law Group. It is anticipated that this exchange will occur in September of 1995. The General Counsel of the Department of Commerce is accepting comments concerning the identification of priority issues to be raised by the U.S. section of the BDC. To identify legal issues relevant to conducting commercial relations with Argentina, please mail or FAX your comments to Ms. Iannone as indicated in the ADDRESSES section above.

**Authority:** Act of February 14, 1903, c. 552, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1501 *et seq.*, 32 Stat. 825; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1979, 19 U.S.C. § 2171 Note, 93 Stat. 1381.

Dated: August 24, 1995.

**Walter M. Bastian, III,**

*Director, Office of Latin America and the Caribbean.*

[FR Doc. 95-21559 Filed 8-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DA-P

[A-588-707]

#### Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests by one respondent and the petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin from Japan. The review period is August 1, 1993, through July 31, 1994. This review covers one company, Daikin Industries, Ltd. As a result of the review, the Department has preliminarily determined that dumping margins exist for the respondent. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 30, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Riggle or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On August 3, 1994, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" (59 FR 39543) of the antidumping duty order on granular PTFE resin from Japan (53 FR 32287, August 24, 1988). Respondent, Daikin Industries, Ltd., and petitioner, E. I. Dupont de Nemours & Company, requested an administrative review in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a) (1993). On September 16, 1994, the Department published a notice of initiation of this review (59 FR 47609). The period of review is August 1, 1993, through July 31, 1994. The Department is now conducting this review pursuant to section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

**Applicable Statute and Regulations**

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

**Scope of the Review**

The antidumping duty order covers granular PTFE resins, filled or unfilled. The order explicitly excludes PTFE dispersions in water and PTFE fine powders. During the period covered by this review, such merchandise was classified under item number 3904.61.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). We are providing this HTS number for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written

description of scope remains dispositive.

The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of granular PTFE resin, Daikin Industries, Ltd. (Daikin). The period of review is August 1, 1993, through July 31, 1994.

**United States Price**

In calculating United States price (USP), the Department determined both purchase price and exporter's sales price (ESP), as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act, to be appropriate. All sales were made through Daikin America, Inc. (DAI), a related sales agent in the United States, to an unrelated purchaser. However, whenever sales are made prior to the date of importation through a related sales agent in the United States, we typically determine that purchase price is the most appropriate determinant of the USP if:

1. The merchandise in question was shipped directly from the manufacturer to the unrelated buyer, without being introduced into the inventory of the related shipping agent;

2. Direct shipment from the manufacturer to the unrelated buyers was the customary commercial channel for sales of this merchandise between the parties involved; and

3. The related selling agent in the United States acted only as a processor of sales-related documentation and a communication link with the unrelated U.S. buyers.

*Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 33188 (June 27, 1995); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: New Minivans From Japan*, 57 FR 21937, 21945 (May 26, 1992).

For Daikin's sales which satisfy the criteria listed above, we regard the routine selling functions of the exporter as merely having been relocated from the country of exportation to the United States, where the sales agent performs them. Whether these functions take place in the United States or abroad does not change the substance of the transactions or the functions themselves, and we therefore treated these sales as purchase price transactions in accordance with section 353.41(b) of our regulations.

DAI also maintains an inventory of subject merchandise in the United States. Where the date of importation preceded the date of sale and DAI's role included warehousing responsibilities in addition to routine selling functions, we regarded sales of such merchandise as ESP sales in accordance with section 353.41(c) of our regulations.

We based purchase price and ESP on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where applicable, for foreign brokerage and handling, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight, U.S. duty, U.S. harbor fees and merchandise processing fees, and inland insurance, in accordance with section 772(d) of the Tariff Act. For ESP sales we also made deductions, where applicable, for credit expense, replacement of defective merchandise, commissions paid to unrelated selling agents in the United States and indirect selling expenses, in accordance with section 772(e) of the Tariff Act.

We made an addition to USP for the Japanese consumption tax in accordance with our practice as set forth in *Silicomanganese From Venezuela; Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value (Silicomanganese)*, 59 FR 31204 (June 17, 1994).

**Foreign Market Value**

Based on a comparison of the volume of home market and third country sales, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based FMV on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers in the home market.

In a preceding administrative review we found that Daikin made home market sales below the cost of production (COP). Therefore, in accordance with our standard practice, we also conducted a COP investigation during the current administrative review. We calculated COP as the sum of Daikin's reported materials, labor, factory overhead, and general expenses. We compared COP to home market prices, net of movement charges, price adjustments, and discounts.

As a result of our COP investigation, we found no below-cost sales, and therefore did not disregard any home market sales as being below cost.

We calculated FMV on a monthly weighted-average basis. Where possible we compared all U.S. sales to sales of identical merchandise sold in Japan. For U.S. sales in which identical merchandise was not sold during the relevant contemporaneous period, we used as FMV contemporaneous sales of the product that was most similar to the merchandise involved in the U.S. sale, in accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act. We matched similar products based on physical characteristics and product specifications provided by Daikin in its

questionnaire response dated February 24, 1995.

In accordance with our practice, we disregarded sample sales as being outside the ordinary course of trade. See *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan; Final Results of Administrative Review*, 58 FR at 50345 (September 27, 1993). The sales in question represent small quantities of granular PTFE resin sold to testing facilities in Japan at prices substantially higher than the prices of the vast majority of Daikin's sales. Further, the sales in question were not for consumption, but for evaluation purposes.

Where applicable, we made deductions for inland freight, discounts, post-shipment price adjustments, and physical differences in merchandise. To adjust for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) between the home market and the United States, we first deducted direct selling expenses incurred in the home market, which included credit and replacement of defective merchandise. Home market movement expenses incurred between the warehouse and the customer after the sale were treated as direct COS deductions. For comparison to purchase price sales, we then added direct selling expenses incurred in the United States for replacement of defective merchandise, credit, and commissions (because no commissions were paid in the home market). Where applicable, in accordance with section 353.56(b)(1) of our regulations, we offset U.S. commissions by deducting home market indirect selling expenses from FMV in an amount not exceeding those commissions. For comparison to ESP sales, in accordance with section 353.56(b)(2) of our regulations, we also deducted home market indirect selling expenses in an amount not to exceed the sum of U.S. commissions and indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States. Home market movement expenses were also incurred between the factory and the warehouse before the sale, and we have adjusted for such expenses as indirect selling expenses under the commission offset provision of section 353.56(b)(1) and under the ESP offset provision of section 353.56(b)(2), as appropriate. In order to adjust for differences in packing between the two markets, we deducted home market packing costs from FMV and added U.S. packing costs. We also adjusted for Japanese consumption tax in accordance with our decision in *Silicomanganes*.

### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP with FMV, we preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (per-cent)
Daikin Industries .....	08/01/93-07/31/94	69.10

Interested parties may submit written comments on these preliminary results. Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 44 days from the date of publication. Case briefs and other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days from the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttal comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days from the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the 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 the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate we establish in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or

exporters will continue to be 91.74 percent, the rate made effective by the final results of the most recent administrative review of the order (see *PTFE Resin From Japan*, 60 FR at 33189). As noted in the Department's previous final results in this proceeding, this rate is the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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

Dated: August 16, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**  
Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-21554 Filed 8-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-475-818, A-489-805]

### Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Certain Pasta From Italy and Turkey

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 30, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Donna Berg (202-482-0114) or Michelle Frederick (202-482-0186), Office of Antidumping Investigations, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

**POSTPONEMENT OF PRELIMINARY DETERMINATIONS:** On June 1, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated antidumping duty investigations of certain pasta from Italy and Turkey (60 FR 30268, June 8, 1995). The notice of initiation stated that if these investigations proceed normally, the Department would issue its preliminary determinations by October 19, 1995.

On June 26, 1995, the U.S. International Trade Commission