

since no sales commissions were paid in the U.S. market. In addition, Onoda was unable to provide dates of payment for some home market sales, since Onoda claimed that it had not received payment for these sales by the time the home market sales tape was created. As a result, we have calculated the weighted-average number of days between the dates of shipment and the dates of payment for those home market sales where the dates of payment were reported. We added this weighted-average number of days to the shipment dates of those home market sales with missing dates of payment. We then used these dates as the dates of payment for these sales.

The Department did not deduct pre-sale transportation costs, in accordance with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's ruling in *The Ad Hoc Committee of AZ-NM-TX-FL Producers of Gray Portland Cement v. United States*, 13 F.3d 398 (Fed. Cir. 1994). This decision allows us to deduct pre-sale transportation costs from FMV only if these expenses are directly related to the home market sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a). In order to determine whether pre-sale transportation costs are direct, the Department examines pre-sale warehousing expenses, since the pre-sale transportation costs incurred in positioning the merchandise at the warehouse are, for analytical purposes, inextricably linked to the pre-sale warehousing expenses. Since Onoda reported that it incurred no after-sale warehousing expenses and did not claim any warehousing expenses as direct circumstance-of-sale adjustments in its questionnaire responses, we determined that Onoda's warehousing expenses were pre-sale, indirect selling expenses. Then, in the absence of contrary evidence, pre-sale transportation costs were also treated as indirect expenses (see *Gray Portland Cement and Clinker From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 43761, 43766, Comment 9, August 23, 1995).

Where appropriate, we made further adjustments to FMV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.57 of the Department's regulations.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV, the Department preliminarily determines that a margin of 28.32 percent exists for Onoda for the period May 1, 1993, through April 30, 1994.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of

publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter and will be limited to those issues raised in the case briefs and/or written comment. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to the issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of any written comments or case briefs.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs.

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 Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Onoda will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the rate published in the most recent final results or determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, earlier reviews, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review, earlier reviews, or the original investigation, whichever is the most recent; and (4) the "all others" rate will be 70.23 percent, as specified in the final results of redetermination pursuant to court remand (60 FR 24832, May 10, 1995).

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

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

Dated: September 27, 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-24926 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-412-817]

#### Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Foam Extruded PVC and Polystyrene Framing Stock From the United Kingdom

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 6, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ellen Grebasch at (202) 482-3773, Dorothy Tomaszewski at (202) 482-0631 or Erik Warga at (202) 482-0922, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

#### INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA).

### The Petition

On September 8, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by Marley Mouldings, Inc. (the petitioner), a producer of foam extruded polyvinyl chloride (PVC) and polystyrene framing stock. A supplement to the petition was filed on September 22, 1995.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, the petitioner alleges that imports of foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock from the United Kingdom are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.

The petitioner states that they have standing to file the petition because they are interested parties, as defined under section 771(9)(C) of the Act.

### Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act requires the Department to determine, prior to the initiation of an investigation, that a minimum percentage of the domestic industry supports an antidumping petition. A petition meets these minimum requirements if (1) the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

A review of the production data provided in the petition and other information readily available to the Department indicates that the petitioner accounts for more than 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and for more than 50 percent of that produced by companies expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. The Department received no expressions of opposition to the petition from any interested party. Accordingly, the Department determines that the petition is supported by the domestic industry.

### Scope of the Investigations

For purposes of these investigations, all extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock regardless of color, finish, width or length. Finished frames

assembled from foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock are excluded. The merchandise under investigation is currently classifiable under HTS subheadings 3924.90.20.00; 3926.90.90.90; 3926.90.95.90; and 3926.90.98.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

### Export Price and Normal Value

Export price was based on a price list from a U.K. producer with the terms of sale on delivered basis. The petitioner made adjustments to the export prices for foreign inland freight, handling, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage, U.S. duties, and U.S. inland freight.

Normal value was based on the same price list, also with the terms of sale on a delivered basis. The petitioner made adjustments to the normal value for foreign inland freight.

Based on comparisons of export price to normal value, the calculated dumping margins for foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock from the United Kingdom range from 20.82 percent to 48.96 percent.

### Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock from the United Kingdom are being, or likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

### Initiation of Investigations

We have examined the petition on foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirements concerning allegations of the material injury or threat of material injury to the domestic producers of a domestic like product by reason of the complained-of imports, allegedly sold at less than fair value. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock from the United Kingdom are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless extended, we will make our preliminary determination by February 15, 1996.

### Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, copies of the public versions of the petition have been provided to the representatives of the government of the United Kingdom.

We will attempt to provide copies of the public versions of the petition to all the exporters named in the petition.

### International Trade Commission (ITC) Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

### Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by October 23, 1995, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock from the United Kingdom are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 732(c)(2) of the Act.

Dated: September 28, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-24928 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

### [C-549-802]

### Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Thailand; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On May 8, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Thailand* for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992. We have completed this review and determine the net subsidy to be 4.29 percent *ad valorem* for all companies. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as indicated above.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 6, 1995.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Copyak or Kelly Parkhill, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution