

Name	Title
Mary Elizabeth Hoinkes	General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel.
Joerg Menzel	Principal Deputy of the On-Site Inspection Agency.
Stanley Riveles	U.S. Standing Consultative Commissioner.

Cathleen Lawrence,
Director of Administration.
 [FR Doc. 95-25726 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6820-32-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Agency Form Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: Bureau of the Census.

Title: Noninterview Adjustment Evaluation.

Form Number(s): DG-1340B.

Type of Request: New collection – EMERGENCY REVIEW.

Burden: 173 hours.

Number of Respondents: 519.

Avg Hours Per Response: 20 minutes.

Needs and Uses: A major goal of the 1995 census test program was to develop and test a new coverage measurement methodology, Integrated Coverage Measurement (ICM). In 1995, the goal of ICM was to measure the error in coverage (overcount or undercount) of the test censuses in three areas: Oakland, CA; Paterson, NJ; and six parishes in northwest Louisiana. A parallel goal of ICM was to test two methods of estimating census coverage: the census plus method and the previously used estimation methodology, dual system estimation (DSE). The decision regarding which method to use in the 2000 census has to be made by the end of 1995, as it leads to further research and development plans that encompass the remaining time before the 2000 census. Toward that end, we plan to conduct a Noninterview Adjustment Evaluation in which we will interview some selected households to determine their correct status. Results of this evaluation will allow us to see if we imputed noninterviewed cases correctly during 1995 ICM testing and will assist in the decision of which estimation methodology—DSE or Census Plus—to use for the 2000 Census. We need OMB clearance by October 18 in order to conduct the evaluation and make this decision by the end of 1995.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.
Frequency: One-time only.
Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.
OMB Desk Officer: Maria Gonzalez, (202) 395-7313.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Gerald Taché, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3271, Department of Commerce, room 5312, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to Maria Gonzalez, OMB Desk Officer, room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: October 13, 1995.

Gerald Taché,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 95-25807 Filed 10-13-95; 10:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-F

International Trade Administration

[A-475-703]

Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy; 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 Italy. The review period is August 1, 1993, through July 31, 1994. This review covers one company, Ausimont, S.p.A. As a result of the review, the Department has preliminarily determined that dumping margins exist for this respondent. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 17, 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 Italy (53 FR 33163, August 30, 1988). Respondent, Ausimont S.p.A., 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. This order also covers PTFE wet raw polymer exported from Italy to the United States (see *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy; Final Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order* (58 FR 26100)). This order excludes PTFE dispersions in water and fine powders. During the period covered by this review, such merchandise was classified under item number 3904.61.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). We are providing this HTS number for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description of the scope remains dispositive.

The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of granular PTFE resin,

Ausimont S.p.A. The period of review is August 1, 1993, through July 31, 1994.

United States Price

The Department based United States price (USP) on exporter's sale price (ESP) as defined in section 772(c) of the Tariff Act because all sales to unrelated parties were made after importation of the subject merchandise into the United States. We based ESP on the packed, delivered prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where applicable, for billing adjustments and rebates, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight from port to warehouse, and U.S. inland freight from warehouse to customer, in accordance with section 772(d)(2)(a) of the Tariff Act. We also made deductions, where applicable, for credit expense, warranties, technical service expenses and indirect selling expenses in accordance with section 772(e) of the Tariff Act. For sales of granular PTFE resin finished in the United States from PTFE wet raw polymer imported from Italy, we also deducted, pursuant to section 772(e)(3) of the Tariff Act, the value added in the United States, which consisted of the costs of further processing in the United States and that portion of the profit on sales of further processed merchandise attributable to the additional processing.

When comparisons were made to home market sales in which a value-added tax (VAT) was added or a VAT was included, we made an addition to USP for the VAT which was not collected, or which was rebated, on export 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.

We calculated FMV on a monthly weighted-average basis. Where possible, we compared U.S. sales to sales of identical merchandise in Italy. For U.S. sales in which identical merchandise was not sold during the relevant contemporaneous period, we used as FMV contemporaneous home market 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. Whereas filled and unfilled resins generally are not similar in terms of their physical characteristics, we compared, whenever possible, home market sales of filled resins to U.S. sales of filled resins, and home market sales of unfilled resins with U.S. sales of unfilled resins. We matched filled resins sold in the two markets according to the amounts and types of fillers, and the percentages of fillers, in the products sold as provided in Ausimont's supplemental questionnaire response dated June 9, 1995.

Where applicable, we made adjustments to home market prices for rebates. To adjust for differences in circumstances of sale between the home market and the United States, we deducted post-sale inland freight, inland insurance and credit expense from FMV in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a). Where applicable, we made adjustments for differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b)(2), we deducted home market indirect selling expenses in an amount not to exceed the amount of indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States.

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 the amount of Italian VAT in accordance with our decision in Silicomanganese.

We compared U.S. sales of further manufactured resins to FMV based on constructed value (CV) when Ausimont did not have contemporaneous home market sales of PTFE reactor bead, the product from which PTFE resin is processed in the United States. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Tariff Act. We included the cost of materials, labor, general expenses, profit and packing. To calculate CV we used: (1) The greater of actual general expenses or the statutory minimum of 10 percent of materials and labor; (2) the greater of actual profit or the statutory minimum of eight percent of materials, labor and general expenses; and (3) packing costs for merchandise exported to the United States. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56, for differences in circumstances of sale. We deducted home market direct selling expenses, and home market indirect selling expenses not to exceed the amount of indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States in accordance with section 353.56(b)(2).

Preliminary Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Ausimont S.p.A.	08/01/93–07/31/94	6.91

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 rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established 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 46.46

percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (50 FR 26019, June 24, 1985). 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: October 2, 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-25753 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-475-703]

Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On October 7, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) issued the preliminary results of its 1992-93 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin from Italy (59 FR 51166; October 7, 1994). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter for the period August 1, 1992, through July 31, 1993. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the preliminary results. The final margin for Ausimont S.p.A. (Ausimont) is listed below in the section "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 17, 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 October 7, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its 1992-93 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular PTFE resin from Italy (59 FR 51166). There was no request for a hearing. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

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.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of granular PTFE resins, filled or unfilled, and shipments of wet raw polymer. 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 the scope remains dispositive.

The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of granular PTFE resin, Ausimont. The review period is August 1, 1992, through July 31, 1993.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received a case brief from petitioner, E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company (Du Pont), and a rebuttal brief from Ausimont.

Comment 1: Du Pont contends that the Department has artificially raised Ausimont's U.S. price by deducting losses attributable to the further manufacturing of wet raw polymer in the United States. According to Du Pont, Ausimont's losses relative to U.S. finishing costs are such that they create an unreliable measure of the "increased value" of the U.S. further manufacturing that is to be deducted from the U.S. price.

Du Pont argues that Ausimont's losses in this review present the same type of problem which the Department confronted in the circumvention inquiry

of the antidumping duty order, at which time Du Pont argued that an allocation of losses would lower artificially the value of the imported wet raw polymer. See *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy; Final Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Order*, 58 FR 26100 (April 30, 1993) (Determination of Circumvention).

Furthermore, citing the Statement of Administrative Action implementing the Uruguay Round of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), Du Pont points out that the Department recognizes it is directed not to deduct losses attributable to further manufacturing as an adjustment made to the U.S. price. While acknowledging that the Department is not bound by the GATT agreements for the purposes of this review, Du Pont claims that under present law the Department has the discretion to make sure that its assessment of the "increased value" of U.S. further manufacturing and its calculation of the U.S. price are reliable, and that it should exercise that discretion in this case by not deducting from the U.S. price Ausimont's losses attributable to finishing wet raw polymer into granular PTFE resin in the United States.

In response, Ausimont cites *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: New Minivans From Japan*, 57 FR 21937, 21939 (May 26, 1992), to argue that the Department has consistently interpreted section 772(e)(3) of the Tariff Act as requiring the allocation of profits and losses to the additional materials and labor added in the United States. Ausimont notes further that the Court of International Trade (CIT) has held that it would be "patently unfair" to allocate profits, but not losses, to the U.S. price in connection with further manufacturing. See *Timken Co. v. United States* (Timken), 14 CIT 753 (1990).

In addition, Ausimont argues that in the Determination of Circumvention (at 26107), the Department allocated both profits and losses "in order to avoid making an inappropriate comparison (of value) to cost." Finally, Ausimont notes that by Du Pont's own admission, the Department is not bound by the Statement of Administrative Action implementing the Uruguay Round of the GATT in this review.

Department's Position: We disagree with Du Pont. Du Pont's claim that the Department's calculation of Ausimont's further manufacturing costs in the context of determining ESP creates an unreliable measure of the value added by Ausimont in the United States is unfounded. Du Pont incorrectly relies