involved in the proceeding are notified and are able to collect information and contribute comments on the merits of the revocation. In addition, the Department can properly plan to examine and verify all necessary U.S. sales and FMV information including the likelihood that the respondent will sell the merchandise at less than FMV in the future (*See* section 353.25(a)(2)(ii)). It is precisely with respect to this last point that the Department has not had the opportunity to gather evidence or solicit comments. The Department received Samsung's revocation request after having completed its verification of information submitted in the sixth review. If the Department had received a timely revocation request from Samsung, it could have planned to gather, analyze, and verify all information necessary for adequately evaluating Samsung's request and making that decision. This, however, is not the situation in this case. For these reasons, the Department is not revoking the order with respect to Samsung in these administrative reviews.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the weighted-average dumping margins for the periods are:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage	Margin percentage
	04/01/88–03/31/89	04/01/89–03/31/90
Cosmos	2.24	2.24
Samsung	0.00	0.03
Samwon	16.57	16.57
Tongkook	16.57	16.57

The Department shall instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for all companies will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the final determination covering the most recent period; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in previous reviews or the original LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the final determination covering the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, previous reviews, or the original 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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 13.90 percent, the ''all other'' rate established in the original LTFV investigation by the Department (49 FR 7620, March 1, 1984), in accordance with the decisions of the CIT in *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States,* 822 F. Supp. 766 (CIT 1993), and *Federal-Mogul Corporation* v. *United States* 822 F. Supp. 782 (CIT 1993).

This notice serves as a final 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 the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibilities concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: January 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–2369 Filed 2–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–840]

Notice of Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Manganese Metal From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Boyland or Daniel Lessard, Office of Countervailing Duty Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, at (202) 482–4198 or (202) 482–1778, respectively.

Amendment to the Final Determination

We are amending the final determination of sales at less than fair value of manganese metal from the People's Republic of China (the PRC) to reflect the correction of ministerial errors made in the margin calculations in that determination. We are publishing this amendment to the final determination in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Case History and Amendment of the Final Determination

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on November 6, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final determination that manganese metal from the PRC was being sold at less than fair value (*see* 60 FR 56045 (November 6, 1995)).

On November 20, 1995, petitioners, Kerr McGee and Elkem Metals Company, and respondents, China National Electronics Import & Export Hunan Company (CEIEC), China Hunan International Economic Development Corporation (HIED), China Metallurgical Import & Export Hunan Corp. and Hunan Nonferrous Metals Import & Export Associated Co. (CMIECHN/CNIECHN), and Minmetals Precious & Rare Minerals Import & Export Co. (Minmetals) made allegations that the Department made ministerial errors in its final determination. On November 22, 1995 and November 28, 1995, rebuttal comments were submitted by petitioners and respondents, respectively.

Because the choice and application of a specific surrogate manganese ore value is not a clerical error pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28(d), as petitioners acknowledged in their submission, the Department has not considered the arguments raised by petitioners or respondents with regard to this issue.

As listed below, Allegations 1 through 5 were made by petitioners and Allegations 6 through 10 were made by respondents. Each summarized allegation, including any comment submitted by petitioners or respondents in response to the allegation, is followed by the Department's response (*see also* November 30, 1995 memorandum to Barbara Stafford, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations).

Allegation 1

According to petitioners, the surrogate ore value used at the final determination requires that the Department adjust the usage levels of direct process chemicals used in the production of subject merchandise.

Respondents argue that petitioners' allegation is not a clerical error, but rather an argument for a methodological change. Respondents also argue that considering this new methodological argument reopens the record and violates respondents' due process rights.

DOC Position

We agree with respondents that petitioners' claim is not a clerical error pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28(d). Furthermore, the information supporting petitioners' clerical error allegation represents untimely-filed new information. Accordingly, the Department has not considered this issue and has removed the information submitted by petitioners in support of this argument, as well as respondents' rebuttal to this information, from the record (*see* 19 CFR 353.31(a)(3)).

Allegation 2

Petitioners allege the following: 1) the calculations of skilled and unskilled labor hours for Producer A were not provided in existing documentation, 2) the allocation of Processor B's skilled versus unskilled labor and direct versus indirect labor was not provided in existing documentation, 3) the verification report for Processor C refers to a July 11, 1995 document regarding labor which is not on the record, and 4) the calculations for Producer D's unskilled labor do not match the documentation provided.

With respect to the above allegation, respondents argue in general that the Department's labor calculations are based on verified information, as stated in the verification reports.

DOC Position

While the calculation of Producer A's skilled and unskilled labor could have been outlined more clearly, the Department does not consider the absence of a full explanation of this producer's labor calculations to be a clerical error.

The verification report of Processor B explains that both the skilled and unskilled labor values were verified from production records which were not taken as verification exhibits. As noted above, the absence of a detailed description of Processor B's labor calculations does not constitute a clerical error.

With respect to Processor C, the verification report was referring to the July 17, 1995 submission by respondents, not to a July 11, 1995 report. This error, in the narrative of the verification report, had no impact on the calculation of labor. When reexamining Processor C's cost of manufacture (COM), however, it was found that estimated indirect labor was omitted. (Note: the final determination stated that indirect labor would be added to the extent that indirect labor could be quantified (*see* 60 FR 56050 (November 6, 1995)). Because the calculation for Processor C's estimated indirect labor yields a positive number, unlike Processor B above, estimated indirect labor has been added to Processor C's COM for the amended final determination.

Finally, although the Department did not outline its calculation of Producer D's unskilled labor, the information necessary to derive this value is contained in the narrative of the verification report and in the referenced exhibit. As indicated above, the Department does not consider the absence of a detailed explanation of Producer D's labor calculations to be a clerical error. The subsequent reexamination of Producer D's labor values, however, has led the Department to revise the original unskilled labor value to include indirect labor inadvertently excluded from the unskilled labor calculation. For the amended final determination, the Department has used a labor value which reflects direct and indirect labor.

Allegation 3

Petitioners allege that, for all respondents, the calculated freight cost is inconsistent with the methodology described in the calculation memorandum. Specifically, the calculated truck rates are lower than the methodology and data would indicate. According to petitioners, the discrepancies do not appear to be explained by rounding errors.

DOC Position

The calculation memorandum inadvertently excluded one element from the explanation of the methodology employed. The calculation memorandum should have stated that, in addition to the distance and transportation rate, the factor usage of each input is multiplied by the relative weight. The calculations for freight costs in the margin calculations were reexamined and determined to be correct.

Allegation 4

Petitioners allege that HIED's margin, as shown on the Department's calculation spreadsheet, does not match the HIED margin published in the Federal Register notice for the final determination. Petitioners also argue that, based on the underlying values in HIED's spreadsheet calculations and supporting data, HIED's margin should be 4.47 percent.

DOC Position

Petitioners are correct. The final margin listed in the final determination notice was incorrect. Additionally, the total value column (TOTVAL) is HIED's margin calculation was incorrectly calculated as gross U.S. price (USP) times quantity. TOTVAL should have been net USP times total quantity. Since this is a clerical error, HIED's TOTVAL has been recalculated using net USP for the amended final determination.

Allegation 5

Petitioners argue that the September 19, 1995 verification report for Producer E indicates that electricity consumption for July 1995 was an amount different than that shown in verification exhibits.

Respondents do not dispute that the Department transposed the July electricity consumption figure. However, they assert that the Department's methodology for deriving Producer E's electricity cost is incorrect and should be corrected using respondents' suggested methodology.

DOC Position

Petitioners are correct. The verification report inadvertently transposed Producer E's electricity usage for July. Since this is a clerical error, the correct number has been used to recalculate Producer E's COM. Because respondents' allegation is based on changing the method by which Producer E's electricity consumption is calculated, the Department considers this to be a methodological argument, as opposed to a clerical error, and has not made the change recommended by respondents.

Allegation 6

Respondents allege that there are a number of mathematical errors in the Department's foreign market value (FMV) calculations.

Petitioners' rebuttal does not substantially deviate from the Department's finding below.

DOC Position

The Department's FMV calculations have been reexamined and compared to the FMV calculation submitted by

respondents. The Department has concluded that the mathematical errors cited by respondents are not errors but are due solely to rounding.

Allegation 7

Respondents allege that the Department incorrectly adjusted the content level of a particular input for Producers E and F.

With the exception of indicating that the difference between the input usages for Producer F, as calculated by respondents and the Department, was likely due to a rounding error, petitioners' rebuttal does not deviate substantially from the Department's finding below.

DOC Position

The calculation values provided by respondents for the input adjustment are not correct. Because the Department's adjustment, as outlined in its calculation memorandum, is reflected correctly in the FMV calculation of Producers E and F, no change has been made pursuant to respondents' allegation.

Allegation 8

Respondents allege that a value for ''rates and taxes'' was incorrectly included in SG&A because, according to the Department's final determination, the FMV was to be ''net for all taxes.'' Additionally, citing the December 19, 1994 calculation memorandum for the final determination of *Coumarin from the People's Republic of China (Coumarin)*, respondents argue that it has been the Department's past practice not to include ''rates and taxe'' from the Reserve Bank of India Bulletin (RBI) in SG&A.

Citing to *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.*, 60 FR 10900 (February 28, 1995), petitioners assert that respondents' argument that ''rates and taxes'' should not be included in the FMV is unsupported by precedent. According to petitioners, respondents are incorrect in relying on *Coumarin* because in that case the question of whether to include or exclude ''rates and taxes'' from SG&A was not raised.

DOC Position

In determining FMV, the Department intended to follow its standard practice, which is to employ tax-exclusive factors of production values and to include a value for ''rates and taxes'' in the calculation of SG&A. The Department assumes that ''rates and taxes'' refer to utility costs, such as sewer rates, and property taxes. Such expenses are properly included within the Department's calculation of the FMV because they reflect required expenses incurred in producing the subject merchandise that were not rebated upon export.

Furthermore, whether ''rates and taxes'' should be included in SG&A was not an issue in *Coumarin*. Therefore, the case provides no guidance or precedent here.

Moreover, while respondents quote the Department as saying in the final determination of this case that the FMV was to be ''net of all taxes,'' the statement was actually ''net of taxes'' and was referring to the sentence before which specifically addressed the Indian surrogate values used in calculating the factors of production.

Finally, we note that the issue of whether ''rates and taxes'' should be included within SG&A is substantive, not clerical.

Allegation 9

Respondents allege that in determining SG&A the Department incorrectly used 296 instead of 204 when valuing ''rates and taxes'' from the RBI. In response, petitioners note that the Department incorrectly calculated SG&A when it used 188 instead of 296 for the ''advertisement'' expense as listed in the RBI.

DOC Position

Respondents, as well as petitioners, are correct. Using the correct RBI values, SG&A is 19.39 percent, as opposed to the 19.34 percent used in the final determination.

Allegation 10

Respondents assert that the Department incorrectly deducted a value for marine insurance from Minmetal's USP.

Petitioners' rebuttal does not deviate substantially from the Department's finding below.

DOC Position

The verification report of Minmetal states that ''we noted no discrepancies with respect to the marine insurance information reported in Minmetal's responses and U.S. sales listing.'' The verification report also states that the ''marine insurance was contracted with a Chinese company'' and that ''Minmetal was invoiced in U.S. dollars.'' Accordingly, the Department's deduction of a surrogate value for marine insurance from Minmental's USP was appropriate and did not represent a clerical error.

Scope of Order

The product covered by this order is manganese metal, which is composed principally of manganese, by weight, but also contains some impurities such as carbon, sulfur, phosphorous, iron and silicon. Manganese metal contains by weight not less than 95 percent manganese. All compositions, forms and sizes of manganese metal are included within the scope of this investigation, including metal flake, powder, compressed powder, and fines. The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheadings 8111.00.45.000 and 8111.00.60.00 of the Harmonized Tariff schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

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

Antidumping Duty Order

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Act, on October 27, 1995, the Department made its final determination that manganese metal from the PRC was being sold at less than fair value (60 FR 56045 (November 6, 1995)). On December 15, 1995, the International Trade Commission notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of the subject merchandise.

Therefore, all unliquidated entries of manganese metal from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 14, 1995, which is the date on which the Department published its notice of preliminary determination in the Federal Register (see 60 FR 31282 (June 14, 1995)), are liable for the assessment of antidumping duties.

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct Customs officers to assess, upon further advice by the administering authority, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise exceeds the United States price for all relevant entries of manganese metal from the PRC. Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The ''PRC-wide'' rate applies to all exporters of subject merchandise not specifically listed below.

The *ad valorem* weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacture/producer/exporter	Margin Percent
CEIEC	11.77
CMIECHN/CNIECHN	0.97
HIED	4.60
Minmetal	5.88
PRC-wide Rate	143.32

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to manganese metal from the PRC pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.21.

Dated: January 19, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–2368 Filed 2–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Exemption of ''Fashion Samples'' From Visa and Quota Requirements

January 30, 1996.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs exempting ''fashion samples'' from visa and quota requirements for an additional three-month trial period.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Fennessy, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–3400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

A notice published in the Federal Register on August 15, 1995 (60 FR 42150) announces a temporary exemption from visa and quota requirements for textile and apparel articles described as ''fashion samples.''

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that, effective on February 1, 1996, textile and apparel articles described as ''fashion samples'' which are produced or manufactured in various countries and entered into the United States for consumption shall be exempt from quota and requirements for an additional three-month trial period beginning on February 1, 1996 and extending through April 30, 1996.

The term ''fashion samples'' is limited to wearing apparel and other textile articles purchased at retail and not imported in multiple units, i.e., no more than a single article in a particular style and/or color. These shipments must not be greater than twenty-four (24) pieces and must accompany a returning buyer. Mail and cargo shipments would not be eligible for treatment as ''fashion samples.''

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

January 30, 1996.

Commissioner of Customs,

Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, all import control directives issued to you by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. This directive also amends, but does not cancel, all visa requirements for all countries for which visa arrangements are in place with the United States.

Effective on February 1, 1996, for a three-month trial, you are directed to no longer require a visa for textile and apparel articles described as ''fashion samples'' which are produced or manufactured in various countries and entered into the United States for consumption for the period beginning on February 1, 1996 and extending through April 30, 1996. Also for the period February 1, 1996 through April 30, 1996, these textile and apparel articles shall not be subject to existing quota.

These textile and apparel items, frequently called buyers ''fashion samples'' are limited to textile and apparel items purchased at retail. The ''fashion samples'' must accompany a buyer returning to the United States, must not be more than a single article in a particular style or color and must not exceed more than 24 pieces total. Mail and cargo shipments would not be eligible for treatment as ''fashion samples.''

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C.553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 96–2367 Filed 2–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Applications of the Chicago Board of Trade for Designation as a Contract Market in Futures and Options on the CBOT Brazil Brady Bond Index

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the terms and conditions of proposed commodity futures and option contracts.

SUMMARY: The Chicago Board of Trade (CBT or Exchange) has applied for designation as a contract market in futures and futures options on the CBOT Brazil Brady Bond Index. The Acting Director of the Division of Economic Analysis (Division) of the Commission, acting pursuant to the authority delegated by Commission Regulation 140.96, has determined that publication of the proposals for comment is in the public interest, will assist the Commission in considering the views of interested persons, and is consistent with the purposes of the Commodity Exchange Act.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 7, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons should submit their views and comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW, Washington, DC 20581. Reference should be made to the CBOT Brazil Brady Bond.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please contact Stephen Sherrod of the Division of Economic Analysis, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, Washington, DC, 20581, telephone 202–418–5277.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Exchange's proposed Brady bond contracts are based on indexes representing the sovereign debt of Brazil. The SEC has been petitioned to grant the sovereign debt of Brazil exempt status under SEC Rule 240.3a12–8. The SEC published the proposed amendment to Rule 240.3a12–8 in the Federal Register for a 30-day public comment period on December 20, 1995. Should the SEC add the sovereign debt of Brazil to the list of exempted securities, the Commission would then be able to designate futures on such security. *See* Section 2(a)(1)(B)(v) of the Act.

Copies of the terms and conditions will be available for inspection at the Office of the Secretariat, Commodity