with the production and sale of the foreign like product, and U.S. packing costs. We used the costs of materials, fabrication, and G&A as reported in the CV portion of Daelim's questionnaire response. We used the U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales portion of Daelim's questionnaire response. We based selling expenses and profit on the information reported in the home market sales portion of Daelim's questionnaire response. See *Certain Pasta from Italy; Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 61 FR 1344, 1349 (January 19, 1996). For selling expenses, we used the average of above-cost per-unit HM selling expenses weighted by the total quantity sold. For actual profit, we first calculated the difference between the home market sales value and home market COP, and divided the difference by the home market COP. We then multiplied this percentage by the COP for each U.S. model to derive an actual profit.

E. Price-to-Price Comparisons

For those price-to-price comparisons where we did not resort to CV or the facts available, we based NV on the price which the foreign like product is first sold for consumption in the exporting country, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, and to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the export price, as defined by section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. We reduced NV for home market credit and advertising expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii), due to differences in circumstances of sale. We also reduced NV by packing costs incurred in the home market, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(i). In addition, we increased NV for U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A). We made further adjustments to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.57 of the Department's regulations.

When NV was based on CV or home market sales, we adjusted for commissions paid on U.S. sales. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b)(1), we offset these commissions with the weighted average of home market indirect selling expenses, because no sales commissions were incurred in the home market, up to the amount of the commissions paid on U.S. sales. In addition, we increased NV by U.S. credit expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, because of differences in the circumstances of sale. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Preliminary Results

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Period	Margin (per-cent)
Daelim Trading Co., Ltd	1/1/94–12/31/94	6.31

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days 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, or the first working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of the administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at the hearing, within 180 days from the issuance of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping dumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of certain stainless steel cooking ware from the Republic of Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Daelim will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in these reviews but covered in the original LTFV investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in these reviews, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of these reviews, or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 8.10 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (52 FR 2139, January 20, 1987).

This notice 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 notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during these review periods. 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.

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

Dated: February 28, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–4983 Filed 3–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–508–605]

Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting two administrative reviews of the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Israel. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 3.84 percent *ad valorem* for all companies for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992, and 5.50 percent *ad valorem* for all companies for the period January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993. If the final results of these reviews remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as indicated above. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 4, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Albright or Cameron Cardozo, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1987, the Department published in the Federal Register (52 FR 31057) the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Israel. On August 3, 1993, and August 3, 1994, the Department published notices of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of this countervailing duty order for the periods January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992 and January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993, respectively (58 FR 41240 and 59 FR 39543). We received a timely request for review for the 1992 review period from the petitioners, FMC Corporation and the Monsanto Company. We received timely requests for review for the 1993 review period from both the petitioners and the respondent, Rotem Fertilizers Ltd.

We initiated the review covering the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992, on September 30, 1993 (58 FR 51054). We initiated the review covering the period January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993, on September 16, 1994 (59 FR 47609). Each review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise, which accounts for virtually all of the exports of subject merchandise from Israel to the United States during the review period, and ten programs.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department is conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994. However, references to the Department's *Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (*Proposed Regulations*), are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's countervailing duty practice. Although the Department has withdrawn the particular rulemaking proceeding pursuant to which the *Proposed Regulations* were issued, the subject matter of these regulations is being considered in connection with an ongoing rulemaking proceeding which, among other things, is intended to conform the Department's regulations to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. *See* 60 FR 80 (Jan. 3, 1995).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of industrial phosphoric acid (IPA) from Israel. Such merchandise is classifiable under item number 2809.20.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS). The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Cash Deposit Purposes

Because Rotem is the only manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, Rotem's net subsidy rate is also the country-wide rate.

Privatization

Israeli Chemicals Ltd. (ICL), the parent company which holds one hundred percent of Rotem's shares, was partially privatized in 1992 and again in 1993. Accordingly, we have determined that the partial privatization of ICL represents a partial privatization of each of the companies in which ICL holds an ownership interest.

In these reviews and prior reviews of the subject merchandise, the Department has found that Rotem and/or its predecessor, Negev Phosphates Ltd., received non-recurring countervailable subsidies prior to these partial privatizations. Further, the Department has found that a private party purchasing all or part of a government-owned company can repay prior non-recurring subsidies on behalf of the company as part or all of the sales price (*see* the General Issues Appendix appended to the *Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from Austria,* 58 FR 37262 (July 9, 1993) (*General Issues Appendix*)). Therefore, to the extent that a portion of the sales price paid for a privatized company can be reasonably attributed to prior subsidies, that portion of those subsidies are repaid.

To calculate the non-recurring subsidies remaining with Rotem after each partial privatization, we performed the following calculations. We first calculated the amount of the purchase price paid for the ICL shares which could be attributed to Rotem using the ratio of Rotem's net assets to ICL's net assets in the year of sale. (For a further explanation of the Department's analysis of the purchase price attributable to Rotem, *see* October 25, 1995 memorandum to Barbara E. Tillman regarding partial privatization of ICL, which is on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce.) We then calculated the net present value (NPV) of the future benefit stream of the non-recurring subsidies received by Rotem at the time of the sale of the shares. Next, we calculated the portion of the purchase price which represents repayment of prior subsidies in accordance with the methodology described in the ''Privatization'' section of the *General Issues Appendix* (58 FR 37259). This amount was then subtracted from the NPV of the subsidies, and the result was divided by the NPV of the subsidies to calculate the ratio representing the amount of subsidies remaining with Rotem after each partial privatization.

To calculate the benefit provided to Rotem for 1992 and 1993, we multiplied the benefit calculated for Encouragement of Capital Investment Law grants (the only subsidies relevant to the privatization calculation) for each period by the ratio representing the amount of subsidies remaining with Rotem after the partial privatization. We then divided the results by the company's total sales of subject merchandise in each respective period.

Analysis of Programs

I. Programs Preliminarily Determined to Confer Subsidies

(A) Encouragement of Capital Investments Law (ECIL) Grants

The ECIL grants program was established to attract capital to Israel. In

order to be eligible to receive various benefits under the ECIL, including investment grants, capital grants, accelerated depreciation, reduced tax rates, and certain loans, the applicant must obtain approved enterprise status. Approved enterprise status is obtained after a review of information submitted to the Investment Center of the Israeli Ministry of Industry and Trade. Investment grants are given as a percentage of the cost of the approved investment. The amount of the grant benefits received by approved enterprises depends on the geographic location of the eligible enterprise. For purposes of the ECIL program, Israel is divided into three zones—Development Zone A, Development Zone B, and the Central Zone—each with a different funding level.

Since 1978, only investment projects outside the Central Zone have been eligible to receive grants. The Central Zone comprises the geographic center of Israel, including its largest and most developed population centers. In *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel*, 52 FR 25447 (July 7, 1987) (*IPA Investigation*), the Department found the ECIL grants program to be *de jure* specific and thus countervailable because the grants are limited to enterprises located in specific regions. In these reviews, the Government of Israel (GOI) has provided no new information or evidence of changed circumstances to warrant reconsideration of this determination.

Rotem Fertilizers Ltd. (Rotem) is located in Development Zone A, and received ECIL investment, drawback, and capital grants in disbursements over a period of years for several projects. We followed the methodology developed in *IPA Investigation* to determine the benefits from the ECIL grants. However, consistent with the *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Israel,* 60 FR 10569 (February 27, 1995) (*Butt-Weld Pipe Investigation*), in these reviews we have amended the calculation methodology to conform with the use of variable rather than fixed interest rates in the years these grants were disbursed. Section 355.49(b)(3) of the Department's *Proposed Regulations* relies on a discount rate, based on the cost of fixed-rate long-term debt for the firm under review or generally in the country under review. However, Rotem had no fixed-rate long-term debt during the years in which it received ECIL grants. Moreover, in *Butt-Weld Pipe Investigation,* the Department determined that no long-term loans with fixed interest rates (or other long-term debt) were available in Israel during that period; the only long-term loans (or other long-term debt) available to companies in Israel were provided at variable interest rates.

This methodology reflects the actual long-term options open to Israeli firms, and also ensures that the net present value of the amount countervailed in the year of receipt does not exceed the face value of the grant. In accordance with *General Issues Appendix,* we allocated these grants over ten years (the average useful life of renewable physical assets in the chemical manufacturing industry, as determined under the U.S. Internal Revenue Service Asset Depreciation Range System). As the discount rate, we have used the rate of return on CPI-indexed commercial bonds (the real rate of return, as published in the Bank of Israel Annual Reports, plus the CPI).

We summed the benefits from these projects for each year (1992 and 1993), and then reduced the annual benefits according to the methodology outlined in the ''Privatization'' section above. We then divided the results by the value of IPA sold by Rotem during the relevant review period. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 3.82 percent *ad valorem* for 1992 and 5.47 percent *ad valorem* for 1993.

(B) Long-term Industrial Development Loans

Prior to July 1985, approved enterprises were eligible to receive long-term industrial development loans funded by the Government of Israel (GOI). During the original investigation, we verified that these loans, like the ECIL grants, were project-specific. They were disbursed through the Industrial Development Bank of Israel (IDBI) and other industrial development banks which no longer exist.

The long-term industrial development loans were provided to a diverse number of industries, including agricultural, chemical, mining, machine, and others. However, the interest rates on loans vary depending on the Development Zone in which the borrower is located. The interest rates on loans to borrowers in Development Zone A are lowest, while those on loans to borrowers in the Central Zone are highest. Therefore, loans to companies in Zone A are provided on preferential terms relative to loans received by companies in the heavily populated and developed Central Zone. In *IPA Investigation,* the Department found long-term industrial development loans to be regional subsidies and countervailable to the extent that they are provided at interest rates which are lower than those applied on loans provided to companies located in the Central Zone. In these reviews, the Government of Israel (GOI) has provided no new information or evidence of changed circumstances to warrant reconsideration of this determination. Rotem had loans outstanding under this program during both review periods. The loans carry the Zone A interest rates because of Rotem's location. Therefore, we determine that Rotem received countervailable benefits under this program because the interest rates paid by Rotem are less than those which would apply in the Central Zone.

As was determined in the *Butt-Weld Pipe Investigation,* under the terms of this program, the interest rates on these loans have two components—a fixed real interest rate and a variable interest rate, the latter of which is based on either the CPI or the dollar/shekel exchange rate. All of Rotem's loans were linked to the dollar/shekel exchange rate. Because the dollar-shekel exchange rate varies from year-to-year, we were unable to apply the Department's methodology described in the *Proposed Regulations* because we cannot calculate *a priori* the payments due over the life of these loans, and hence cannot calculate the ''grant equivalent'' of the loans. Accordingly, in accordance with section 355.49(d)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations,* we have compared the interest that would have been paid by a company in the Central Zone, as a benchmark, to the amount actually paid by Rotem during the review periods.

For each project, we calculated the interest savings accrued during the period of review (POR). We then summed the benefits and divided the total by the value of all IPA sold by Rotem during the POR. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy from this program to be 0.01 percent *ad valorem* for 1992, and less than 0.005 percent *ad valorem* for 1993.

(C) Exchange Rate Risk Insurance Scheme

Prior to September 1993, the Exchange Rate Risk Insurance Scheme (EIS), operated by the Israel Foreign Trade Risk Insurance Corporation Ltd. (IFTRIC), was designed to insure exporters against losses which resulted when the rate of inflation exceeded the rate of devaluation and the new Israeli Shekel (NIS) value of an exporter's foreign currency receivables did not rise enough to cover increases in local costs.

The EIS was optional and open to any exporter willing to pay a premium to IFTRIC. Compensation was based on a

comparison of the rate of devaluation of the NIS against a basket of foreign currencies with the change in the consumer price index. If the rate of inflation exceeded the rate of devaluation, the exporter was compensated by an amount equal to the difference between these two rates multiplied by the value-added of the exports. If the rate of devaluation was higher than the rate of inflation, however, the exporter was required to compensate IFTRIC. The premium was calculated for all participants as a percentage of the value-added sales value of exports. IFTRIC changed this percentage rate periodically, but at any given time it was the same for all exporters.

In determining whether an export insurance program provides a countervailable benefit, we examine whether the premiums and other charges are adequate to cover the program's long-term operating costs and losses. Despite periodic increases in the premium rate, we determined in *IPA Investigation* that this program did not cover its long term costs and losses and, therefore, conferred an export subsidy on exports of IPA from Israel. In addition, in the *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel* (59 FR 5176; February 3, 1994), covering the 1991 review period, we found that this program conferred a countervailable benefit on exporters in Israel of the subject merchandise. Normally, five years is a sufficiently long enough period of time to establish that the premiums and other charges are manifestly inadequate to cover the long-term operating costs and losses of the program. (See section 355.44(d)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*). We reviewed EIS financial statements in these reviews which showed that EIS has continuously operated at a loss from 1981 through 1992. Since EIS has operated at a loss for 12 years, the determination that this program is countervailable remains unchanged.

We verified that Rotem did not receive benefits from IFTRIC for its IPA exports to the United States during 1992. However, Rotem did receive benefits from IFTRIC for its IPA exports to United States during 1993. Therefore, for the 1993 review period, we have calculated the benefit rate by dividing the net amount of compensation Rotem received during the review period from IFTRIC for IPA exported to the United States, by the value of the company's exports of IPA to the United States during the same period. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the benefit from this program to be zero for the 1992 review period and 0.02 percent *ad valorem* for the 1993 review period.

(D) Encouragement of Industrial Research and Development Grants (EIRD)

Rotem received several grants under this program in both the 1992 and 1993 review periods. In *IPA Investigation*, we determined that the results of research funded by EIRD grants are not made publicly available, and that such grants are countervailable. (See also section 355.44(l) of the *Proposed Regulations*). We followed the methodology developed in *IPA Investigation* in determining the benefits from the EIRD funding.

The EIRD grant issued to Rotem on January 13, 1992 benefited a research project concerning green acid, which is used as an input in the production of IPA. We view this as a ''non-recurring'' grant based on the analysis set forth in the Allocation section of the *General Issues Appendix*. Since the grant value was less than 0.50 percent of all Rotem's sales, we allocated the full amount of the grant to 1992 and divided by Rotem's total sales of all products. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the benefit from this program to be less than 0.005 percent *ad valorem*.

II. New Program Preliminarily Determined Not to Confer Subsidies

Law for the Encouragement of the Business Sector (Absorption of Workers)

The questionnaire responses submitted by the GOI and Rotem for the 1992 and 1993 review periods stated that Rotem participated in a temporary program aimed at encouraging employment in order to cope with the problems caused by immigration. This program, enacted under the temporary Law for the Encouragement of the Business Sector (Absorption of Workers), has not been examined in any prior reviews or in the investigation of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we requested additional information on this program, and on the benefits received by Rotem, in a supplemental questionnaire, and we verified the information in both responses in order to determine whether the program was limited, either *de jure* or *de facto*, to a specific enterprise or industry, or a group of enterprises or industries, and thus countervailable.

The temporary Law for the Encouragement of the Business Sector (Absorption of Workers) was instituted in 1991 in an effort to expand employment opportunities in the Israeli economy, following rising levels of unemployment between 1988–1991 caused by large Russian immigration. Under the Absorption of Workers program, funded by the Treasury and administered by the National Insurance Institute (NII), any employer in the business sector employing a monthly average of over five employees is eligible to receive a monthly grant from the Treasury for each additional employee hired. The period of payment of the grant for each employee is limited to two years. During the first year, the grant consists of one-third of the monthly wages paid to the employee but cannot exceed NIS 1000 per month. During the second year, the grant consists of one-fourth of the monthly wages paid to the employee but cannot exceed NIS 750 per month. Payments under the program began in July 1991 and are scheduled to terminate in December 1995.

Companies that wish to participate in this program submit an application, certified by a CPA, through their bank to the NII within nine months of the end of the quarter for which they are requesting assistance. The NII reviews the application form and compares it to the company's insurance records and Department of the Interior records to calculate the average number of workers employed prior to the period of application. Any workers hired over this baseline number make the company eligible for participation in the program. For eligible companies, payment is transferred directly into the employer's bank account within 45 days of the application. The NII conducts random audits of approximately 20 percent of the recipients.

We verified that all companies in the business sector employing a minimum of five workers are eligible to participate in the program and, upon submission of a complete and accurate application within the specified time frame, will receive a grant for each additional worker hired. Moreover, we found no evidence that the program is regional or that approval is contingent upon the export performance of the company. Finally, we found no evidence that the program is limited to a specific enterprise or industry, or a group of enterprises or industries. There are a large number and wide variety of users of the program. The range of industrial branches that received grants includes agriculture, general industry, electricity and water, construction, food and hospitality, transportation, financial, public services, and private services. Chemical producers are neither a dominant nor disproportionate recipient of the grants, and there is no evidence that the GOI exercises discretion, in general or across industries, in

conferring the grants. Thus, we preliminarily determine that this program is not countervailable within the meaning of section 701(a) of the Act. (For a more detailed explanation of the Department's decision, *see* the May 26, 1995 Memorandum for the 1992 Administrative Reviews of IPA from Israel, on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce).

III. Programs Preliminarily Determined Not to Be Used

We also examined the following programs and preliminarily determine that the producer/exporter of the subject merchandise did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs during the 1992 or 1993 review periods:

A. Reduced tax rates under ECIL;
B. ECIL section 24 loans;
C. Preferential accelerated depreciation under ECIL;
D. Labor training grants; and
E. Dividends and Interest Tax Benefits under Section 46 of the ECIL.

Preliminary Results of Reviews

For the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 3.84 percent *ad valorem* for all firms. For the period January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 5.50 percent *ad valorem* for all firms.

If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess the following countervailing duties:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Period	Rate (percent)
All companies ...	1992	3.84
All companies ...	1993	5.50

The Department also intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, of 5.50 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from Israel entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of these administrative reviews.

Parties to the proceedings may request disclosure of the calculation methodology used in either review and interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in the case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit written arguments in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Written arguments that are intended to comment on the preliminary results for both the 1992 and 1993 reviews must be submitted to the file for each proceeding. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 355.38(e).

Representatives of parties to these proceedings may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under section 355.38(c), are due. The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 355.22.

Dated: February 22, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–4984 Filed 3–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Weather Service To Discontinue the Issuance of All Routine Agricultural Forecasts and Fruit Frost Forecasts

AGENCY: National Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice updates the National Weather Services (NWS) plans to transfer Agricultural Weather Services to the private sector, notice of which was published on July 5, 1995; *see* National Weather Service Transfer of Specific Products and Services to the Private Sector, 60 Fed. Reg. 34969.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action becomes effective April 1, 1996, for routine agricultural forecasts and April 20, 1996, for fruit frost forecasts.

ADDRESSES: National Weather Service, Industrial Meteorology Staff, 1325 East-West Highway, #18462, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward Gross, 301–713–0258.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 5, 1995, the National Weather Service (NWS) announced that it planned to transfer specific products and services to the private sector effective October 1, 1995. Subsequently, concerns were raised about the disruption of critical forecasts to regions of the United States dependent on receiving NWS agricultural weather services and the Conference Report for the Department of Commerce Fiscal Year 1996.

Appropriations Bill to accompany H.R. 2076 noted that, ''it may be necessary within funds available to provide Agricultural Weather Services for a limited time.''

Accordingly, NWS has continued and will continue routine agricultural forecasts until April 1, 1996, and will continue those Fruit Frost Forecasts that it has already commenced providing until April 20, 1996. At that time, funds available for Agricultural Weather Services will be exhausted. However, if a freeze or very cold weather is in progress on April 20, 1996, fruit frost products will continue until the episode ends.

The NWS has been notifying customers of changes to its Agricultural Weather Services program since July 1995. The provision of these services has been extended from October 1, 1995 until April 20, 1996 for the purpose of minimizing the disruption of critical forecasts to certain regions and to allow customers an opportunity to find alternative sources of agricultural weather information from the private sector. This action complies with the conference language of maintaining a goal of smoothly transferring services to those private sector vendors capable and willing to assume them.

The following NWS agricultural products will no longer be available:

Agricultural Weather Forecast
Fruit Frost Forecast
Special Agricultural Weather Advisory
Weather Advisory for Ag Operations
30-day Agricultural Weather Outlook
National Agricultural Weather Highlights
Cranberry Bog Forecasts

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Joint Agricultural Weather Facility will continue producing the International Weather and Crop Bulletin.