the total home market COP for these sales. We then multiplied this percentage by the COP for each U.S. model to derive an actual profit.

We derived the CEP offset amount from the amount of the indirect selling expenses on above-cost sales in the home market. We limited the home market indirect selling expense deduction by the amount of the indirect selling expenses incurred on sales to the United States.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of CEP and NV, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
Akzo	12/16/93–5/31/95	21.31

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.′

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of PPD–T aramid from the Netherlands entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original 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 (3) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 66.92 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (59 FR 32678, June 24, 1994).

These deposit rates, 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 Act.

Dated: March 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–8683 Filed 4–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–428–801]

Ball Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof, From Germany; Final Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On February 8, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) issued preliminary results in the 1994–1995 new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof, from Germany (ball bearings) (61 FR 4763). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is December 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995 (the POR).

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results and no comments were received. Therefore, the final results remain unchanged from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas O. Barlow or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

On February 8, 1996, the Department issued preliminary results (61 FR 4763) of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings from Germany (54 FR 20900, May 15, 1989). The preliminary results indicated that Miniaturkugellager GmbH (MKL) sold subject merchandise at not less than normal value during the POR. We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results.

The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 353.22 of its regulations.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of ball bearings and parts thereof. These products include all antifriction bearings that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10,

8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.10, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6590, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.70.6060, 8708.70.8050, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.5000, 8708.93.6000, 8708.93.75, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.31, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.5800, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, 8803.90.90.

The size or precision grade of a bearing does not influence whether the bearing is covered by the order. For a further discussion of the scope of the order being reviewed, including recent scope determinations, *see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders,* 60 FR 10900 (February 28, 1995). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

This review covers one producer/exporter. The POR is December 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

Final Results of the Review

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments. The final results remain unchanged from the preliminary results as the Department used the same methodology described in the preliminary results. As a result of our comparison of constructed export price (CEP) and normal value (NV), we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
MKL	12/01/94–5/31/95	0.00

The results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties. The posting of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and section 353.22(h)(4) of the Department's regulations, will no longer be permitted for this firm. 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 these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be zero percent; (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, 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, previous reviews, or the original 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 68.89 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the final results of review published on July 26, 1993 (*see Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order,* 58 FR 39729 (July 26, 1993)). This rate is the ''All Others'' rate from the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also 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 a 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)(1). 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This new shipper administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) and 19 CFR 353.22(h).

Dated: March 20, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–8684 Filed 4–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–834–805]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Beryllium Metal and High Beryllium Alloys From Kazakhstan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Grebasch at (202) 482–3773 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 NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigation

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 March 14, 1996, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') received a petition filed in proper form by Brush Wellman Inc. (''petitioner''), a domestic producer of beryllium metal and high beryllium alloys (''beryllium''). The Department received supplemental information to the petition on March 28, and March 29, and April 1, 1996.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, petitioner alleges that imports of beryllium from Kazakhstan 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.

Petitioner claims that it has standing to file the petition because it is an interested party, 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