

Dated: April 26, 1996.  
 Susan G. Esserman,  
*Assistant Secretary for Import  
 Administration.*  
 [FR Doc. 96-11124 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-588-054 and A-588-604]

**Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Less Than Four Inches in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof From Japan; Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Time Limits**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Extension of Time Limits.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits of the preliminary and final results of the 1994-95 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order (A-588-604) and finding (A-588-054) on tapered roller bearings from Japan. These reviews cover 13 manufacturers/exporters and resellers of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period October 1, 1994, through September 30, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 6, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Valerie Turoscy or Robert James, 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) 482-5253.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Because it is not practicable to complete these reviews within the normal time frame, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the preliminary results until October 30, 1996, in accordance with section 751 (a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994. We will issue our final results for these reviews by February 28, 1997.

These extensions are in accordance with section 751 (a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: April 29, 1996.  
 Joseph A. Spetrini,  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary For Compliance.*  
 [FR Doc. 96-11249 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

**U.S.-Korea Committee on Business Cooperation**

**AGENCY:** International Trade Administration, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Extension of time period to seek membership on U.S.-Korea Committee on Business Cooperation.

**SUMMARY:** On April 4, 1996, the Department of Commerce published a notice in the Federal Register (61 FR 15041 (April 4, 1996)) seeking nominations of outstanding individuals to serve on the U.S. section of the U.S.-Korea Committee on Business Cooperation ("CBC"). The purpose of the CBC is to provide a forum through which the U.S. and Korean public and private sectors can cooperate to exchange information on commercial matters and to encourage discussions on a variety of issues that impact their bilateral commerce. This notice extends the time for requests to serve on the U.S. section.

**DEADLINE:** The earlier notice provided that requests needed to be received by the Department of Commerce not later than May 3, 1996. This notice extends the period for the receipt of requests to serve until June 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send your requests for consideration to Susan M. Blackman, Director, Office of Korea and Southeast Asia, either by fax on (202) 482-4760 or by mail at Room 3203, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.  
**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Susan M. Blackman, Director, Office of Korea and Southeast Asia, either by fax on (202) 482-4760 or by mail at Room 3203, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Authority: Act of February 14, 1903, c. 552, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*, 32 Stat. 825; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1979, 19 U.S.C. 2171 Note, 93 Stat. 1381.

Dated: April 26, 1996.  
 Nancy Linn Patton,  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Asia Pacific.*  
 [FR Doc. 96-11159 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 3510-DA-P

[C-412-811]

**Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain hot rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 1.69 percent *ad valorem* for United Engineering Steels Limited. The net subsidies for non-reviewed companies are 20.33 percent *ad valorem* for Allied Steel and Wire Limited (ASW), and 9.76 percent *ad valorem* for all other non-reviewed companies for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as indicated in the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 6, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Melanie Brown or Christopher Cassel, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**  
 Background

On March 22, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 15327) the countervailing duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from the United Kingdom. On March 7, 1995, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" (60 FR 12540) of this countervailing duty order. We received timely requests for review from United Engineering Steels Limited, Inland Steel Bar Co. and United States/Kobe Steel Co., interested parties to this administrative review. We initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19018).

In accordance with section 355.22(a) of the Department's *Interim Regulations*, this review covers only those producers or exporters for which a review was specifically requested. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Interim Regulations; Request for Comments*, 60 FR 25130 (May 11, 1995) (*Interim Regulations*). Accordingly, this review covers United Engineering Steel Limited and British Steel plc. British Steel plc. stated that it did not produce or export the subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). Therefore,

British Steel plc. has not been assigned an individual company rate for this administrative review.

On November 2, 1995, we extended the period for completion of the preliminary and final results pursuant to section 751(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. See *Extension of the Time Limit for Certain Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 60 FR 55699. As explained in the memoranda for the record from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated November 22, 1995, and January 11, 1996, all deadlines were further extended to take into account the partial shutdowns of the Federal Government from November 15 through November 21, 1995, and December 15, 1995, through January 6, 1996. Therefore, the deadline for these preliminary results is no later than April 30, 1996, and the deadline for the final results of this review is no later than 180 days from the date on which these preliminary results are published in the Federal Register.

#### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. References to the *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 *Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 60 FR 80 (January 3, 1995).

#### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of non-alloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined

by the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1 (f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead or 0.1 percent or more of bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00, 60.00; 7213.39.00.30, 00.60, 00.90; 7214.40.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.50.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; 7214.60.00.10, 00.30, 00.50; and 7228.30.80. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Programs

##### I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

##### Allocation of Subsidies From BSC to UES

UES is a joint venture company formed in 1986 by British Steel Corporation (BSC) and Guest, Keen & Nettlefolds (GKN). In return for shares in UES, BSC contributed a major portion of its Special Steels Business and GKN contributed its Brymbo Steel Works and its forging business. BSC was wholly owned by the Government of the United Kingdom at the time the joint venture was formed; BSC was privatized in 1988 and now bears the name British Steel plc (BS plc).

In the investigation and first administrative review of this order, the Department found that BSC had received a number of subsidies prior to the 1986 sale of its Special Steels Business to UES (each of these subsidies to BSC is described in detail in Sections (1) through (4) below). See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom*, 58 FR 6237, 6243 (January 27, 1993) (*Lead Bar*) and *Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom; Final Results of Administrative Review*, 60 FR 54841, 54842 (October 26, 1995) (*Lead Bar II*). The Department determined that the sale did not alter the benefit from these previously bestowed subsidies, and thus the portion of BSC's pre-1986 subsidies which was attributable to the Special Steels Business productive unit transferred to UES (see *Lead Bar*, 58 FR

at 6240). The Department modified the *Lead Bar* allocation methodology in the subsequent *Remand Determination for Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom* which was based on the privatization methodology set out in the *General Issues Appendix* appended to the *Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from Austria*, 58 FR 37217, 37225 (July 9, 1993) (*Certain Steel*). In *Certain Steel*, the Department stated that it can no longer be assumed that the entire amount of subsidies allocated to a certain productive unit follows it when it is sold; rather, a portion of the sales price of the productive unit represents the repayment of prior subsidies.

To calculate a rate for the subsidies that were allocated from BSC to UES, we first determined the subsidies attributable to BSC's Special Steels Business by dividing the asset value of BSC's Special Steels Business by the total asset value of BSC. We then applied this ratio to the net present value, in the year of the spin-off, of the future benefit streams from all of BSC's prior subsidies allocable to the POR. The future benefit streams at the time of UES' creation reflect the Department's allocation over time of prior subsidies to BSC in accordance with the declining balance methodology (see *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49), as well as the effect of prior spin-offs of BSC productive units.

We next estimated the portion of the purchase price which represents repayment of prior subsidies by determining the portion of BSC's net worth that was accounted for by subsidies. To do that, we divided the face value of the allocable subsidies received by BSC in each year from fiscal year 1978/79 through fiscal year 1984/85 (the year prior to the creation of UES) by BSC's net worth in the same year. We calculated a simple average of these ratios, which was then multiplied by the purchase price of the productive unit. Thus, we determined the amount of the purchase price which represents repayment of prior subsidies. This amount was subtracted from the subsidies attributed to BSC's Special Steels Business at the time of sale to arrive at the amount of subsidies allocated to UES in 1986.

Having determined the amount of BSC's previously bestowed subsidies allocable to UES with the Special Steels Business in 1986, we then determined the benefit provided to UES by these subsidies in 1994. To do this, we divided the subsidies allocated to UES by the net present value (in the year of the spin-off) of the future benefit

streams from subsidies received by BSC prior to the spin-off and allocable to the POR. The resulting percentage, which represents the portion of BSC's future benefit streams to be apportioned to UES, was then multiplied by the total benefit amount from BSC's previously bestowed subsidies that would have been allocated to BSC in 1994 absent any spin-offs or privatization. This provides the benefits to UES in 1994. We divided these benefit amounts by the company's total sales in 1994, and preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 1.69 percent *ad valorem* for UES during 1994.

In determining the subsidies previously bestowed to BSC that were allocated to UES, we examined the following programs: equity infusions, Regional Development Grants, a National Loan Fund loan cancellation, and loans and interest rebates under ECSC Article 54.

#### (1) *Equity Infusions*

In every year from 1978/79 through 1985/86, BSC received equity capital from the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry pursuant to section 18(1) of the Iron and Steel Acts 1975, 1981, and 1982. According to section 18(1), the Secretary of State for the Department of Trade and Industry may "pay to the Corporation (BSC) such funds as he sees fit." The Government of the United Kingdom's equity investments in BSC were made pursuant to an agreed external financing limit which was based upon medium-term financial projections. BSC's performance was monitored by the Government of the United Kingdom on an ongoing basis and requests for capital were examined on a case-by-case basis. The UK government did not receive any additional ownership, such as stock or additional rights, in return for the capital provided to BSC under section 18(1) since it already owned 100 percent of the company.

In *Lead Bar* (58 FR at 6241), the Department found BSC to be unequityworthy from 78/79 through 1985/86, and thus determined that the Government of the United Kingdom's equity infusions were inconsistent with commercial considerations. Although, prior to the formation of UES, BSC's section 18(1) equity capital was written off in two stages (£3,000 million in 1981 and £1,000 million in 1982) as part of a capital reconstruction of BSC, the Department determined that BSC benefitted from these equity infusions, notwithstanding the subsequent write-off of equity capital. Therefore, the Department countervailed the equity investments as grants given in the years

the equity capital was received. No new information or evidence of changed circumstances was presented in this review to warrant a reconsideration of that finding.

Because the Department determined in *Lead Bar* that the infusions are non-recurring benefits, we have allocated the benefits over the average useful life of renewable physical assets in the steel industry (15 years) in accordance with our non-recurring grant methodology. See *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49; see also *Certain Steel*, 58 FR at 37230.

To calculate the benefit from these grants, we have used a discount rate which includes a risk premium. See *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.44(b)(6)(iv). While uncreditworthiness was not specifically alleged or investigated during the investigation on lead bar, in the *Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from the United Kingdom*, 58 FR 37393 (July 9, 1993) (*UK Certain Steel*), the Department found that BSC was uncreditworthy from 1977/78 through 1985/86. No new information or evidence of changed circumstances was presented in this review to warrant a reconsideration of that finding.

After calculating the 1994 allocation of subsidies from BSC to UES, as described above (Allocation of Subsidies From BSC to UES), we divided the subsidies allocated to UES by the company's total sales of all products domestically produced during 1994. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for this program to be 1.49 percent *ad valorem* in 1994.

#### (2) *Regional Development Grant Program*

Regional development grants were paid to BSC under the Industry Act of 1972 and the Industrial Development Act of 1982. In order to qualify for assistance under these two Acts, an applicant had to be engaged in manufacturing and located in an assisted area. Assisted areas are older, industrial regions identified as having deep-seated, long-term problems such as high levels of unemployment, migration, slow economic growth, derelict land, and obsolete factory buildings.

Regional development grants were given for the purchase of specific assets. According to the Government of the United Kingdom, the program involved one-time grants, disbursed sometimes over several years.

BSC received regional development grants during the period between fiscal years 1978/79 and 1985/86. The Department found this program

countervailable in *Lead Bar* (58 FR at 6242), because it is limited to specific regions. No new information or evidence of changed circumstances was presented in this review to warrant a reconsideration of that finding.

The Government of the United Kingdom claimed that the Regional Development Grants provided to BSC should be treated as non-countervailable green light subsidies, in accordance with section 771(5)(B) of the Act and Article 8.2(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. To be considered a non-countervailable green light subsidy, the Department must determine that the program under which the subsidies were bestowed satisfied all of the criteria set forth in the Act. Therefore, we requested that the UK Government submit information on the Regional Development Grant program in light of these criteria. We determined that the information submitted by the UK Government in its January 23, 1996 questionnaire response was insufficient to conduct a full analysis of the program in view of the green light criteria, and, therefore, sought additional and clarifying information in our February 6, 1996, supplemental questionnaire. However, on April 16, 1996, the UK Government submitted a letter indicating that the authorities responsible for collecting the information had concluded that the limited existing documentation was inadequate to meet the Department's requests for information, and no additional material was provided. Consequently, for the purpose of this administrative review, we continue to find the Regional Development Grant program countervailable and we will not make a determination as to whether the Regional Development Grant program meets the green light criteria set forth in section 771(5)(B) of the Act.

In *Lead Bar*, we determined that, since each grant required a separate application, these grants are non-recurring. Accordingly, we have calculated the benefits from this program by allocating the benefits over the average useful life of renewable physical assets in the steel industry (15 years) in accordance with our non-recurring grant methodology. See *Certain Steel*, 58 FR at 37227; see also *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49. Since BSC was uncreditworthy from 1978/79 through 1985/86 (as discussed under Equity Infusions), we have used a discount rate which includes a risk premium (see *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.44(b)(6)(iv)) to calculate the benefits from these grants. After calculating the 1994 allocation of

subsidies from BSC to UES, described above (Allocation of Subsidies From BSC to UES), we divided the subsidies allocated to UES by the company's total sales in 1994 and calculated the subsidy for that year. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for this program to be 0.05 percent *ad valorem* for UES during 1994.

### (3) National Loan Funds Loan Cancellation

In conjunction with the 1981/1982 capital reconstruction of BSC, section 3(1) of the Iron and Steel Act of 1981 extinguished certain National Loans Fund (NLF) loans, as well as the accrued interest thereon, at the end of BSC's 1980/81 fiscal year. Because this loan cancellation was provided specifically to BSC, the Department determined in *Lead Bar* (58 FR at 6242) that it provided a countervailable benefit. No new information or evidence of changed circumstances was presented in this review to warrant a reconsideration of that finding.

We calculated the benefit for this review using our standard methodology for non-recurring grants. We allocated the benefits from this loan cancellation over the average useful life of renewable physical assets in the steel industry (15 years) (see *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49; see also *Certain Steel*, 58 FR at 37230); because BSC was found to be uncreditworthy in 1981/82 (as discussed under Equity Infusions), we have used a discount rate which includes a risk premium (see *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.44(b)(6)(iv)). After calculating the 1994 allocation of subsidies from BSC to UES, described above (Allocation of Subsidies From BSC to UES), we divided the benefit allocated to UES by the company's total sales in 1994 and calculated the *ad valorem* subsidy for that year. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for this program to be 0.16 percent *ad valorem* for UES during 1994.

### (4) European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) Article 54 Loans/Interest Rebates

The European Coal and Steel Community's (ECSC) Article 54 Industrial Investment loans are direct, long-term loans from the Commission of the European Communities to be used by the iron and steel industry for purchasing new equipment or financing modernization. The purpose of the program is to facilitate the borrowing process for companies in the ECSC, some of which may not otherwise be able to obtain loans. In *UK Certain Steel*, the Department determined that this program is limited to the iron and steel

industry, and thus is countervailable to the extent that it provides loans on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations. No new information or evidence of changed circumstances was presented in this review to warrant a reconsideration of that finding.

In addition, interest rebates on Article 54 loans were granted to steel companies during the restructuring and modernization of the industry in the early 1980s. To qualify for the rebates, companies had to meet certain criteria, such as being in the process of reducing their steel production capacity or of implementing improvements in processing that would yield energy savings and improved efficiency.

The interest rebates, which were limited to a maximum of 3 percent of the total investment over a period of five years, were funded from the ECSC operational budget. While levies imposed on ECSC steel companies have provided the revenues for the operational budget since 1985, contributions by Member States supplemented the budget before that time. For this reason, the Department determined in *UK Certain Steel* that a portion of those interest rebates was countervailable. Following the same methodology in this review to determine the countervailable portion, we calculated the ratio of the contributions by Member States to the ECSC's total available funds for each year in which the rebates were given, and then multiplied this ratio by the rebate amount.

BSC received one Article 54 loan in fiscal year 76/77 and two Article 54 loans in fiscal year 77/78, all of which were provided in U.S. dollars and are still outstanding. BSC also received interest rebates during the first five years of the 76/77 loan. Because BSC qualified for the interest rebate at the time the loan was granted, we considered the rebate to constitute a reduction in the interest rate charged rather than a grant.

We considered the loan made to BSC during its creditworthy period (*i.e.*, in BSC's 76/77 fiscal year) separately from the two loans made during its uncreditworthy period (*i.e.*, in BSC's 77/78 fiscal year). For the Article 54 loan provided when BSC was creditworthy, we used as our benchmark the average U.S. long-term commercial rate for 1977. We used this rate because we did not have information on U.S. dollar loans borrowed in the United Kingdom in 1977. To calculate the benefit from this loan we employed our long-term loan methodology. See *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49(c)(1). We then

compared the amount of interest that would have been paid on the interest benchmark loan to the interest paid by BSC (factoring in the interest rebate as discussed above) and found that BSC's interest payments were higher than those it would have made on the benchmark loan. Therefore, we find that this particular loan was provided on terms consistent with commercial considerations.

For the loans provided when BSC was uncreditworthy, we used as our benchmark the highest U.S. lending rate available for long-term fixed rate loans at the time the loan was granted, plus a risk premium equal to 12 percent of the U.S. prime rate for 1977. See, *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: New Steel Rail, Except Light Rail, from Canada*, 54 FR 31991 (August 3, 1989); see also, *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.44(b)(6)(iv). Again, we used a U.S. interest rate because we did not have information on U.S. dollar loans borrowed in the United Kingdom in 1977. We then compared the cost of the benchmark financing to the cost of the financing that BSC received under this program and found that the two Article 54 loans to BSC during its uncreditworthy period were provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

To calculate the benefit from these loans we used our long-term loan methodology. See *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.49(c)(1). Using this methodology and a benchmark discount rate which includes a risk premium (see *Proposed Regulations*, § 355.44(b)(6)(iv)), we calculated the grant equivalent and allocated it over the life of the loans. Then we calculated the 1994 allocation of subsidies from BSC to UES, as described above (Allocation of Subsidies From BSC to UES). We then divided the subsidies allocated to UES by the company's total sales in that year to calculate the *ad valorem* subsidy. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for this program to be 0.0003 percent *ad valorem* for UES during 1994.

### II. Programs Preliminarily Determined To Be Not Used

We examined the following programs and preliminarily find that the producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise subject to this review did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs during the POR:

- (A) New Community Instrument Loans
- (B) ECSC Article 54 Loan Guarantees
- (C) NLF Loans
- (D) ECSC Conversion Loans

- (E) European Regional Development Fund Aid
- (F) Article 56 Rebates
- (G) Regional Selective Assistance
- (H) ECSC Article 56(b)(2) Redeployment Aid
- (I) BRITE/EuRAM II
- (J) Inner Urban Areas Act of 1978

#### Preliminary Results of Review

In accordance with section 355.22(c)(4)(ii) of the Department's *Interim Regulations*, we have calculated an individual subsidy rate for each producer/exporter subject to this administrative review. For the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy for United Engineering Steels Limited to be 1.69 percent *ad valorem*. 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 countervailing duties for United Engineering Steels Limited at 1.69 percent *ad valorem*. The Department also intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of 1.69 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from United Engineering Steels Limited, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

The URAA replaced the general rule in favor of a country-wide rate with a general rule in favor of individual rates for investigated and reviewed companies. The procedures for countervailing duty cases are now essentially the same as those in antidumping cases, except as provided for in section 777A(e)(2)(B) of the Act. Requests for administrative reviews must now specify the companies to be reviewed. See § 355.22(a) of the *Interim Regulations*. The requested review will normally cover only those companies specifically named. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 355.22(g), for all companies for which a review was not requested, duties must be assessed at the cash deposit rate, and cash deposits must continue to be collected, at the rate previously ordered. As such, the countervailing duty cash deposit rate applicable to a company can no longer change, except pursuant to a request for a review of that company. See *Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) and *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993) (interpreting 19 C.F.R. 353.22(e), the antidumping regulation on automatic assessment, which is

identical to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(g)). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except those covered by this review will be unchanged by the results of this review. We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company.

Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by this order are 20.33 percent *ad valorem* for ASW and 9.76 percent *ad valorem* for all other non-reviewed companies, which are the rates calculated in the most recently completed administrative proceeding. See *Lead Bar II*, 60 FR at 54841. These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested. In addition, for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

#### Public Comment

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of the calculation methodology 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 case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. 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 C.F.R. 355.38.

Representatives of parties to the proceeding 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 19 C.F.R. 355.38, are due. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

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

Dated: April 29, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-11244 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 950519137-6100-02]

RIN 0693-XX08

#### Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of funds.

**SUMMARY:** The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) invites proposals from qualified organizations for funding projects to provide manufacturing extension services to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in the United States. NIST will provide assistance for the creation and support of manufacturing extension centers in accordance with the provisions of Section 5121 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-418), codified in 15 U.S.C. 278k, and final rule 15 CFR part 290 published September 17, 1990 and amendment published May 2, 1994.

Manufacturing extension centers must be affiliated with a U.S.-based not-for-profit institution or organization. Support may be provided for a period not to exceed six years. Support beyond the initial award is dependent upon satisfactory performance and the availability of funds. Applicants are required to provide 50% or more of the operating costs for providing these manufacturing extension services in year 1 through 3 and an increasing percentage in years 4 through 6.

**DATES:** Proposals from qualified applicants must be received at the address below by 5 p.m. EDST, July 8, 1996. Selection of awards will be made in September 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Applicants must submit one signed original and six (6) copies of their proposal along with a Standard Form 424, 424-A, and 424-B (Rev 4-92), Form CD-511 and Form SF-LLL to the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, Building 301, Room C121, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-0001. Plainly mark on the outside of the package that it contains a manufacturing extension center proposal.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**