	Period
Cylindrical Roller Bearings, A–475–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Japan:	
Ball Bearings, A–588–804	5/1/95–4/30/96
Cement, A–588–815	5/1/95–4/30/96
Cylindrical Roller Bearings, A–588–804	5/1/95–4/30/96
Impression Fabric, A–588–066	5/1/95–4/30/96
Spherical Plain Bearings, A–588–804	5/1/95–4/30/96
Romania: Ball Bearings, A–485–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Russia: Pure Magnesium, A–821–805	11/7/94–4/30/96
Singapore: Ball Bearings, A–559–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
South Korea:	
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings, Other than Grooved, A–580–507	5/1/95–4/30/96
DRAMs, A–580–812	5/1/95–4/30/96
Sweden:	
Ball Bearings, A–401–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Cylindrical Roller Bearings, A–401–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Taiwan:	
Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tubes, A–583–008	5/1/95–4/30/96
Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings, Other Than Grooved, A–583–507	5/1/95–4/30/96
Thailand: Ball Bearings, A–549–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
The People's Republic of China:	
Construction Castings, A–570–502	5/1/95–4/30/96
Pure Magnesium, A–570–832	11/7/94–4/30/96
The Ukraine: Pure Magnesium, A–823–806	11/7/94–4/30/96
The United Kingdom:	
Ball Bearings, A–412–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Cylindrical Roller Bearings, A–412–801	5/1/95–4/30/96
Turkey: Pipes and Tubes, A–489–501	5/1/95–4/30/96
Countervailing Duties Proceedings:	
Brazil: Certain Heavy Iron Construction Castings, C–351–504	1/1/95–12/31/95
Singapore:	
Ball Bearings, C–559–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Cylindrical Roller Bearings, C–559–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Needle Roller Bearings, C–559–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Spherical Plane Bearings, C–559–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Spherical Roller Bearings, C–559–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Sweden: Viscose Rayon Staple Fiber, C–401–056	1/1/95–12/31/95
Thailand: Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof, C–549–802	1/1/95–12/31/95
Venezuela: Ferrosilicon, C–307–808	1/1/95–12/31/95

In accordance with sections 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interested party as defined by section 353.2(k) may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. The Department has changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25137 (May 11, 1995)), an interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order for which they are requesting a review. Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping Compliance, Attention: Pamela Woods, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping (Countervailing) Duty Administrative Review,'' for requests received by the last day of May 31, 1996. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of May 31, 1996, a request for review of entries covered by an order or finding listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute, but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: May 1, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–11391 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–351–820]

Ferrosilicon From Brazil; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests from one manufacturer/exporter, Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia (Ferbasa), and from AIMCOR, Elkem Metals Company and SKW Metals & Alloys, Inc. (petitioners), the Department of Commerce (the Department) has conducted an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ferrosilicon from Brazil. This notice of preliminary results covers one manufacturer/exporter, Ferbasa, for the period August 16, 1993 through February 28, 1995. The review indicates that there were no dumping margins during this period.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of our administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. 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.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel LaCivita, or Thomas F. Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5253

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statue 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, (60 FR 25130).

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on ferrosilicon from Brazil on March 14, 1994 (59 FR 11769). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1993 through 1995 period on March 7, 1995 (60 FR 12540). On March 21, 1995, we received a request for review from Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia (Ferbasa) covering the period August 16, 1993 through February 28, 1995. On March 31, 1995, petitioners requested a review for Companhia Brasilerira Carbureto de Calcio (CBCC), Companhia Ferroligas Minas Geräs (Minasligas), Italmagnesio S.A. Industria e Comercio (Italmagnesio) and Ferbasa for the same period. Petitioners withdrew their request for review for Itralmagnesio on April 11, 1995. We initiated an administrative review on CBCC and Ferbasa on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017) and on Minasligas on May 15, 1995 (60 FR 25886). Petitioners subsequently withdrew their request for review of Minasligas and CBCC on July 15, 1995 and the Department published in the Federal Register a Termination in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review for those companies (60 FR 52366). Consequently, this review covers only one manufacturer/exporter, Ferbasa.

The Department extended the time limits for the deadlines for the preliminary and final results of review because of the additional time required for the development of a new questionnaire in accordance with the adoption of the URAA. *See Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Time Limits*, 60 FR 56141 (November 7, 1995). Deadlines were further extended as a result of the 28-day shutdown of the federal government.

The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

On October 5, 1995, petitioners requested that the Department conduct an investigation to determine if Ferbasa made sales at prices below its cost of production (COP) during the 1993–1995 review period. On February 9, 1996, based on petitioners' allegation and the totality of evidence on the record, the Department determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Ferbasa made sales at prices below its COP, in accordance with section 773 (b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act, and initiated a COP investigation for Ferbasa, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act. See the Department's memorandum to the file, *Ferrosilicon from Brazil—Home Market Sales Below Cost Allegation for Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia,* February 9, 1996.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this review is ferrosilicon, a ferroalloy generally containing, by weight, not less than four percent iron, more than eight percent but not more than 96 percent silicon, not more than 10 percent chromium, not more than 30 percent manganese, not more than three percent phosphorous, less than 2.75 percent magnesium, and not more than 10 percent calcium or any other element.

Ferrosilicon is a ferroalloy produced by combining silicon and iron through smelting in a submerged-arc furnace. Ferrosilicon is used primarily as an alloying agent in the production of steel and cast iron. It is also used in the steel industry as a deoxidizer and a reducing agent, and by cast iron producers as an inoculant.

Ferrosilicon is differentiated by size and by grade. The sizes express the maximum and minimum dimensions of the lumps of ferrosilicon found in a given shipment. Ferrosilicon grades are defined by the percentages by weight of contained silicon and other minor elements. Ferrosilicon is most commonly sold to the iron and steel industries in standard grades of 75 percent and 50 percent ferrosilicon. Calcium silicon, ferrocalcium silicon, and magnesium ferrosilicon are specifically excluded from the scope of this review.

Calcium silicon is an alloy containing, by weight, not more than five percent iron, 60 to 65 percent silicon, and 28 to 32 percent calcium. Ferrocalcium silicon is a ferroalloy containing, by weight, not less than four percent iron, 60 to 65 percent silicon, and more than 10 percent calcium. Magnesium ferrosilicon is a ferroalloy containing, by weight, not less than four percent iron, not more than 55 percent silicon, and not less than 2.75 percent magnesium.

Ferrosilicon is currently classifiable under the following subheadings of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS): 7202.21.1000, 7202.21.5000, 7202.21.7500, 7202.21.9000, 7202.29.0010, and 7202.29.0050. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Ferrosilicon in the form of slag is included within the scope of this review

if it meets, in general, the chemical content definition stated above and is capable of being used as ferrosilicon. Parties that believe their importations of slag do not meet these definitions should contact the Department and request a scope determination.

Level of Trade

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, at 829–831, *see* H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 829–831(1994), to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale. The SAA makes clear that there cannot be two different levels of trade where the selling functions are the same. When the Department is unable to find sale(s) in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale(s), the Department may compare sales in the U.S. and foreign markets at a different level of trade.

Ferbasa made only one U.S. sale during the period of review, which was to an unaffiliated reseller in the U.S. market. It made sales to unaffiliated resellers and to steel producers in the home market. The selling functions for the U.S. sale and for all home market sales are identical. The selling functions include invoicing, order acknowledgment, order processing, quality control, marketing, and price negotiation. Therefore, we conclude that home market and U.S. sales were all made at the same level of trade.

United States Price (USP)

In calculating USP for Ferbasa, we used export price, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and because no other circumstances indicated that constructed export price (CEP) was appropriate. Ferbasa reported that export price was based on the unpacked, FOB price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions for brokerage and handling charges, and inland freight from the plant to the port, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, because these expenses were incident to bringing the subject merchandise from the original place of shipment in the exporting country to the place of delivery in the United States.

Ferbasa reported inventory carrying costs and indirect selling expenses which were attributed to sales in the U.S. market. We did not make adjustments for these expenses since these are indirect selling expenses which do not fall within the adjustments applicable to export price under section 772(c) of the Act.

No other adjustments to USP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value (NV)

A. Viability

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Ferbasa's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. Because Ferbasa's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV for Ferbasa.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

As stated above in the *Background* section, the Department initiated a ''cost of production'' investigation for Ferbasa. The term ''cost of production'' is defined in section 773(b) of the Act.

Before making any fair value comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below.

a. Calculation of COP

We calculated COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and the cost of all expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. In making our calculations, we relied on the home market sales and COP information for the six-month period surrounding Ferbasa's sale to the United States.

b. Test of Home Market Prices

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in order to determine whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices which permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

We used the respondent's weighted-average COP for the six-month period for which home market sales were reported. We compared the weighted-average COP figures to home market sales of the foreign like product as required under section 773(b) of the Act. We compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable price adjustments for quantity changes.

c. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of respondent's sales were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the six-month period were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because we determined that the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in ''substantial quantities'' in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, and because we determined that the below-cost sales of the product were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

C. Model Match

We have determined that all the products covered by this review constitute a single category of like merchandise. All sales in the home market are considered to be identical to the sales in the United States. Therefore, we made no adjustments for similar characteristics and uses pursuant to section 771(10) of the Act.

D. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the exporting country, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, and 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 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 commissions, bank fees and U.S. credit in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act.

No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

Currency Conversion

The Department's preferred source for daily exchange rates is the Federal

Reserve Bank. However, the Federal Reserve Bank does not track or publish exchange rates for Brazilian currency. Therefore, we made currency conversions based on the daily exchange rates from the Dow Jones Business Information Service, as published in the Wall Street Journal.

Section 773A(a) directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, ignoring any ''fluctuations.'' We determine that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark rate by 2.25 percent or more. The benchmark rate is defined as the rolling average of the rates for the past 40 business days. When we determined that a fluctuation existed, we substituted the benchmark rate for the daily rate. For a complete discussion of the Department's exchange rate methodology, *See*, ''Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions'' (61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996).

Preliminary Results

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period August 16, 1993 through February 28, 1995:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia	0.00

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the 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 ferrosilicon from Brazil 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 Ferbasa 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 35.95 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the antidumping duty order (59 FR 11769, March 14, 1994).

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 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 (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)).

Dated: April 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–11491 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–821–803]

Titanium Sponge From the Russian Federation; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 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 limit of the preliminary results of the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on titanium sponge from the Russian Federation. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and two resellers of the subject merchandise, covering the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy S. Wei or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until September 3, 1996. See Memo to Susan G. Esserman from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Administrative Review, April 25, 1996. We will issue our final results for this review by January 2, 1997.

This extension is 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: May 1, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–11390 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P