International Trade Administration

[A–421–805]

Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide From the Netherlands; Extension of Time Limit of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limit of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the final results in the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on aramid fiber formed of poly para-phenylene terephthalamide (PPD–T aramid) from the Netherlands, covering the period December 16, 1993, through May 31, 1995, because it is not practicable to complete the review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Little or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 9, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results of this review (*see Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide from the Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review,* 61 FR 15766). The review covers the period December 16, 1993, through May 31, 1995.

It is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (*see* Memorandum for Paul Joffe from Joe Spetrini, Extension of Time Limits for 1993–95 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide from the Netherlands, May 9, 1996). Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the final results to September 25, 1996. The Department adjusted the time limits by 28 days due to the government shutdowns, which lasted from November 14, 1995, to November 20, 1995, and from December 15, 1995, to January 6, 1996. *See* Memorandum to the file from Susan G. Esserman, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, January 11, 1996. These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: May 16, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–13321 Filed 5–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–602–803]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Australia: 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 a request by the petitioners, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group, a Unit of USX Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, AK Steel Corporation, Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, WCI Steel, Inc., and Lukens Steel Company, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Australia.* This review covers The Broken Hill Proprietary Company, Ltd. (BHP), the sole manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR) August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995. Because BHP failed to submit a response to our questionnaire, we have preliminarily determined to use facts otherwise available for cash deposit and assessment purposes.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Bolling or Jean Kemp, Office of Agreements Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3793.

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). 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).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 37079) the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Australia, and published an antidumping duty order on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44161). On August 1, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 39150) a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Australia. On August 31, 1995, petitioners requested an administrative review of BHP, a manufacturer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States. We initiated the review on September 8, 1995 (60 FR 46817).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this administrative review constitute one ''class or kind'' of merchandise: certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products. The class or kind includes flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the HTS under item numbers 7210.31.0000, 7210.39.0000, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030,

7210.49.0090, 7210.60.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.21.0000, 7212.29.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.12.1000, 7217.13.1000, 7217.19.1000, 7217.19.5000, 7217.22.5000, 7217.23.5000, 7217.29.1000, 7217.29.5000, 7217.32.5000, 7217.33.5000, 7217.39.1000, and 7217.39.5000. Included are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (''terne plate''), or both chromium and chromium oxides (''tin-free steel''), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%–60%–20% ratio. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers BHP and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995 (POR).

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776 of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for BHP because it did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. We sent BHP a questionnaire on September 14, 1995, with deadlines of October 16, 1995 for section A and November 13, 1995 for the remaining sections. On October 11, 1995, BHP requested that the Department extend the deadlines for section A and all other portions of the questionnaire for one month. On October 13, 1995, the Department granted BHP a one-week extension for its section A response. However, the Department did not grant an extension for the remaining sections because we are conducting this review under statutory deadlines. Section A of the Department's questionnaire is a general information section that the Department uses to gather information on the respondents, (corporate structure, distribution process, sales process, accounting/financial practices, merchandise, aggregate quantity and value of sales, further manufacture or assembly in the United States, etc.). On October 23, 1995, we received a response to section A. Since section A is the general information section of the Department's questionnaire, the only relevant numerical data provided in section A is the aggregate quantity and value of sales. Sections B through E of the Department's questionnaire provide the Department with transaction-specific pricing and cost data used in the Department's calculation methodology. On November 20, 1995, BHP informed the Department that it no longer intended to continue to participate in this review. We did not receive a response to sections B through E of the questionnaire. Therefore, we must make our preliminary determination based on facts otherwise available (section 776(a) of the Act).

The Department finds that, in not responding to the questionnaire, BHP failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information from the Department. Therefore, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, we may, in making our determination, use an adverse inference in selecting from the facts otherwise available. This adverse inference may include reliance on data derived from the petition, a previous determination in an investigation or review, or any other information placed on record. Accordingly, in this case, we preliminary assign to BHP a margin of 39.11 percent, the margin calculated in the first administrative review using information provided by BHP in that review (see *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Australia, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 14049–14057 (March 29, 1996)).

Because the margin selected for this review is based on information obtained in the course of an earlier segment of the proceeding, the Department is required, pursuant to section 776(c) of the Act, to corroborate this information to the extent practicable from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. This simply means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information used has probative value (See Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, published in H. Doc. 103–106, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. At 870).

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (see, e.g., *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (February 22, 1996), where the Department disregarded the highest margin in that case as adverse BIA because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin). In this case, we have used the margin calculated in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding, the previous administrative review (see *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Australia, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 14049–14057 (March 29, 1996)). The margin calculated in the above first administrative review, 39.11 percent, was a calculated rate, based on information provided by BHP. There are no circumstances indicating that this margin is not relevant for use as adverse facts available.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that a margin of 39.11 percent exists for BHP for the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

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. Case

briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

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

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of corrosion-resistant steel from Australia entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (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 that 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 the ''All Others'' rate established in the original LTFV investigation, which is 24.96 percent.

These requirements, 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 this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: May 20, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–13430 Filed 5–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–403–801]

Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway; 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 new shipper antidumping duty administrative review of fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon from Norway. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period May 1, 1995 through October 31, 1995

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas 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) 482–4195/3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because this review is extraordinarily complicated, the Department is extending the time limits for the completion of the preliminary results until September 30, 1996, in accordance with Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994. (*See* Memorandum to the file.) We will issue our final results for this review by December 30, 1996.

These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: May 14, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–13320 Filed 5–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–588–839]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determination: Antidumping Duty Investigation of Sodium Azide From Japan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 29, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Magd Zalok or John Beck, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4162 or (202) 482–3464, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act.

Postponement of Preliminary Determination

On May 13, 1996, the American Azide Corporation, the petitioner in this investigation, requested that the Department postpone the preliminary determination of this investigation. We see no reason to deny this request. Therefore, pursuant to section 733 (c)(1)(A) of the Act, we are postponing the date of the preliminary determination as to whether sales of sodium azide from Japan have been made at less then fair value until no later than August 13, 1996.

This notice is published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act.

Dated: May 20, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–13322 Filed 5–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[C–401–804]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Sweden; Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time