Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3.5 hours per response.

Respondents: State or local governments, small business or organizations, and non-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 2.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 8.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 56.

Copies of this information collection, and related form and instructions, can be obtained from Dawn Wolfgang, Program Support and Regulatory Analysis Group, at (202) 720–0812.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether this proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to: F. Lamont Heppe, Jr., Director, Program Support and Regulatory Analysis Group, Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, AG Box 1522, 14th & Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250–1522. FAX: (202) 720–4120.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record:

Dated: June 28, 1996.

John P. Romano,

Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 96–17363 Filed 7–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: Patent and Trademark Office (PTO).

Title: Admittance to Practice and Roster of Registered Patent Attorneys and Agents Admitted to Practice Before the Patent and Trademark Office.

Agency Approval Number: 0651–0012.

Type of Request: Extension of the expiration date of a currently approved collection without any change in the substance or in the method of collection.

Burden: 3,500 hours.

Number of Respondents: 10,500.

Avg. Hours Per Response: ⅓ hour.

Needs and Uses: Information is required to determine the qualifications of individuals entitled to represent applicants before the Patent and Trademark Office in the preparation and prosecution of applications for a patent, and to administer and maintain the roster of attorneys registered to practice before the Patent and Trademark Office.

Affected Public: Individuals.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

OMB Desk Officer: Maya A. Bernstein, (202) 395–4816.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, Acting DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to Maya A. Bernstein, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10236, New Executive Office building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: July 3, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96–17449 Filed 7–08–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

International Trade Administration

[A–570–808]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From The People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts (lug nuts) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in response to a request by petitioner, Consolidated International Automotive, Inc. (Consolidated). This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between export price and NV.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Little, Elisabeth Urfer, or Maureen Flannery, 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) 482–4733.

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).

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping duty order on lug nuts from the PRC on April 24, 1992 (57 FR 15052). On September 12, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 47349) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on lug nuts from the PRC covering the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995.

On September 28, 1995, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a), Consolidated requested that we conduct an administrative review of China National Automotive Industry I/E Corp., Nantong

Branch (Nantong); China National Automobile Import and Export Corp., Yangzhou Branch (Yangzhou); Jiangsu Rudong Grease-Gun Factory, also known as JiangSu Huanghai Auto Parts Share Co., Ltd. (Rudong); Ningbo Knives & Scissors Factory (Ningbo); Shanghai Automobile Import & Export Corp. (Shanghai Automobile); Tianjin Automotive Import and Export Co. (Tianjin); China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp., Jiangsu Branch (Jiangsu); and China National Automotive Industry I/E Corp. (China National). We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on October 12, 1995 (60 FR 53165). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

On April 19, 1994, the Department issued its ''Final Scope Clarifications on Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from Taiwan and the PRC.'' The scope, as clarified, is described in the subsequent paragraph. All lug nuts covered by this review conform to the April 19, 1994 scope clarification.

Imports covered by this review are one-piece and two-piece chrome-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished. The subject merchandise includes chrome-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, which are more than 11/16 inches (17.45 millimeters) in height and which have a hexagonal (hx) size of at least 3/4 inches (19.05 millimeters) but not over one inch (25.4 millimeters), plus or minus 1/16 of an inch (1.59 millimeters). The term ''unfinished'' refers to unplated and/or unassembled chrome-plated lug nuts. The subject merchandise is used for securing wheels to cars, vans, trucks, utility vehicles, and trailers. Zinc-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, and stainless-steel capped lug nuts are not included in the scope of this review. Chrome-plated lock nuts are also not subject to this review.

Chrome-plated lug nuts are currently classified under subheading 7318.16.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995, and eight producers/exporters of Chinese lug nuts.

Market-Oriented Industry

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as a non-market economy (NME) country. Pursuant to section 771(18)(c)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. Information presented in this review has not caused the Department to change that determination.

Rudong submitted, with its January 25, 1996 questionnaire response, a request that we treat the lug nuts industry as a market-oriented industry (MOI). Rudong claims that its material inputs are acquired at market prices and that, accordingly, we should find that the Chinese lug nuts industry is an MOI, and use Rudong's home market sales and/or costs as the basis of NV.

The criteria for determining whether an MOI exists are: 1) for the merchandise under review, there must be virtually no government involvement in setting prices or amounts to be produced; 2) the industry producing the merchandise under review should be characterized by private or collective ownership; and 3) market-determined prices must be paid for all significant inputs, whether material or non-material (*e.g.*, labor and overhead), and for all but an insignificant portion of all the inputs accounting for the total value of the merchandise under review. (*See Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order: Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China* (57 FR 15054, April 24, 1992) (*Lug Nuts Redetermination*).)

We find preliminarily in this review that the PRC lug nut industry does not meet these three criteria. With respect to the first and second criteria, Rudong has stated that it is the only producer of lug nuts, that it is a collectively-owned public enterprise, and that it independently negotiates prices. However, we did not receive a PRC government response to our questionnaire requesting the names of all lug nut producers in the PRC. We were unable, therefore, to determine whether the first and second criteria are met for the industry as a whole. With respect to the third criterion, Rudong did not submit any information on supply and demand factors indicating that it pays market-determined prices for steel, a major input in lug nut production, or that the steel industry is not subject to significant state control. Further, Rudong has not placed on the record any information on supply and demand factors indicating that it pays market-determined prices for chemical inputs, or that the chemicals industry is not subject to significant state control. Based on the foregoing, we preliminarily determine that Rudong has not demonstrated the lug nut industry is an MOI and accordingly have calculated NV in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. For a further discussion of the Department's preliminary determination that the lug nuts industry does not constitute an MOI, see *Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Director of the Office of Antidumping Compliance,* dated June 18, 1996, ''Market Oriented Industry Request in the Third Administrative Review of Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China,'' which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Facts Available

We preliminarily determine that, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, the use of facts available is appropriate for Nantong, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Jiangsu, China National, Tianjin, and Shanghai Automobile because these firms did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. The Department finds that, in not responding to the questionnaire, these seven firms failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of their ability to comply with requests for information from the Department. Because necessary information is not available on the record with regard to sales by these firms as a result of their withholding the requested information, we must make our preliminary determination based on facts otherwise available pursuant to section 776(a) of the Act.

Where the Department must base the entire dumping margin for a respondent in an administrative review on the facts available because that respondent failed to cooperate, section 776(b) authorizes the Department to use an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing the facts available. Section 776(b) also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. Because information from prior proceedings constitutes secondary information, section 776(c) provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary

information to be used has probative value.

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; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* (60 FR 49567, September 26, 1995), where the Department disregarded the highest margin as adverse best information available 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 highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 44.99 percent. There is no indication that this rate is not appropriate. This rate was calculated in the review covering the period September 1, 1992 through August 31, 1993 (1992–1993 review).

Separate Rates

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this policy, exporters in non-market economies (NMEs) are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: 1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; 2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and 3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: 1) whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of a government authority; 2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; 3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and 4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management.

In the administrative review covering the period from September 1, 1992 through August 31, 1993 (1992–93 review), we determined that Nantong merited a separate rate, and in the 1993–94 review we preliminary determined that Rudong merited a separate rate. Because we made a final determination, under the criteria set forth in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*, that Nantong merited a separate rate, and therefore did not request that Nantong respond to the separate rates section of the questionnaire, and because no evidence was put on the record of this review demonstrating that Nantong did not merit a separate rate, for this review we continue to assign Nantong a separate rate. (As noted above, this rate is based on facts available.) Because the results from the 1993–94 review are not final, we analyzed Rudong's submission in this review to determine whether Rudong merits a separate rate. We have made the determination of whether Rudong should receive a separate rate under the policy set forth in *Silicon Carbide* and *Sparklers*. No other company in this review was previously determined to merit a separate rate under the *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide* criteria, or responded to our request for information regarding separate rates; therefore, we are assigning the PRC rate to these remaining companies.

With respect to the absence of *de jure* government control, evidence on the record indicates that Rudong is a collectively-owned enterprise. The ''Regulations on Rural Collective Enterprises'' identify rules and regulations pertaining to collectively-owned enterprises which give rural collective enterprises such rights as the right to act on their own, adopt independent accounting, and assume the sole responsibility for their profits and losses. (*See* May 31, 1996 memorandum to the file, with attachments, ''Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China: laws and regulations governing various categories of companies in the PRC.'')

Further, several PRC laws establish that the responsibility for managing entities has been transferred from the central government to the enterprise. (*See* July 18, 1995 memorandum to the file, with attachments, ''Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China: laws and regulations governing various categories of companies in the PRC.'') Additionally, lug nuts do not appear on the ''Temporary Provisions for Administration of Export Commodities,'' approved on December 21, 1992, and are not, therefore, subject to the constraints of this provision.

With respect to the absence of *de facto* control, Rudong's management is elected by Rudong's staff, and is responsible for all decisions such as the determination of its export prices, profit distribution, employment policy, and marketing strategy, and for negotiating contracts.

We have found that the evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to Rudong according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*. For further discussion of the Department's preliminary determination that Rudong is entitled to a separate rate, *see Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Director of the Office of Antidumping Compliance*, dated June 18, 1996, ''Separate Rate for Jiangsu Rudong Grease-Gun Factory in the Fourth Administrative Review of Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China,'' which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Export Price

For sales made by Rudong we used export price, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unrelated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States.

We calculated export price based on the price to unrelated purchasers. We deducted an amount for foreign inland freight. We valued foreign inland freight using surrogate data based on Indian freight costs. We selected India as the

surrogate country for the reasons explained in the ''Normal Value'' section of this notice.

Normal Value

For companies located in NME countries, section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine NV using a factors-of-production methodology if (1) the merchandise is exported from an NME country, and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

In the amendment to the final determination of sales at less than fair value (LTFV), the Department treated the PRC as an NME country, and determined that the lug nuts industry is not an MOI (*see Lug Nuts Redetermination*). Rudong has argued that the lug nut industry is an MOI; however, as discussed above, we have preliminarily determined the lug nut industry not to be market-oriented. Accordingly, we are not able to determine NV on the basis of Rudong's costs and prices, and have applied surrogate values to the factors of production to determine NV.

We calculated NV based on factors of production in accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act and section 353.52(c) of our regulations. We determined that India (1) is comparable to the PRC in terms of level of economic development, and (2) is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. Therefore, for this review, we have used publicly available information relating to India to value the various factors of production. (*See Memorandum to Laurie Parkhill from David Mueller,* dated March 15, 1996, ''Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China: Non-market Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' and *Memorandum to the File from Elisabeth Urfer,* dated June 14, 1996, ''India: Significant Production of Comparable Merchandise,'' which are on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).)

We valued the factors of production as follows:

- For steel wire rods, we used a per kilogram value obtained from the *Monthly Statistics of Foreign Trade of India* (*Indian Import Statistics*). Using wholesale price indices (WPI) obtained from the *International Financial Statistics,* published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), we adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the period of review (POR). We made further adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the supplier and Rudong.
- For chemicals used in the production and plating of lug nuts, we used per kilogram values obtained from the Indian publication *Chemical Weekly* and the *Indian Import Statistics.* We adjusted the *Indian Import Statistics* rates to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF. We made further adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the supplier and Rudong.
- For hydrochloric acid, we based the value on an Indian price quote used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Coumarin from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 66895, December 28, 1994) (*Coumarin*), because data in the *Indian Import Statistics* for hydrochloric acid has been found to be aberrational (*see Coumarin*). We adjusted the value used in *Coumarin* to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF.
- For direct labor, we used the labor rates reported in the Economic Intelligence Unit report *Investing, Licensing & Trading Conditions Abroad: India,* released November 1994. This source breaks out labor rates between skilled and unskilled labor for 1994 and provides information on the number of labor hours worked per week. We adjusted these rates to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF.
- For factory overhead, we used information reported in the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* for the Indian metals and chemicals industries. From this information, we were able to determine factory overhead as a percentage of the total cost of manufacture.
- For selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we used information obtained from the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* for the Indian metals and chemicals industries. We calculated an SG&A rate by dividing SG&A expenses by the cost of manufacture.
- To calculate a profit rate, we used information obtained from the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* for the Indian metals and chemicals industries. We calculated a profit rate by dividing the before-tax profit by the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A.
- For packing materials, we used per kilogram values obtained from the *Indian Import Statistics.* We adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF.
- To value electricity, we used the average price of electricity as of March 1995 published in the *Current Energy Scene in India.* We adjusted the value of electricity to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF.
- To value truck freight, we used the rates reported in an August 1993 cable from the U.S. Consulate in India submitted for the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China* (58 FR 48833, September 20, 1993). We adjusted the rates to reflect inflation through the POR using WPI published by the IMF.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions pursuant to section 353.60 of the Department's regulations at the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Jiangsu Rudong Grease-Gun Factory, also known as JiangSu Huanghai Auto Parts Share Co., Ltd.	09/01/94–08/31/95	20.11
China National Automotive Industry I/E Corp., Nantong Branch	09/01/94–08/31/95	44.99
PRC rate	09/01/94–08/31/95	44.99

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c)(6). Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b). 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 in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(c). 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. 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 U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and NV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC 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) for Rudong, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for Nantong, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the highest margin ever in the LTFV investigation or in this or prior administrative reviews; (3) for the companies named above which have not been found to have separate rates, China National, Jiangsu, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai Automobile, and Tianjin, as well as for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate; and (4) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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 (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: July 1, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17463 Filed 7–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–580–812]

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above from the Republic of Korea; 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 three respondents and one U.S. producer, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period of May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995. The review indicates that there are no dumping margins for either manufacturer/exporter during this period of review.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price and the normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments 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: July 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: 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) 482–3814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 May 10, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 27250) the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMS) from the Republic of Korea. On May 10, 1995, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of this antidumping duty order for the period of May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995 (60 FR 24831). We received timely requests for review from three manufacturers/exporters of subject merchandise to the United States: Hyundai Electronics Industries Co. (Hyundai), LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LGS, formerly Goldstar Electron Co., Ltd.), and Samsung Electronics Co. (Samsung). The petitioner, Micron Technologies Inc., requested an administrative review of these same three Korean manufacturers of DRAMS. On June 15, 1995, the Department initiated a review of the above Korean manufacturers (60 FR 31447). The period of review (POR) for all respondents was May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

In addition, on June 26, 1995, we automatically initiated an investigation to determine if Hyundai and LGS made sales of subject merchandise below the cost of production (COP) during the POR based upon the fact that we disregarded sales found to have been made below the COP in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, which was the most recent period for which a review had been completed.

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (Samsung), formerly a respondent in this administrative review, was excluded from the antidumping duty order on DRAMS from Korea on February 8, 1996. *See Final Court Decision and Partial Amended Final Determination: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit and Above From the Republic of Korea,* 61 FR 4765 (February 8, 1996). Accordingly, we terminated this review with respect to Samsung.