The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for the companies named above that have separate rates and were reviewed (Premier, Guizhou, Henan, Jilin, Luoyang, Shanghai, Liaoning, Chin Jun, and Wafangdian), the cash deposit rates will be the rates for these firms established in the final results of the 1992–93 administrative review, except that when margins are *de minimis, i.e.,* less than 0.5 percent, no cash deposit will be required; (2) for Hubei and Guizhou Automotive, both of which we determine to be entitled to separate rates, the rates will continue be those that currently apply to these companies (8.83 percent for both); (3) for all remaining PRC exporters, all of which were found not to be entitled to separate rates, the cash deposit will be 8.83 percent; and (4) for other 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 requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 C.F.R. 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to APOs of their responsibility concerning disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 C.F.R 353.22.

Dated: December 5, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–31589 Filed 12–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–791–001]

Ferrochrome From South Africa: Preliminary Results of the 1992 Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of 1992 Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting the 1992 administrative review of the countervailing duty order on ferrochrome from South Africa. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 0.27 percent ad valorem, which is de minimis, for all companies for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries without regard to countervailing duties. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit an 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: December 13, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Thirumalai, Office 1, Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4087.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 9, 1981, the Department published in the Federal Register (55 FR 11417) the countervailing duty order on Ferrochrome from South Africa. On March 12, 1993, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (58 FR 13583) of this countervailing duty order. We received timely requests for review from Chromecorp Technology (Pty) Ltd. (Chromecorp), Consolidated Metallurgical Industries Ltd. (CMI), Ferralloys Limited (Ferralloys), and Samancor Ltd. (Samancor), all South African producers/exporters of ferrochrome.

We initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992, on May 6, 1993 (58 FR 26960). This review covers three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise (CMI, Ferralloys, and Samancor), which account for all exports of the subject merchandise to the United States from South Africa, and the following eight programs:

(1) Export Incentive Program
(2) Regional Industrial Development Incentives
(3) Preferential Rail Rates
(4) Government Loan Guarantees
(5) Beneficiation Allowances—Electric Power Cost Aid Scheme
(6) General Export Incentive Scheme
(7) Industrial Development Corporation Loans
(8) Rail Transport Rebate on Outgoing Goods (subprogram of the Regional Industrial Development Incentives)

One company, Chromecorp, reported having no exports to the United States during the review period, although Chromecorp received benefits pursuant to export subsidy programs for which there was no program-wide measurable change. In cases where a company does not ship to the United States but benefits from export subsidies for which there are not measurable program-wide changes, we do not include the company in the review (see, *e.g., Certain Electrical Conductor Aluminum Redraw Rod From Venezuela; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,* 57 FR 41918, September 14, 1992). Therefore, we have not included Chromecorp in this 1992 review.

Applicable Statute

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994. However, references to the Department's *Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* (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 60 FR 80, January 3, 1995.)

Scope of Review

The imported product covered by this review is ferrochrome from South Africa which is currently classifiable under items 7202.41.00, 7202.49.10 and 7202.49.50 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, but our written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

Analysis of Programs

I. Export Incentive Program

The Export Incentive Program (EIP) provides assistance to exporters through a number of different subprograms. Because the availability of this program is limited to exporters, the Department previously determined that the benefits available under this program constitute bounties or grants within the meaning of the Act. See, *Ferrochrome From South Africa; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (58 FR 59988, November 12, 1993) (1991 Ferrochrome Preliminary Results); *Ferrochrome from South Africa; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (60 FR 7043, February 6, 1995) (1991 Ferrochrome Final Results). In this review, neither the Government of South Africa nor the respondents provided new information which would warrant reconsideration of this determination.

Category A of the EIP

Category A of the EIP allowed exporters to claim a rebate of 50 percent of the import duties applicable to inputs used in the production of goods for export. Exporters could claim this rebate regardless of whether the inputs were actually imported or obtained domestically. Additionally, Category A benefits were independent of normal duty drawback which operated under section 4703 of the Customs and Excise program.

Although the Category A program was terminated on March 30, 1990, two companies received residual benefits under Category A during the review period. These benefits resulted from the Department of Trade and Industry's practice of using promissory notes to pay claims. The companies had received promissory notes pursuant to claims filed in an earlier period, but the notes either matured or were discounted by the company during the review period. Therefore, consistent with the Department's practice of recognizing the occurrence of the benefit at the time that the benefit has a cash-flow effect on the recipient (see section 355.48(a) of the *Proposed Regulations*), we determine that promissory notes which either matured or were discounted during the review period constitute a bounty or grant within the meaning of the Act.

Two companies reported receiving benefits under Category A of the EIP; both claimed that the benefits were tied to exports to countries other than the United States. In each case, the company calculated its full, potential Category A claim applicable to all exports, and then multiplied this amount by the percentage of exports to countries other than the United States.

The Electrical Power Cost Aid Scheme (EPCAS), a program providing rebates of electricity costs looked at in previous reviews, is similar to the Category A program in that benefits are not directly linked to sales to particular markets but, instead, are allocated. However, claims for rebates under the EPCAS program are required by the GOSA to be externally audited. There is no comparable auditing procedure for Category A. Since Category A benefits must be allocated in some fashion, we find that, in the absence of government oversight, we cannot be assured that the benefits claimed are tied, in fact, to markets other than the United States. Therefore, we find that benefits received pursuant to Category A benefit all export sales.

To calculate the benefit, we divided the total amount of the value at maturity, or the discounted price of the promissory notes, by the recipient companies' total exports of all products to all markets during the review period. We then weight-averaged the resulting rate by each company's share of exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the review period. On this basis, we preliminarily determine the benefits from Category A promissory notes to be 0.27 percent ad valorem for all companies.

Category D of the EIP

Category D of the EIP provided exporters an additional tax deduction for marketing expenses related to export sales. Based on export performance, an exporter could deduct from taxable income an additional 75 or 100 percent of export marketing expenses, in addition to the deductions normally allowed.

Section 355.44 (i)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations* states that the countervailable benefit conferred by a tax program is the amount of additional taxes a company would have paid absent the use of the program. All of the responding companies either did not file a tax return during the review period or experienced operating losses and were not, therefore, in a taxable position before taking into account the Category D deductions. Since the tax liability of each company during the review period was unchanged by the Category D deductions, we preliminary find that no company received benefits pursuant to Category D of the EIP (see *Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, (60 FR 44843, 44847 August 29, 1995) and *Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 29534, 29536, June 11, 1996).

II. Regional Industrial Development Incentives

The Government of South Africa offered several incentives to companies located in geographically remote areas designated as Industrial Development Points. These incentives were: the Labor Incentive, the Interest Concession and the Subsidy on Housing for Key Personnel.

We determined in our previous review of this order that, as regional subsidies, these incentives constitute bounties or grants within the meaning of the Act. (See *1991 Ferrochrome Preliminary Results; 1991 Ferrochrome Final Results.*) In this review, neither the Government of South Africa nor the respondents have provided new information which would warrant reconsideration of this determination.

Labor Incentive and Interest Concession

No ferrochrome exporter under review claimed to have received benefits pursuant to the Labor Incentive or the Interest Concession during the review period. (See *Programs Not Used* section below.)

Subsidy on Housing for Key Personnel

The Regional Industrial Development Authorities subsidize housing for key personnel at regional development points for a maximum of 20 years on new mortgage loans and the outstanding principal of existing loans. Companies pay an interest rate that is a fixed amount (*e.g.*, 4.25% per annum) less than the Official Building Society rate, subject to a floor of 6.00% per annum. The Regional Industrial Development Authorities pay the difference between the interest paid by the companies and

the Official Building Society rate monthly.

As stated above, one company reported having loans under this program. Because the loans received under this program were long-term variable rate loans, we calculated the interest differential in accordance with section 355.49(d)(1) of the Department's *Proposed Regulations*. Consistent with our methodology in *Ferrochrome From South Africa; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (61 FR 19259, May 1, 1996) (1994 Ferrochrome Preliminary Results), and in accordance with section 355.44(b)(5) of the *Proposed Regulations*, we used as our benchmark rate the Official Building Society Rate, as reported in the questionnaire response. To calculate the benefit, we compared the amount of interest which was actually paid during the review period to the interest which would have been paid at the benchmark rate. To the extent that the interest actually paid was less than that calculated using the benchmark rate, we took this amount and divided it by the company's total sales of all merchandise during the review period. We then weight-averaged the resulting rate by the company's share of exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the review period. Based on the above, we preliminarily determine the ad valorem subsidy rate for benefits received pursuant to this program to be 0.003 percent ad valorem for all companies.

III. Programs Not Used

We also examined the following seven programs and preliminarily determine that producers/exporters of ferrochrome to the United States did not use them during the review period:

(1) Industrial Development Corporation Loans
(2) Export Incentive Program
  (a) Category B
  (b) Category C
(3) Regional Industrial Development Incentives
  (a) Labor Incentive
  (b) Interest Concession
(4) Preferential Rail Rates
(5) Government Loan Guarantees
(6) Beneficiation Allowances—Electric Power Cost Aid Scheme
(7) General Export Incentive Scheme
(8) Rail Transport Rebate on Outgoing Goods (subprogram of the Regional Industrial Development Incentives)

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 0.27 percent ad valorem, which is de minimis, for all companies for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992. If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, we intend to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of subject merchandise exported on or after January 1, 1992 and entered on or before December 31, 1992. Because the countervailing duty order was revoked effective January 1, 1995 (see Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders (60 FR 40568, August 9, 1995)) pursuant to section 753 of the Act, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, no other instructions will be sent to the U.S. Customs Service.

Parties to this 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 of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case briefs. 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 CFR 355.38(e).

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 are due under 19 CFR 355.38(c).

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: November 25, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–31727 Filed 12–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Consolidation and Amendment of Export Visa Requirements to Include the Electronic Visa Information System for Certain Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Singapore

December 9, 1996.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs consolidating and amending visa requirements.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet Heinzen, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

In an exchange of notes dated November 8, 1996 and November 26, 1996, the Governments of the United States and Singapore agreed to amend the existing visa arrangement for textile products, produced or manufactured in Singapore and exported on and after January 1, 1997. The amended arrangement consolidates existing and new provisions of the export visa arrangement, including provisions for the Electronic Visa Information System (ELVIS). In addition to the ELVIS requirements, shipments will continue to be accompanied by an original visa stamped on the front of the original commercial invoice issued by the Government of the Republic of Singapore.

In the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to amend the existing visa requirements for textile products produced or manufactured in Singapore and exported on and after January 1, 1997.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see Federal Register notice 60 FR 65299, published on December 19, 1995). Also see 47 FR 6683, published on February 16, 1982; and 60 FR 56576, published on November 9, 1995. Information