percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of subject merchandise from Canada, except from Timminco Limited (which was excluded from the order in the original investigation).

The Department also intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to collect a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties of 7.13 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from Canada, except from Timminco Limited (which was excluded from the order during the original investigation), entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of these reviews.

Parties to these proceedings may request disclosure of the calculation methodology and interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 355.38 (e).

Representatives of parties to the proceedings 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 proceedings, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR 355.38(c), are due. The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal briefs or at a hearing.

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 CFR 355.22.

Dated: March 12, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–7359 Filed 3–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–428–823, C–274–803, C–122–827, and C–307–814]

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations: Steel Wire Rod from Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 24, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy A. Malmrose (Germany), Vince Kane (Trinidad and Tobago), Robert Bolling (Canada) and Chris Cassel (Venezuela), Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–5414, 482–2815, 482–1386 and 482–4847, respectively.

Initiation of Investigations

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act effective January 1, 1995 (the Act).

The Petition

On February 26, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by Connecticut Steel Corp., Co-Steel Raritan, GS Industries, Inc., Keystone Steel & Wire Co., North Star Steel Texas, Inc. and Northwestern Steel and Wire Co. (the petitioners), six U.S. producers of wire rod. Supplements to the petitions were filed on March 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18, 1997.

In accordance with section 701(a) of the Act, petitioners allege that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of the subject merchandise in Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela receive countervailable subsidies.

The petitioners state that they have standing to file the petition because they are interested parties, as defined under section 771(9)(C) of the Act.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1)of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether the petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who account for production of the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. However, while both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition of domestic like product, they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.[1]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines domestic like product as ''a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation,'' *i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

The petition refers to the single domestic like product defined in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section, above. The Department has no basis on the record to find the petition's definition of the domestic like product clearly inaccurate. In this regard, we have found no basis on which to reject petitioners' representations that there are clear dividing lines, in terms of characteristics or uses, between the product under investigation on the one hand and, on the other hand, other carbon and alloy coiled steel products. The Department has, therefore, adopted the like product definition set forth in the petition. In this case, petitioners established industry support representing approximately 75 percent of the production of the domestic like product.

[1] See *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 642–44 (CIT 1988); *High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition,* 56 FR 32376, 32380–81 (July 16, 1991).

On March 12, 1997, the Department held consultations with representatives of the Government of Canada (GOC) and the Government of Quebec (GOQ) pursuant to 702(b)(4)(ii), during which they submitted certain information with respect to industry support for the petition (See March 18, 1997 memos to the file regarding these consultations and *Consultations* section, below). On March 13, 1997, Stelco Inc. (Stelco), a producer of wire rod in Canada, alleged that the petition covering imports from Canada did not contain information concerning support from domestic coiled bar producers. Stelco argued that domestic bar producers' support was necessary because petitioners' March 4, 1997, submission specifically included ''other coiled products known in the industry as 'bar.' '' Accordingly, Stelco argued that the Department should poll the industry in order to evaluate the question of industry support.

The Department has determined that the petition contained adequate evidence of sufficient industry support and that polling is therefore unnecessary. Petitioners established industry support representing approximately 75 percent of the production of the domestic like product, which percentage includes the coiled bar. The GOC, GOQ and Stelco did not allege and have not demonstrated that coiled bar is a separate domestic like product requiring a separate determination as to industry support. Further, we note that both the American Iron and Steel Institute and HTSUS statistics treat coiled bars and coiled rods as one category. Because it is reasonable to find a single domestic like product for purposes of evaluating industry support in these circumstances, petitioners are well within the statutory requirements for industry support—both among all producers and among producers expressing an opinion—for the single like product covered by the petition. Finally, the Department notes that the inclusion or exclusion in industry support calculations of ''tire cord'' wire rod—which is excluded from the scope of these proceedings—does not materially affect petitioners' approximate support level of 75 percent (see Antidumping Initiation Checklist, dated March 18, 1997, and found in the official file in Room B–099). Accordingly, the Department determines that the petition is filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

Injury Test

Because Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela are ''Subsidies Agreement Countries'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, Title VII of the Act applies to this investigation. Accordingly, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Consultations

Pursuant to Section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department invited representatives of the relevant foreign governments for consultations with respect to the petitions filed. On March 12, 13 and 17, consultations were held with representatives from Canada; Trinidad and Tobago; and the European Commission (EC) and Germany, respectively. On March 14 and 17, 1997, we received submissions from the GOQ and the GOC.

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by these investigations are certain hot-rolled carbon steel and alloy steel products, in coils, of approximately round cross section, between 5.00 mm (0.20 inch) and 19.0 mm (0.75 inch), inclusive, in solid cross-sectional diameter. Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) Stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; (e) free machining steel that contains by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.4 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, and/or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium; or (f) concrete reinforcing bars and rods.

The following products are also excluded from the scope of these investigations:

- Coiled products 5.50 mm or less in true diameter with an average partial decarburization per coil of no more than 70 microns in depth, no inclusions greater than 20 microns, containing by weight the following: Carbon greater than or equal to 0.68 percent; aluminum less than or equal to 0.005 percent; phosphorous plus sulfur less than or equal to 0.040 percent; maximum combined copper, nickel and chromium content of 0.13 percent; and nitrogen less than or equal to 0.006 percent. This product is commonly referred to as ''Tire Cord Wire Rod.''
- Coiled products 7.9 to 18 mm in diameter, with a partial decarburization of 75 microns or less in depth and seams no more than 75 microns in depth; containing 0.48 to 0.73 percent carbon by weight. This product is commonly referred to as ''Valve Spring Quality Wire Rod.''

The products under investigation are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3000, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, and 7227.90.6050 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

Allegation of Subsidies

Section 702(b) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a countervailing duty proceeding whenever an interested party files a petition, on behalf of an industry, that (1) alleges the elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a), and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to petitioners supporting the allegations.

Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations

The Department has examined the petitions on wire rod from Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela and found that it complies with the requirements of section 702(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b) of the Act, we are initiating countervailing duty investigations to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of wire rod from these countries receive subsidies.

A. Germany

Petitioners have made specific subsidy allegations with respect to two German wire rod producers: Saarstahl and Hamburger Stahlwerke (HSW). We are including in our investigation the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided subsidies to producers of the subject merchandise in Germany:

1. *Saarstahl Debt Forgiveness*
2. *Assumption of Saarstahl's Guaranteed Debt*
3. *Saarstahl's Private Bank Debt Forgiveness/Assurances of Liquidity Provided to Private Banks*
4. *Post-Bankuptcy Assistance to Saarstahl*
5. *Worker Assistance under Article 56 of the European Coal and Steel Community*
6. *1984 Assistance to HSW*
7. *1984 State Aid to HSW*

8. *1984 Loan Guarantee to HSW*
9. *1994 Assistance to HSW*

We note that the EC has ordered repayment of the 1994 assistance to HSW. Consultations with representatives of the EC indicate that the assistance is being repaid, regardless of the fact that the EC decision is under appeal. We intend to look into this possibility.

Petitioners allege that Saarstahl was uncreditworthy from 1986 to present, and in prior years if the Department should deem such years relevant. However, petitioners only allege non-recurring countervailable subsidies in 1989 and 1993–1996. Therefore, we will only examine Saarstahl's creditworthiness in these years.

Petitioners also allege that Saarstahl was unequityworthy from 1986 to present, and in prior years if the Department should deem such years relevant. However, petitioners provide no information that Saarstahl received equity infusions in the relevant years. Therefore, we will not examine Saarstahl's equityworthiness in our investigation.

Petitioners allege that HSW was uncreditworthy and unequityworthy from 1984 to 1994. However, petitioners only allege non-recurring countervailable subsidies in 1984 and 1994. For those years in which non-recurring subsidies were not alleged we will not examine HSW's creditworthiness and equityworthiness.

B. Trinidad and Tobago

We are including in our investigation the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided subsidies to producers of the subject merchandise in Trinidad and Tobago:

1. *Government Equity Infusions in the Iron and Steel Corporation of Trinidad and Tobago (ISCOTT) over the Period 1983 though 1990 for Investment in Plant, Loss Coverage, Debt Service, or Other Purposes*
2. *Ongoing Government Support of ISCOTT from 1989–1994*

During this period ISCOTT's assets were leased by a private company, Caribbean Ispat, Ltd. (Ispat). Information provided by petitioners indicates that the government of Trinidad and Tobago assumed the debt incurred by ISCOTT prior to the lease. We intend to investigate the assumption of debt and any other ongoing support to the production of wire rod during the leasing period.

3. *Preferential Natural Gas Prices*
4. *Preferential Electricity Rates*
5. *Loan Guarantee from the Trinidad and Tobago Electric Commission*
6. *Preferential Terms for the Point Lisas Lease*
7. *Tax Credits for Exports*
8. *Export Promotion Allowance for Tax Purposes*
9. *Corporate Tax Exemption under the Fiscal Incentives Act*
10. *Import Duty Concessions under Section 56 of the Customs Act*

Petitioners have alleged that ISCOTT was uncreditworthy and unequityworthy during the years 1980–1995. We are not investigating creditworthiness or equityworthiness in the years prior to 1983. In *Carbon Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order* (49 FR 480, January 4, 1984) (1984 final), we determined that investments in, and loans to the company were on terms consistent with commercial considerations. Petitioners have not provided any new evidence to lead us to change our previous determination. With respect to the period 1983 to 1990, we will investigate whether ISCOTT was creditworthy or equityworthy during the years in which petitioners have alleged non-recurring countervailable subsidies.

We are not including in our investigation the following programs alleged to be benefitting the production of the subject merchandise in Trinidad and Tobago:

1. ISCOTT's Rent-Free Use of a Dock Facility

In 1984, the Department determined that ISCOTT's rent-free use of a dock facility was countervailable. Press reports filed with the petition indicate that Ispat has been paying a rental fee for this facility. (See petition Exhibit 9 B–7.) Petitioners assume that this rental fee is preferential but offer no support for their assumption. Therefore, we are not including this program in our investigation.

2. Exemption From the Value Added Tax (VAT)

Petitioners allege that companies exporting at least 80 percent of production may receive an exemption from the VAT on manufacturing inputs. Because exemptions from VAT or rebates of VAT paid on inputs used to produce for export are regarded as permissible, we are not including this program in our investigation.

3. Trinidad and Tobago Free Trade Zones

The petition documents the existence of free trade zones in Trinidad and Tobago established under the Free Trade Zones (Amendment) Act of 1995. Certain of the benefits available to companies within the zones appear to be countervailable. However, as described in the petition, Ispat's plant is adjacent to, and not within, the designated free zone; therefore petitioners have not demonstrated that it is eligible for these benefits.

C. Canada

Petitioners have made specific subsidy allegations with respect to only one Canadian wire rod producer: Sidbec-Dosco, Inc. We are including in our investigation the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided subsidies to producers of the subject merchandise in Canada:

1. *1982 Assistance to Sidbec-Dosco*
2. *Assistance to Reduce Sidbec-Dosco's Accumulated Deficit during the period 1984 to 1986*
3. *Sidbec-Dosco Debt-to-Equity Conversion in 1987*
4. *Sidbec Dosco Debt-to-Equity Conversion in 1988*
5. *1987 Grant to Sidbec-Dosco*

Petitioners allege that Sidbec-Dosco was uncreditworthy during the years 1977–1988. We will investigate the creditworthiness of Sidbec-Dosco in 1982 and 1984–1988. These are the years in which we will be investigating the receipt of non-recurring subsidies.

We are not including in our investigation at this time the following program alleged to be benefitting producers of the subject merchandise in Canada:

Assistance Prior to 1982

Petitioners allege that Sidbec-Dosco received some form of assistance prior to 1982. In addition, petitioners allege that Sidbec-Dosco was uncreditworthy and unequityworthy during this period. Although we found sufficient evidence to investigate whether Sidbec-Dosco was subsidized in 1982 (see the program listed under item (1) above), for assistance which may have been provided earlier, petitioners only cite to a 1982 news article which states that Sidbec-Dosco had been provided a certain amount of funds from either the GOC or GOQ since Sidbec-Dosco's inception. Sidbec-Dosco was founded in 1964, and petitioners provided no evidence or indication of when during the 1964 to 1982 period these other funds may have been provided to the company. In particular, petitioners provided no evidence that any of these funds—whatever their precise nature might be—were provided to Sidbec-Dosco during or after 1977, *i.e.*, the allocation period captured by petitioners' allegation of a company-

specific 20 years average useful life of assets for Sidbec-Dosco. Consequently, we do not have sufficient information to initiate an investigation of a specific program based on this allegation of assistance.

D. Venezuela

We are including in our investigation the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided subsidies to producers of the subject merchandise in Venezuela:

1. *Government Equity Infusions in SIDOR in 1977, 1978, 1981, 1982 and 1983*
2. *Government Conversion of SIDOR's Debt to Equity in 1981, 1986, 1989 and 1992*
3. *Government Guarantees of SIDOR's Private Debt in 1987 and 1988*
4. *1990 Government Loan to SIDOR*
5. *Government Provision of Iron Ore for less than Adequate Remuneration*
6. *Preferential Tax Incentives Under Decree 1477*

Petitioners also allege that SIDOR was uncreditworthy in the following years: 1977, 1978, 1981–1983, 1986–1990 and 1992. We will investigate SIDOR's creditworthiness in each of these years because these are the years in which we will be investigating either government equity infusions, loans or loan guarantees.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act, copies of the public version of the petitions have been provided to the representatives of Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela. We will attempt to provide copies of the public version of the petitions to all the exporters named in the petition.

ITC Notification

Pursuant to section 702(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of these initiations.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by April 14, 1997, whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of imports from Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, Canada and Venezuela of wire rod. Any ITC determination which is negative will result in the investigations being terminated; otherwise, the investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to Section 702(c)(2) of the Act.

Dated: March 18, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–7356 Filed 3–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

March 19, 1997.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) (44 U.S.C. 3508(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirement on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Corporation for National and Community Service is soliciting comments concerning its proposed Evaluation Information System (EIS) Form for Learn and Serve America: School and Community-Based Programs.

Copies of the information collection requests can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the address section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses section on or before May 19, 1997. The Corporation for National and Community Service is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Corporation, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Learn and Serve America, Attn: Brad Lewis, Program Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, 1201 New York Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20525.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brad Lewis, (202) 606–5000, ext. 113.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Office of Evaluation has engaged Brandeis University and Abt Associates to do qualitative evaluations on Learn and Serve America: School and Community-based Programs. Additional information regarding quantitative descriptive data on programs needs to be sought to provide a complete overview of program success.

II. Current Action

The Office of Evaluation plans to distribute, through the mail, the Evaluation Information System (EIS) forms to recipients of Learn and Serve America: School and Community-Based grants. The EIS forms will collect grantee and sub-grantee information for the purpose of maintaining records and disseminating grant/program information to several audiences. The Corporation for National and Community Service seeks approval of a new form to evaluate the impact of the program on student participants.

Type of Review: New.

Agency: Corporation for National and Community Service.

Title: Evaluation Information System Form.

OMB Number: None.

Agency Number: None.

Affected Public: Grantees and sub-grantee recipients only.

Total Respondents: 200.

Frequency: Annual.

Average Time Per Response: 1 hour.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 200 hrs.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): 0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): 0.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.