

Dated: March 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-8769 Filed 4-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Arizona; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 96-129. *Applicant:* University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. *Instrument:* Surface Forces Apparatus, Model Mark 4. *Manufacturer:* Australian National University, Australia. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 4032, January 28, 1997.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides measurement of the forces between two surfaces in vapor or liquid with a sensitivity of 10 nN and a distance resolution of about 0.1 nm with a positioning accuracy to 50 nm. This capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97-8768 Filed 4-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-401-401]

Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On December 3, 1996, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 (61 FR 64062; December 3, 1996). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. For information on the net subsidy for the reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest or Lorenza Olivas, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(a), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers SSAB Svenskt Stal AB ("SSAB"), the sole known producer/exporter of the subject merchandise during the review period. This review also covers the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, and 10 programs.

We published the preliminary results on December 3, 1996 (61 FR 64062). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments from any of the parties.

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 ("URAA") effective January 1, 1995 ("the Act"). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain carbon steel

products from Sweden. These products include cold-rolled carbon steel, flat-rolled products, whether or not corrugated, or crimped; whether or not pickled, not cut, not pressed and not stamped to non-rectangular shape; not coated or pleated with metal and not clad; over 12 inches in width and of any thickness; whether or not in coils. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7209.11.0000, 7209.12.0000, 7209.13.0000, 7209.21.0000, 7209.22.0000, 7209.23.0000, 7209.24.5000, 7209.31.0000, 7209.32.0000, 7209.33.0000, 7209.34.0000, 7209.41.0000, 7209.43.0000, 7209.44.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7211.30.5000, 7211.41.7000 and 7211.49.5000. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Allocation Methodology

In the past, the Department has relied upon information from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service on the industry-specific average useful life ("AUL") of assets in determining the allocation period for nonrecurring grant benefits. See General Issues Appendix appended to Final Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products from Austria, 58 FR 37217, 37226 (July 9, 1993) ("General Issues Appendix"). However, in *British Steel plc. v. United States*, 879 F. Supp. 1254 (CIT 1995) ("*British Steel*"), the U.S. Court of International Trade ("the Court") ruled against this allocation methodology. In accordance with the Court's remand order, the Department calculated a company-specific allocation period for nonrecurring subsidies based on the AUL of non-renewable physical assets. This remand determination was affirmed by the Court on June 4, 1996. *British Steel*, 929 F. Supp. 426, 439 (CIT 1996).

The Department has decided to acquiesce to the Court's decision and, as such, we intend to determine the allocation period for nonrecurring subsidies using company-specific AUL data where reasonable and practicable. In the preliminary results (61 FR 64062), the Department preliminarily determined that it is reasonable and practicable to allocate all new nonrecurring subsidies (*i.e.*, subsidies that have not yet been assigned an allocation period) based on a company-specific AUL. However, if a subsidy has already been countervailed based on an allocation period established in an earlier segment of the proceeding, it does not appear reasonable or