

indicate that these loans are at noncommercial rates, or otherwise provide a benefit to producers of subject merchandise. Of the loans identified by petitioners, one loan appears to have been on preferential terms to a producer of subject merchandise. However, that loan was provided under law 46, which we have included in this investigation. Therefore, we are not initiating on this allegation regarding "other government loans."

5. Government Loan Guarantees: Petitioners allege that several third party loan guarantees listed in the producers' annual reports are likely to have been provided by the government at preferential rates. Petitioners claim that these guarantees may be the same, or similar to, loan guarantees countervailed by the Department in *Certain Steel*.

The Department countervailed government loan guarantees provided by IRI and Finsider in *Certain Steel* based on BIA. However, in *Electrical Steel*, these loan guarantees were found to have been provided only by Finsider, not IRI. Since Finsider was in liquidation, and therefore could not have paid the loan even if required to, the Department found that these loan guarantees provided no benefit.

Petitioners have not provided any information that indicates that the guarantees listed in the company's annual reports are provided by the government at preferential rates, nor have they provided any information demonstrating that these guarantees, if provided by the government, were done so on a specific basis. Therefore, we are not initiating on these loan guarantees.

6. Bolzano/Trentino-Alto Adige Law 9/91: Petitioners allege that Law 9/91, which provides easy term loans to stimulate local economic activity, provides countervailable benefits to producers of subject merchandise. Loans under this law are available to companies in tourism, agriculture, crafts and services. Petitioners have not shown that producers of subject merchandise would be eligible for benefits under this provision. Moreover, they have not provided sufficient information to indicate that Law 9/91 would be specific. Therefore, we are not initiating on this program.

7. Trentino-Alto Adige Law 8/95: Petitioners allege that the region of Trentino-Alto Adige provides various incentives under Law 8/95 to promote local industry, commerce, services, crafts and tourism. However, they have not provided sufficient information to indicate that the incentives provided under this law are specific. Therefore,

we are not initiating on Law 8/95 of the region of Trentino-Alto Adige.

8. Veneto Law 39/87: Petitioners allege that Law 39/87 of the Veneto region provides countervailable benefits to producers of subject merchandise. This law establishes a registry for financial assistance in the province. Based on the information contained in the petition, this law seems to be simply an administrative measure that requires companies to register with the province before applying for assistance. Petitioners have provided no basis to believe that Law 39/87 provide any benefits; therefore, we are not initiating on this program.

9. Veneto Law 16/93: Petitioners allege that Law 16/93 of the Veneto region provides countervailable benefits to producers of subject merchandise. This law established various initiatives designed to promote the economic and social development of Veneto's eastern region. However, based on evidence in the petition, Valbruna, the only producer of subject merchandise located in the Veneto Region, is not located in the eastern portion of the region and there is no indication that other parts of the region are eligible for benefits. As no producers of subject merchandise appear eligible for benefits under this law, we are not initiating on this program.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act and section 351.203(c)(2) of the Department's regulations, copies of the public version of the petition have been provided to the representatives of the GOI and the EC. We will attempt to provide copies of the public version of the petition to all the exporters named in the petition.

ITC Notification

Pursuant to section 702(d) of the Act and section 351.203(c)(1) of the Department's regulations, we have notified the ITC of this initiation.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by September 15, 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 Italy of SSWR. Any ITC determination which is negative will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 702(c)(2) of the Act and section

351.203(c)(1) of the Department's Regulations.

Dated: August 19, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-22687 Filed 8-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of New Mexico 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: 97-043. *Applicant:* University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-6041. *Instrument:* X-Ray Photoelectron Spectrometer, Model AXIS HSi. *Manufacturer:* Kratos Analytical, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 32766, June 17, 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, was being manufactured in the United States at the time of purchase (December 19, 1996).

Reasons: The foreign instrument provides magnetic charge equalization for uniform charge compensation across the sample surface. The U.S. Department of Energy advises that (1) this capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use at the time of purchase.

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. 97-22691 Filed 8-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P