would help improve the refinery's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is August 28, 1995. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to September 11, 1995).

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

U.S. Department of Commerce District Office, Room 3718, Federal Office Building, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: June 19, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–15608 Filed 6–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–588–707]

Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On January 30, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its 1992–93 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin from Japan (60 FR 5622). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter. The review period is August 1, 1992, through July 31, 1993. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received we have changed the margin calculation. The final margin for Daikin Industries (Daikin) is listed below in the section ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 27, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle or Michael Rill, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 30, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its 1992–93 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular PTFE resin from Japan. There was no request for a hearing. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Applicable Statutes and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statutes and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of the Review

The antidumping duty order covers granular PTFE resins, filled or unfilled. The order explicitly excludes PTFE dispersions in water and PTFE fine powders. During the period covered by this review, such merchandise was classified under item number 3904.61.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). We are providing this HTS number for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description of scope remains dispositive.

The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of granular PTFE resin, Daikin. The review period is August 1, 1992, through July 31, 1993.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received a case brief from petitioner, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company (Du Pont), and case and rebuttal briefs from Daikin.

Issues Raised by Du Pont

Comment 1: Du Pont argues that, although the Department determined that Daikin's U.S. sales included both purchase price and exporter's sales price (ESP) transactions, the Department should treat all of Daikin's U.S. sales as ESP transactions. Du Pont claims that Daikin's wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary, Daikin America, Inc. (DAI), is actively involved in all critical aspects of Daikin's U.S. sales process. Du Pont claims that DAI has become a full-fledged sales, marketing and technical services organization, and that DAI now runs Daikin's PTFE business in the United States. Du Pont claims that DAI's activities and responsibilities go beyond the more limited ''paper pusher'' role of a related party in purchase price transactions.

Daikin argues that the Department correctly determined that some of Daikin's U.S. sales were purchase price sales, and that the facts surrounding Daikin's purchase price sales are easily distinguishable from those sales treated as ESP transactions. Daikin argues that, as in the first review, the Department applied its three-prong test for determining whether a transaction should be treated as a purchase price or as an ESP sale. Daikin notes that, as in the first review, the Department determined that sales meeting the criteria set forth in the test were properly treated as purchase price sales. *See Granular Polyvtetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 50343 (September 27, 1993) (*PTFE I*).

DOC Position: We agree with Daikin. In reaching our preliminary results of review, we examined DAI's role to determine whether Daikin's sales were purchase price or ESP. *See Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 5622 (January 30, 1995). We applied a three-part test, as outlined in the preliminary results, and in *PTFE I*, 58 FR at 50344. For certain sales, DAI merely facilitated the sales process, which was handled directly by Daikin in Japan. Daikin controlled pricing and selling decisions, while DAI acted as a communication link between Daikin and unrelated commission agents responsible for making sales. There is no evidence that would indicate that DAI performed more than routine selling functions with regard to these sales, which we therefore continue to regard as purchase price transactions.

For other sales we found that DAI had inventoried the subject merchandise in warehouses in the United States based upon anticipated demand.

We determined that these sales were ESP sales, which Daikin has not challenged.

Comment 2: Du Pont claims that the Department failed to include several

ESP sales in the preliminary results. The Department analyzed ESP transactions with entry dates that fell within the period of review (POR). Du Pont argues that the Department's established policy is to analyze ESP sales by date of sale rather than date of entry, because ESP sales frequently enter the United States prior to the actual date of sale. Du Pont argues that the Department should revise its calculations to analyze ESP sales by sale date instead of entry date.

Daikin agrees that the Department's calculations should be revised in order to capture all ESP transactions with sale dates during the POR.

DOC Position: We agree. We erroneously analyzed ESP sales by entry date rather than sale date, as is our established practice. We have revised the calculations for these final results.

Issue Raised by Daikin

Comment 3: Daikin argues that the Department should reduce the quantity sold on U.S. sales by the quantity of returned merchandise in order to account for losses incurred by Daikin for the replacement of defective merchandise, which, Daikin stated, cannot be resold. Daikin notes that, according to the Department's analysis memorandum, the Department intended to adjust the quantity sold by the quantity of returned merchandise.

Antidumping Duty Order on Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Japan—Analysis Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Second Review of Daikin Industries (December 2, 1994) (Analysis Memorandum).

Daikin states that such an adjustment is necessary in order to avoid double counting the costs and expenses associated with returned merchandise, because all expenses related to returns are reported under separate variables and are already incorporated in the margin calculation. According to Daikin, failure to make the adjustment would result in the same merchandise contributing a second time to an increase in dumping duties when the Department calculates duties for the returned quantity. Furthermore, Daikin argues that the Department routinely adjusts for returns by deducting the amount returned from the original transaction.

DOC Position: We agree with Daikin. We intended to adjust the quantity of U.S. sales by deducting the quantity of returned defective merchandise. *Analysis Memorandum* at 2. The returned merchandise can be tied to the related sale by invoice number. We made a similar adjustment for returns associated with home market sales. We have revised our calculations for these final results to adjust U.S. sales quantities to account for returns.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of the comments received, we have revised our preliminary results and determine that the following margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Daikin Industries	08/01/92–07/31/93.	23.33

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for Daikin will be the rate shown above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 91.74 percent, the ''all others'' rate from the LTFV investigation, for the reasons explained in *PTFE I*

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final 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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOS) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). 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.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: June 21, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–15610 Filed 6–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Beckman Research Institute et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated 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.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 95–001. *Applicant:* Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope, Duarte, CA 91010. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model MAT 900. *Manufacturer:* Finnigan MAT, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 5166, January 26, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) capability of switching modes between scans based on results of the previous scan, (2) magnetic sector operations and (3) high sensitivity with electrospray. *Advice Received From:* National Institutes of Health, April 25, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–002. *Applicant:* Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, La Verne, CA 91750. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model Autospec. *Manufacturer:* Fisons, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 7168, February 7, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides