transportation expenses in calculating the total profit in the last review.

Final Results of Review

Based on our analysis of comments received, and the correction of clerical errors, we have determined that a final margin of 24.27 percent exists for Onoda for the period May 1, 1992, through April 30, 1993.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV 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the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Onoda will be 24.27; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the rate published in the most recent final results or determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, earlier reviews, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review, earlier reviews, or the original investigation, whichever is the most recent; and (4) the ''all others'' rate, as established in the original investigation, will be 70.23 percent.

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

This notice also 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). Timely written notification of 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 Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 11, 1995.

Paul L. Joffe,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 95–20929 Filed 8–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–588–028]

Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 23, 1995.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the American Chain Association, the petitioner in this proceeding, the Department of Commerce has conducted an administrative review of the antidumping finding on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. This review, which covers four manufacturers/exporters of this merchandise to the United States and the period April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, indicates the existence of dumping margins. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Berg or Gregory Thompson, Office of Antidumping Investigation, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0114 or 482–3003, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statue and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22).

Background

On October 7, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 52264) the final results of its last administrative review of the antidumping finding on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan (38 FR 9226; April 12, 1973). In April 1993, the petitioner requested that we conduct an administrative review for the period April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1). We published a notice of initiation of review on May 27, 1993 (58 FR 30769).

On August 9, 1993, the Department issued an antidumping questionnaire to the following six companies: Daido Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Daido), Enuma Chain Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Enuma), Hitachi Metals Techno Ltd. (Hitachi), Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Izumi), Pulton Chain Co., Ltd. (Pulton), and R.K. Excel (Excel). Of those six companies, Excel and Izumi submitted their responses on September 24, 1993. Hitachi and Pulton asserted that they had no sales during this period of review (POR). Although Daido and Enuma were included when the Department published a notice of initiation for this review, the administrative reviews of Daido and Enuma are being conducted separately and their preliminary results will be published in a later notice.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. The term ''roller chain, other than bicycle,'' as used in this review includes chain, with or without attachments, whether or not plated or coated, and whether or not manufactured to American or British standards, which is used for power transmission and/or conveyance. Such chain consists of a series of alternately-assembled roller links and pin links in which the pins articulate inside the bushings and the rollers are free to turn on the bushings. Pins and bushings are press fit in their respective link plates. Chain may be single strand, having one row of roller links, or multiple strand, having more than one row of roller links. The center plates are located between the strands of roller links. Such chain may be either single or double pitch and may be used as power transmission or conveyer chain.

This review also covers leaf chain, which consists of a series of link plates alternately assembled with pins in such a way that the joint is free to articulate between adjoining pitches. This review further covers chain model numbers 25 and 35. Roller chain is currently

classified under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) subheadings 7315.11.00 through 7619.90.00. HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Fair Value Comparisons

We compared the United States price (USP) to the foreign market value (FMV), as specified in the ''United States Price'' and ''Foreign Market Value'' sections of this notice. When comparing the U.S. sales to sales of similar merchandise in the home market, we made adjustments for differences in physical characteristics, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.57.

United States Price

Pursuant to section 772(b) of the Act, we based USP on purchase price because all of Excel's and Izumi's U.S. sales to the first unrelated purchaser took place prior to importation into the United States, and exporter's sales price methodology was not otherwise indicated.

We calculated purchase price based on packed FOB or ex-go-down Japanese port prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States or Japan. Inasmuch as Excel incorrectly reported U.S. price, net of commissions, we recalculated gross unit price to include U.S. commissions. Where applicable, we made deductions for foreign inland freight and foreign inland insurance. *See Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* 57 FR 56319–20 (November 27, 1992).

In accordance with our standard practice, pursuant to the decision of the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company v. United States (Federal-Mogul)*, 834 F. Supp. 1391 (CIT 1993), our calculations include an adjustment to U.S. price for the consumption tax levied on comparison sales in Japan. See *Final Antidumping Duty Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Angle From Japan*, 60 FR 16609 (March 31, 1995) and *Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determination: Color Negative Photographic Paper and Chemical Components from Japan*, 59 FR 16177, 16179 (April 6, 1994), for an explanation of this methodology.

Foreign Market Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of the subject merchandise in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating FMV, we compared each respondents' volume of home market sales of the subject merchandise to the volume of third country sales in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. We found that the home market was viable for both respondents. *See* 19 CFR 353.48(a).

We calculated FMV for both respondents based on packed, FOB or delivered prices to unrelated purchasers in Japan. We made deductions, where appropriate, from FMV for inland freight, insurance, and discounts. In accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act, we deducted, as appropriate, home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs. We made circumstance-of-sale adjustments, where applicable, for differences in credit expenses, advertising expenses, warranty expenses and technical service expenses. Pursuant to section 353.56 (b)(1) of the Department's regulations, we offset U.S. commissions, where appropriate, by deducting home-market indirect selling expenses from FMV in an amount not exceeding the U.S. commissions. We recalculated Excel's technical service costs. Only the travel portion of Excel's technical service costs was treated as a direct selling expense because these expenses would not have been incurred absent the sales of the subject merchandise. Following our past practice, the fixed costs associated with technical services (salaries, benefits, and automobile depreciation) were treated as indirect selling expenses.

An adjustment for the consumption tax was made in accordance with our practice (*see* ''United States Price'' section of this notice).

We performed an arm's-length test to determine whether Izumi's sales to its related customers were made at arm's length. Consequently, we disregarded one of Izumi's reported sales to a related party for margin calculation purposes because there were no comparable sales to unrelated parties to use as an arm's length benchmark.

Section 773(a)(4)(c) of the Act provides that a difference-in-merchandise (DIFMER) allowance may be made when a product on which FMV is based is not identical to that exported to the United States. However, when the DIFMER is greater than 20 percent of the U.S. product's total cost of manufacture (COM), the Department resorts to constructed value (CV) to establish FMV. *See* ''Differences in Merchandise: 20% Rule,'' *Import Administration Policy Bulletin:* Number 92.2 (July 29, 1992).

In this review, we found that the variable manufacturing cost differences for certain models of roller chain, other than bicycle, did not exceed 20 percent of the total average COM of the product exported to the United States. In such instances, we based FMV on home-market prices, including a DIFMER allowance. For some models sold by Izumi, however, these variable-cost differences exceeded 20 percent of the U.S. product COM. In these instances, we based FMV on CV, as described in the ''Constructed Value'' section below.

Constructed Value

Pursuant to section 773(a)(2) of the Act, where there were no contemporaneous home-market sales of such or similar merchandise, we based FMV on CV. We also relied on CV where there were contemporaneous home-market sales of such or similar merchandise but the DIFMER exceeded 20 percent.

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the cost of materials, fabrication costs, general expenses, profit, and U.S. packing. Based on *Import Administration Policy Bulletin:* Number 94.6 (March 25, 1994), we did not include consumption taxes in our calculation of CV. We added statutory or actual amounts for the general expenses and profit components of CV, as appropriate.

With respect to Izumi's CV submission, we made the following adjustments:

(1) General and administrative (G&A) expenses: Izumi, in accordance with its accounting period, reported its G&A expenses for the chain division in two six-month periods. We recalculated these expenses on a company-wide basis for the year ending September 30, 1992. Using this period is consistent with the Department's practice, i.e., it was the annual period corresponding most closely to the POR. Additionally, we deducted inland freight from the submitted G&A expenses.

(2) Interest expenses: Izumi computed interest expense for CV based on amounts incurred by the company's chain division. It is the Department's normal practice to compute interest at the highest entity level, in this case, Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Ltd. We therefore revised Izumi's interest expense based on its company-wide financial statements for the year ended September 30, 1992, the annual period most closely related to the POR.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of United States price to foreign market value, we preliminarily determine the following dumping margins:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Hitachi	[1] 12.68
Izumi	0.27
Pulton	[1] 0.01
Excel	0.10
All Others	15.92

[1] No sales during the period. Rate is from the last period in which there were sales.

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. Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate will be that established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the final determination covering the most recent period review; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, previous reviews, or the original investigation, but its manufacturer is such a firm, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the manufacturer in the final results of the most recently completed review; and (4) for any future entries from all other manufacturers or exporters who are not covered in this or prior administrative reviews, and who are unrelated to any firms listed above, or any previously reviewed firm, the cash deposit rate will be the ''new shipper'' rate established in the first review conducted by the Department in which a ''new shipper'' rate was established, as discussed below.

On May 25, 1993, the Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Floral Trade Council v. United States,* 822 F. Supp. 766 (CIT 1993), and in *Federal-Mogul,* 822 F. Supp. 782 (CIT 1993), decided that once an ''all others'' rate is established for a company, it can only be changed through an administrative review. The Department has determined that in order to implement these decisions, it is appropriate to reinstate the original ''all others'' rate from the LTFV investigation (or that rate as amended for correction of clerical errors or as a result of litigation) in proceedings governed by antidumping duty orders for the purposes of establishing cash deposits in all current and future administrative reviews. Because this proceeding is governed by an antidumping duty finding, and we are unable to ascertain the ''all others'' rate from the Treasury LTFV investigation, the ''all others'' rate for the purposes of this review would normally be the ''new shipper'' rate established in the first notice of final results of administrative review published by the Department (46 FR 44488, September 4, 1981). However, a ''new shipper'' rate was not established in that notice. Therefore, the ''all others'' rate of 15.92 percent is based on the first review conducted by the Department in which a ''new shipper'' rate was established in the final results of antidumping finding administrative review (48 FR 51801, November 14, 1983).

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

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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.

Public Comment

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B–099, within ten days of publication. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than September 18, 1995, and rebuttal briefs no later than September 20, 1995. A public hearing, if requested, will be held on September 22, 1995, at 10:00 am at the U.S. Department of Commerce, in Room 1410, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours prior to the scheduled time. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b), oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, including an analysis of issues raised in any written comments.

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

Dated: August 16, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–20930 Filed 8–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–057]

Replacement Parts for Self-Propelled Bituminous Paving Equipment from Canada; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Finding

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

ACTION: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Finding.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from the Blaw-Knox Construction Equipment Corporation (Blaw-Knox), the petitioner in this proceeding, and the Road Machinery Division of Ingersoll-Rand Company (IR), the only respondent in the administrative reviews covering the periods September 1, 1991 through August 31, 1992 (1991–92) and September 1, 1992 through August 31, 1993 (1992–93), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review and issuing a notice of intent to revoke the antidumping duty finding. Blaw-Knox has filed a submission stating that it no longer has any interest in the antidumping finding. In addition, the petitioner has consulted with interested parties who are known to them to be involved in the U.S. production of replacement parts, Barber-Greene and Cedarapids, and did not find any opposition to the revocation of the finding. Blaw-Knox and IR also requested that this revocation be retroactive to the beginning of the 1991–92 administrative review period, September 1, 1991. Therefore, based on the fact that domestic interested parties