documentation in their files in support of license applications. This clearance also covers the procedures for returning an unused or partially used import certification, as well as what must be done when a change in representation occurs.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for–profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: Don Arbuckle, (202) 395–7340.

Agency: Bureau of Export Administration (BXA).

Title: Multi–Purpose Application.

Agency Form Number: BXA–622P, BXA–685P, BXA–699P, BXA–748P.

OMB Approval Number: 0694–0088.

Burden: 13,631 hours.

Number of Respondents: 14,910.

Avg Hours Per Response: Varies between 2 and 45 minutes depending on the requirement.

Needs and Uses: This collection is required in compliance with U.S. export regulations. The information furnished by U.S. exporters provides the basis for decisions to grant licenses for export, reexport, and classifications of commodities, goods and technologies that are controlled for reasons of national security and foreign policy. This revision is necessary to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, which now recognizes and includes the burden associated with third party disclosures, certifications and notification requirements imposed on the public.

Affected Public: Businesses and other for–profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: Don Arbuckle, (202) 395–7340.

Copies of the above information collection proposals can be obtained by calling or writing Gerald Tache, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3271, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collections should be sent to Don Arbuckle, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: September 12, 1995.

Gerald Taché,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 95–23225 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–CW–F

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 52–95]

Foreign-Trade Zone 12—McAllen, Texas, Area Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the McAllen Economic Development Corporation, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 12, McAllen, Texas, requesting authority to expand its zone to include an additional site in the McAllen, Texas, area, within the Hidalgo Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on September 11, 1995.

FTZ 12 was approved on October 23, 1970 (Board Order 84, 35 FR 16962, 11/3/70) and expanded on May 2, 1984 (Board Order 254, 49 FR 22842, 6/1/84) and June 19, 1990 (Board Order 469, 55 FR 26225, 6/27/90). The zone currently consists of: Site 1 (80 acres)—within the McAllen Southwest Industrial Area, FM 1016 and Ware Road, Hidalgo County, and, Site 2 (8.5 acres)—at the Air Cargo Facility within McAllen Miller International Airport complex, McAllen, Texas.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand Site 1 to include an adjacent 695-acre industrial park area located on FM 1016 between Bentsen Road and Shary Road, Hidalgo County, 5 miles south of the McAllen Miller International Airport.

No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board's regulations (as revised, 56 FR 50790–50808, 10–8–91), a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application 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 November 20, 1995. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to December 4, 1995).

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

Office of the Port Director, U.S. Customs Service, Administration Building, International Bridge, Hidalgo, Texas 78557

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

Dated: September 13, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23221 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–401–805]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Sweden: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by a respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on *Certain Cut-to Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden* (A–401–805). This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR) February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994.

We have preliminarily determined that sales to the United States have been made below the foreign market value (FMV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 19, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Patience or Jean Kemp, Office of Agreements Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 37213) the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden, and published an antidumping duty order on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44168). On August 3, 1994, the Department published the notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of this order for the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994 (59 FR 39543). The Department received a request for an administrative review from Svenskt Stal AB (SSAB). On September 8, 1994 (59 FR 46391), we initiated the administrative review of SSAB.

The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). This review covers sales of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Sweden. The POR is February 4, 1993 through July 31, 1994.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review constitute one ''class or kind'' of merchandise: certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate. These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000, 7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.0000,7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, and 7212.50.0000. Included are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded is grade X–70 plate. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Tariff Act, we verified information provided by the respondent by using standard verification procedures, including onsite inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports.

United States Price

All of SSAB's U.S. sales were based on the packed price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States. Because the sales were made prior to importation to the United States, the Department determined that purchase price, as defined in section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, was the appropriate basis for calculating USP. For terms of sale, please see Analysis Memorandum to the File, August 31, 1995. We made deductions from purchase price, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight and insurance, ocean freight, marine insurance, brokerage and handling, port charges, U.S. customs duties and fees, wharfage, and U.S. inland freight.

We used as date of sale the date of contract (if the contract set quantity and value) or, if either price or quantity was not set, the date of order confirmation (the date on which price and quantity are fixed).

We adjusted USP for Swedish value-added taxes (VAT) in accordance with our practice as outlined in recent determinations, including Silicomanganese from Venezuela, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 59 FR 55435, 55439 (November 7, 1994).

Foreign Market Value

Based on a comparison of the volume of home market and third country sales, we determined that the home market was viable because the amount of similar merchandise sold in the home market is more than five percent of the amount sold to third countries. See 19 CFR 353.48(a). Further, SSAB had sales both to related and unrelated parties in the home market during the POR. In order to determine whether sales to related parties might be appropriate to use as the basis of FMV, the Department compared prices of those sales to prices to unrelated parties, on a model-by-model basis. When possible, the Department used unrelated party sales at the same level of trade as the related party sales for this comparison. When the price ratio of related to unrelated purchases was less than 99.5 percent, we determined that those sales were not arm's length sales and disregarded those sales. See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, (58 FR 37062, July 9, 1993).

We used prices to related purchasers only if such sales were made at arm's length as defined above. In addition, we determined that sales made by SSAB through its related distributor, Tibnor AB (TAB), were a significant portion of the home market sales listing. We asked SSAB to report the portion of home market sales made through TAB to the first unrelated customer. SSAB claimed TAB could not identify the supplying producer for sales to unrelated customers. We verified this claim. We also verified that TAB's reported price is set without regard to the supplying producer. We asked SSAB to develop an allocation methodology to account for SSAB sales through TAB to unrelated customers. However, TAB's proposed allocation methodology for reporting the downstream sales is inconsistent with standard accounting principles because it does not consider the impact of purchases from non-SSAB suppliers, it assumes that TAB's beginning inventory was zero, and it assumes that the first plate sold is always SSAB plate. It is also inconsistent with TAB's normal methodology for valuing its inventory. Additionally, at verification, we found that the percentage of TAB purchases of SSAB merchandise is significantly less than respondent's methodology assumes. Therefore, the impact of merchandise sourced from producers other than SSAB is greater than indicated by respondent's methodology. After evaluating the larger percentage of non-SSAB merchandise purchased by TAB, the lack of information regarding

non-SSAB purchases, and the inconsistencies with standard accounting practices, we decided not to use respondent's methodology. However, we determined that as the final price to the customer was set regardless of producer and that TAB accurately reported most of its expenses and adjustments, it was reasonable to use TAB's sales listing. Therefore, we rejected TAB's allocation methodology, revised TAB's reported sales to neutralize the effect of non-SSAB suppliers and used the revised sales listing in our calculations. For more information on our use of SSAB's downstream sales, see Analysis Memorandum to the File, August 31, 1995.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.58 and 353.55, we compared U.S. sales to home market sales made at the same level of trade, and in comparable commercial quantities, where possible. SSAB reported a number of sales in its home market database in currencies other than the Swedish currency. Company officials explained these are typically sales where the merchandise was shipped to an address in Sweden, as indicated by the destination code of the sale, but customer's invoicing address was not in Sweden. We verified that SSAB properly included these home market sales in its reporting to the Department. Therefore, we included these sales in our calculations.

SSAB had sales of secondary merchandise (non-prime) in the home market; however, there were no sales of secondary merchandise in the U.S. market during the POR. Therefore, as per our established model match criteria, the Department only compared prime merchandise sold in the United States to prime merchandise sold in the home market.

Based on the Department's previous determination of sales made at below the cost of production (COP) in the original LTFV investigation in accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, we determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that, for this review period, SSAB had made sales of subject merchandise in the home market at prices less than the COP. As a result, we investigated whether SSAB sold such or similar merchandise in the home market at prices below the COP over an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices which permitted recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.51(c), we calculated COP for SSAB as the sum of reported materials, labor, factory overhead, and general expenses. We compared COP to home market prices, net of price adjustments, discounts, and movement expenses.

Based upon data collected during verification of SSAB, we recalculated SSAB's general and administrative expenses, after adjusting cost of goods sold for one subsidiary for the effect of inter-company transfers. We also recalculated finance expense using SSAB's consolidated financial statements.

Pursuant to the Department's practice, for each model for which less than 10 percent, by quantity, of the home market sales during the POR were made at prices below COP, we included all sales of that model in the computation of FMV. For each model for which 10 percent or more, but less than 90 percent, of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP, we excluded from the calculation of FMV those home market sales which were priced below COP, provided that they were made over an extended period of time. For each model for which 90 percent or more of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP and were made over an extended period of time, we disregarded all sales of that model in our calculation. See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the United Kingdom, (60 FR 10558, February 27, 1995).

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, to determine whether sales below cost had been made over an extended period of time, we compared the number of months in which sales below cost occurred for a particular model to the number of months in which that model was sold. If the model was sold in fewer than three months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales of that model in each month sold. If a model was sold in three or more months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were sales below cost in at least three of the months in which the model was sold. See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 58 FR 64720, 64729 (December 8, 1993).

Because SSAB provided no indication that its below-cost sales of models within the ''greater than 90 percent'' and the ''between 10 and 90 percent'' categories were at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time and in the normal course of trade, we disregarded those sales of models within the ''10 to 90 percent'' category which were made below cost over an extended period of time.

SSAB did not report COP information for all product models. This affected both the home market and downstream sales listings. For certain of these models, respondent provided a methodology for assigning average costs for similar products. We used their methodology to the extent possible. However, this methodology did not cover all product models with missing COP. We have assigned the highest costs for similar products to the sales of models missing COP information as partial BIA. For more information, see our Analysis Memorandum of August 31, 1995.

In accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, the Department normally uses the constructed value (CV) of those models for which home market price has been disregarded as below COP. See, e.g., Mechanical Transfer Presses from Japan, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 59 FR 9958 (March 2, 1994). We did not use CV as FMV for those U.S. models for which we were unable to find a home market match because we found during verification that SSAB had not reported certain home market sales of subject merchandise. We therefore assume that all unmatched sales were the result of this reporting failure. We used a margin based upon BIA only for those unmatched U.S. sales. As BIA, we applied to those sales SSAB's final margin determined in the less-than-fair value (LTFV) investigation. We have determined that resorting to total BIA is not warranted because SSAB's U.S. database is not sufficiently flawed such that the response as a whole is unreliable. *See National Steel Corporation* v. *United States,* 870 F. Supp. 1130, 1135 (CIT 1994).

In accordance with section 773 (a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act, for those U.S. models for which we were able to find a home market such or similar match, we calculated FMV based on the packed home market sales price to unrelated and related purchasers in the home market. For terms of sale, please see Analysis Memorandum to the File, August 31, 1995.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(4)(B) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2), we made circumstance of sale adjustments to FMV, where applicable, for credit expenses, handling expense, inland freight, discounts and rebates. Where appropriate, we deducted from FMV home market packing costs and added to FMV packing expenses incurred in

Sweden for U.S. sales. We also adjusted FMV, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.57. Due to discrepancies found at verification, reporting errors, and unsupported adjustments, we disallowed and/or recalculated certain expenses and adjustments. See Analysis Memorandum to the File, August 31, 1995 for more information on these disallowed and/or recalculated adjustments.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV, we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period February 4, 1993, through July 31, 1994:

Manufacturer	Margin (percent)
SSAB	10.96

Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above.

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 the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act. A cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties shall be required on shipments of Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden as follows: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (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, or the original 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will be 24.23 percent, which is the ''all others'' rate from the LTFV investigation. See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden, (58 FR 37213, July 9, 1993).

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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and this 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: September 13, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–23220 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

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), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95-067. *Applicant:* The Salk Institute for Biological Studies, 10010 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037. *Instrument:* DIP-2000 Imaging Plate X-ray Diffraction Image Processor with Kappa-goniometer and SRA M18XHF Rotating Anode X-ray Generator. *Manufacturer:* MAC Science Co., Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to collect X-ray diffraction data from crystals made with biological macromolecules such as signal transduction, ion conductance, and protein-DNA recognition during the study of proteins such as transducin from bovine eye and potassium channels from rat kidney. *Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* August 1, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–068. *Applicant:* University of California, Department of Nutritional Sciences, 119 Morgan Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-3104. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model JMS-AX505WA. *Manufacturer:* JEOL, Japan. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to measure isotope incorporation levels in different metabolites during studies of glucose, fat and protein metabolism in animals and humans. *Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* August 1, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–069. *Applicant:* Saint Barnabas Medical Center, 94 Old Short Hills Road, Livingston, NJ 07039. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope, Model JEM-1210. *Manufacturer:* JEOL, Japan. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used in several research projects to study ultrastructural features of biomedical research specimens from experimental animals, cultured cells and various tissues from patients with pathological disorders. In addition, the instrument will be used to train pathology residents in the application of the electron microscope. *Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* August 1, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–070. *Applicant:* Rutgers, The State University, Waksman Institute, P.O. Box 6999, Piscataway, NJ 08855-6999. *Instrument:* Cryogenic Cooling System. *Manufacturer:* Oxford Cryosystems, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used for X-ray crystallographic studies of proteins with the objective of solving the atomic structure of a subject protein. The instrument will also be used to teach undergraduate courses in crystallography in which students will be trained in the skills necessary to the analysis of protein crystal by means of X-ray Diffraction. *Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* August 4, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–071. *Applicant:* Colorado State University, Natural