

the duty rate that would otherwise apply to sound pads (3.9%). The company states that the removal of the time limit would allow Western Publishing to continue to use zone procedures to maintain the U.S. plant'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 January 29, 1996. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to February 13, 1996).

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 596, 517 E. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 3716, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230

Dated: November 21, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-29266 Filed 1130-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

International Trade Administration

[A-485-804]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Romania

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 30, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Beck or Magd Zalok, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3464 or (202) 482-4162, respectively.

THE APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) are references to the provisions effective

January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION: Because of the Federal Government shutdown, the deadline for this preliminary determination has been extended by the number of days of the shutdown, six days, to Tuesday, November 21, 1995.

We preliminarily determine that circular welded non-alloy steel pipe (pipe) from Romania is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation on May 16, 1995 (60 FR 27078, May 22, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On May 30, 1995, a letter of appearance was filed on behalf of Tepro S.A. (Tepro), a producer of the subject merchandise, as well as Metagrimes S.A. (Metagrimes), Metalexportimport S.A. (Metalexportimport), and Metanef S.A. (Metanef), exporters of the subject merchandise. On June 7, 1995, a cable was sent to the U.S. Embassy in Romania requesting the identification of Romanian producers and exporters of pipe exported to the United States. We received a response on June 13, 1995, identifying the same companies named in the May 30, 1995, letter of appearance.

On June 12, 1995, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) notified the Department of Commerce (the Department) of its affirmative preliminary determination.

On June 30, 1995, we presented questionnaires to the Romanian Embassy and counsel for Tepro, Metagrimes, Metalexportimport and Metanef. Supplemental questionnaires were issued in August and September 1995. Responses to the original and supplemental questionnaires were received in August, September, and October 1995.

On September 14, 1995, the Department, at the request of the petitioner, postponed the preliminary determination to November 15, 1995 (60 FR 48690, September 20, 1995).

Postponement of Final Determination

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act, on November 20, 1995, the respondents requested that, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone its final determination until 135 days after the date of publication of an affirmative

preliminary determination in the Federal Register. Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.20(b), because our preliminary determination is affirmative, the respondents account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are granting respondents' request and postponing the final determination.

Scope of Investigation

The following scope language reflects certain modifications from the notice of initiation. In the initiation notice, we indicated that our scope language may change based on any final scope determination regarding the antidumping duty orders on certain circular welded non-alloy steel pipe from Brazil, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Venezuela. See *Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Scope Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Brazil, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Venezuela* (59 FR 1929, January 13, 1994). However, the final determination has not yet been made. Consequently, we have modified our scope language in an effort to eliminate the need for use certification at this time.

For purpose of this investigation, circular welded non-alloy steel pipes (standard pipes) are all pipes and tubes, of circular cross-section, not more than 406.4 mm (16 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (black, galvanized, or painted), end finish (plain end, bevelled end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or industry specification (ASTM, proprietary, or other) used in standard or structural pipe applications.

The scope specifically includes, but is not limited to, all pipe produced to the ASTM A-53, ASTM A-135, ASTM A-795, and BS-1387 specifications. It also includes any pipe multiple-stencilled or multiple-certified to one of the above-listed specifications and to any other specification. Pipe which meets the above physical parameters and which is produced to proprietary specifications, the API-5L, the API-5L X-42, or to any other non-listed specification is included within the scope of this investigation if used in a standard or structural pipe application, regardless of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)* category into which it was classified. If the pipe does not meet any of the above identified specifications, although it is within the identified physical parameters described in the second paragraph of this section, our presumption is that it

is not used in a standard pipe application.

Standard pipe uses include the low-pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air, and other liquids and gases in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses. Standard pipe may carry liquids at elevated temperatures but may not be subject to the application of external heat. Standard pipe uses also include load-bearing applications in construction and residential and industrial fence systems. Standard pipe uses also include shells for the production of finished conduit and pipe used for the production of scaffolding.

Specifically excluded from this investigation are mechanical tubing, tube and pipe hollows for redrawing, and finished electrical conduit if such products are not certified to ASTM A-53, ASTM A-120, ASTM A-135, ASTM A-795, and BS-1387 specifications and are not used in standard pipe applications. Additionally, pipe meeting the specifications for oil country tubular goods is not covered by the scope of this investigation, unless also certified to a listed standard pipe specification or used in a standard pipe application.

The merchandise under investigation is currently classifiable under items 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90 of the *HTSUS*. Although the *HTSUS* subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Regarding implementation of the use provision of the scope of this investigation, and any order which may be issued in this investigation, we are well aware of the difficulty and burden associated with such certifications. Therefore, in order to maintain the effectiveness of any order that may be issued in light of actual substitution in the future (which the use criterion is meant to achieve), yet administer certification procedures in the least problematic manner, we have developed an approach which simplifies these procedures to the greatest extent possible.

First, we will not require use certification until such time as petitioner or other interested parties provide the Department with a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that substitution is occurring. Second, we will require use certification only for the product(s) (or specification(s)) for which evidence is provided that substitution is occurring. For example, if, based on evidence provided by

petitioner, the Department finds a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that pipe produced to the API-5L specification is being used as standard pipe, we will require use certifications for imports of API-5L specification pipe. Third, normally we will require only the importer of record to certify to the use of the imported merchandise. If it later proves necessary for adequate implementation, we may also require producers who export such products to the United States to provide such certification on invoices accompanying shipments to the United States.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is October 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995.

Nonmarket Economy Country Status

The Department has treated Romania as a nonmarket economy country (NME) in all past antidumping investigations (see, e.g., *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Romania* (57 FR 42957, September 17, 1992)). Since neither respondents nor petitioners have challenged such treatment, we will continue to treat Romania as a NME in this investigation, in accordance with section 771(18)(C) of the Act.

When the Department is investigating imports from a NME, section 773(c)(1) of the Act directs us to base normal value (NV) on the NME producer's factors of production, valued in a comparable market economy that is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. The sources of individual factor prices are discussed under the NV section, below.

Surrogate Country

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act requires the Department to value the NME producer's factors of production, to the extent possible, in one or more market economy countries that: (1) are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the NME country; and (2) are significant producers of comparable merchandise. The Department has determined that Algeria, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Morocco and Peru are the countries most comparable to Romania in terms of overall economic development (see the July 25, 1995, memorandum from David Mueller, Director, Office of Policy, to David L. Binder, Director, Antidumping Investigations Division II). On July 28, 1995, the Department issued a letter allowing all interested parties an opportunity to comment on those countries and to provide the Department with information to value Tepro's

factors of production. Responses to that letter were received in September, October and November, 1995.

According to the information on the record, we have determined that Colombia is also a significant producer of pipe among these six potential surrogate countries. Accordingly, where possible, we have calculated NV using Colombian prices to value the Romanian producer's factors of production. Where we did not have Colombian values, we used values for inputs from: (1)

Thailand, which was the surrogate country in the first investigation of this product from Romania (see the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Romania (Steel Pipe I)* (57 FR 42957, September 17, 1992)), when no information was available from any other surrogate countries listed in the July 25, 1995, memorandum referenced above; or (2) U.S. import prices, when no current information was available from: (a) any other surrogate countries listed in the July 25, 1995, memorandum referenced above; or (b) Thailand. For a complete analysis of the selection of the surrogate country, see the November 21, 1995, memorandum from the team to Barbara R. Stafford, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations.

Separate Rates

To establish whether a firm is sufficiently independent from government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under a test articulated in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) and amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, 22586, May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under the separate rates criteria, the Department assigns separate cash deposit rates in nonmarket economy cases only if a respondent demonstrates the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* governmental control over export activities.

The Department typically considers three factors which support, though do not require, a finding of *de jure* absence of central control. These factors include: (1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; or (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. The Department typically considers four factors in evaluating whether each

respondent is subject to *de facto* governmental control of its export functions: (1) whether the export prices are set by or subject to the approval of a governmental authority; (2) whether the respondent has authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; (3) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether the respondent retains the proceeds of its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding disposition of profits or financing of losses (*see Silicon Carbide*).

Regarding the absence of *de jure* control, the three exporters of the subject merchandise, Metagrimex, Metanef and Metalexportimport, have provided their business licenses issued by the Romanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. According to each of the three exporters, this license does not require renewal, does not impose any limitations on or create any entitlements for the operations of these exporters, and can only be revoked by the issuing authorities if the requirements of the license are not fulfilled. The three exporters have also provided copies of several laws which they claim provide for the elimination of the state monopoly in the economy and foreign trade. We have reviewed these laws and have found no evidence to contradict that claim.

The three exporters have also asserted absence of governmental control based on all the *de facto* criteria. All three respondents have stated that: (1) they establish their own export prices; (2) they negotiate contracts, without guidance from any governmental entities or organizations; and (3) there are no restrictions on the use of their export revenues and they make independent decisions regarding disposition of profits or financing of losses. Concerning autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of management, both Metagrimex and Metanef have each asserted that their Council of Administration, which selects the management of the company and is similar to a board of directors, is free from government control and the companies are therefore able to make their own management personnel decisions. Metalexportimport has asserted that its five member Council of Administration includes one member appointed by the state ownership fund¹

¹ This fund holds the state—s shares in this company and all other companies in which the state owns shares. The state is required to privatize a certain number of the shares it holds every year until it no longer holds any shares in any company.

(SOF) and one member appointed by the private ownership fund² (POF). The SOF and POF were created by the Romanian government to help privatize Romanian companies. Therefore, although Metalexportimport's Council of Administration includes one member appointed by the SOF and one member appointed by the POF, the council is made up of five members and, thus, the SOF and POF have a minority representation. There is, therefore, no evidence that the central government controls the selection of management for Metalexportimport. All of these statements will be subject to verification.

Consequently, we preliminarily determine that the information provided by these three companies supports a preliminary finding that there is *de jure* and *de facto* absence of governmental control of export functions. Therefore, these three companies have preliminarily met the criteria for the application of separate rates. For a further discussion of the Department's preliminary determination that these three companies are entitled to separate rates, see the November 13, 1995, memorandum from the team to Gary Taverman, Acting Director, Office of Antidumping Investigations.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of pipe from Romania to the United States by Metagrimex, Metalexportimport and Metanef were made at less than fair value, we compared the Export Price (EP) to the NV, as specified in the "Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice.

Export Price

For all three exporters, we calculated EP in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation. The constructed export price under section 772(b) is not otherwise warranted on the basis of the facts of this investigation.

We calculated EP based on packed, FOB Romanian port or C&F U.S. port prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States, as appropriate. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for foreign brokerage and handling, foreign inland freight and ocean freight. Given that foreign brokerage and handling and foreign inland freight were services provided by Romanian companies, we valued these

² This fund possesses the —Certificates of Ownership— which were distributed to all qualified Romanian citizens and will become actual shares of Romanian companies after five years.

expenses in Thailand (*see the Surrogate Country section above*).

Normal Value

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, we calculated NV based on factors of production reported by Tepro, which produced the pipe for Metagrimex, Metalexportimport and Metanef. To calculate NV, the reported unit factor quantities were multiplied by publicly available Colombian values, where possible. As stated above, we used values from other countries for certain other factors where Colombian values were not available. The selection of the surrogate values applied in this determination was based on the quality and contemporaneity of the data. As appropriate, we adjusted input prices to make them delivered prices. For those values not contemporaneous with the period of investigation (POI), we adjusted for inflation using wholesale price indices or, in the case of labor rates, consumer price indices, published in the International Monetary Fund's *International Financial Statistics*.

In presenting their suggestions to the Department on the appropriate values to use in this investigation, Tepro and the petitioners have raised two issues. The first issue involves the quality of steel to be valued. Tepro has stated that it uses secondary, not prime, steel, in producing the subject merchandise. Furthermore, Tepro claimed that the grade of steel it uses is different than that contained in the steel valuation suggestions presented by the petitioners. Thus, Tepro argued that the Department should discount any value it uses to account for the difference between primary and secondary steel. The petitioners refuted Tepro's arguments, claiming that Tepro did not provide sufficient support for its claim that it uses secondary steel in the production of the subject merchandise. The Department agrees with the petitioners and has preliminarily denied Tepro's claim for a discount on the value we have used for steel. This decision was based on: (1) the fact that Tepro's reported scrap rates do not appear to be indicative of a producer who's chief material input is second quality; and (2) the results of a test submitted by the petitioners which showed that the grade of steel used by Tepro is identical to the grade of steel used by U.S. and other world producers of the subject merchandise.

The second issue involves the different sources of information presented to value the steel factor. Both Tepro and the petitioners claimed that the information provided by the other was not appropriate. We have

determined that the information provided by the petitioners was the most appropriate source since it included prices for a greater range of the steel thicknesses used by Tepro. For a complete analysis of these issues, see the November 21, 1995, memorandum from the team to Barbara R. Stafford, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations.

Valuation of Factors

To value hot rolled steel coil, the major material input, we used a steel price list for sheet and coil sold to industrial users in Colombia published by Acerias Paz del Rio. S.A., a Colombian producer of steel sheet and coil. We were unable to locate Colombian publicly available published information (PAPI) for the other material inputs. Thus, to value saleable steel scrap, we used the same percentage difference between steel coil and steel scrap used in *Steel Pipe I*. For lacquer and marking paint, we used the basket category data for both of these values that were used in *Steel Pipe I*. For zinc, saleable zinc scrap, hydrochloric acid, zinc chloride and ammonium chloride, we used values based on U.S. import statistics (IM 145) from market economy countries for the last quarter of 1994 and the first quarter of 1995. We used U.S. import statistics for these five inputs because values for these factors were not available from the other surrogate countries and these factors were not used in *Steel Pipe I*.

To value unskilled, indirect and packing labor, we used the 1994 wage rate for the manufacturing sector published in the *Economic Guide for Investors* by the Colombian government. Since we cannot determine if the labor values in this case were for skilled or unskilled workers, we are following the method established in the *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Polyvinyl Alcohol from the PRC* (60 FR 52647, October 10, 1995). In that investigation, we found no basis to assume the skill level of the surrogate value, nor did we have agreement among the parties regarding the skill level. Thus, we applied a single wage rate to all reported labor factors. Since we have the same situation here, we also applied a single wage rate to all reported labor factors. Further, because this value was exclusive of benefits, we increased the amount reported to include benefits.

To value electricity, we used electricity rates for Colombian industrial users published quarterly by the Latin America Energy Organization (Organizacion Latinoamericana de Energia, or OLADE). For methane,

because we were unable to find a Colombian value, we used the value of natural gas because, according to the petitioners, it has substantially the same end use as methane. Tepro also submitted values for natural gas as well. We based the surrogate value for natural gas on 1992 Colombian prices shown in a 1993 OLADE publication.

For the packing materials of cold rolled strip, PVC foil and thread protectors, because we could find no Colombian PAPI, we used the values in *Steel Pipe I*.

We were unable to locate Colombian PAPI for overhead and selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses. Thus, for factory overhead and SG&A expenses, we used the rates used in *Steel Pipe I*. These rates showed overhead as a percentage of materials, exclusive of energy, and SG&A as a percentage of the sum of materials, labor and overhead. For both overhead and SG&A, we are using the percentages for black plain end pipe as the percentages for galvanized plain end pipe and are using the percentages for black threaded and coupled pipe as the percentages for galvanized threaded and coupled pipe.

We were unable to locate Colombian PAPI for profit. In *Steel Pipe I*, we used eight percent because it was the statutory minimum profit percentage. The statutory minimum profit figure is no longer applicable. We were able to obtain profit information for the pipe industry in Thailand from the *Preliminary Results of the 1992-93 Administrative Review of Pipe and Tube from Thailand (Pipe and Tube from Thailand)*. That review contained public information indicating that the profit for the pipe and tube industry in Thailand is greater than eight percent (see the November 28, 1994, memorandum from the case analyst to the file). Thus, we used eight percent as the profit margin in this preliminary determination not because it was formerly the statutory minimum profit figure, but because publicly available information indicates that the profit figure is not less than eight percent. If additional public information becomes available either as a result of the final determination in *Pipe and Tube from Thailand* or otherwise, we will consider that information in our final determination.

We were also unable to locate Colombian PAPI for rail freight and foreign brokerage and handling. Thus, for rail freight, we used the rate contained in *Steel Pipe I*. This information was obtained from *The Investment Environment in Thailand* for 1991. For foreign brokerage and handling, we used the rate contained in the public version of a questionnaire

response submitted in the 1994 antidumping duty investigation of *Carbon Steel Butt Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand*. We used the rate contained in the 1994 investigation because this figure was more recent than the foreign brokerage and handling rate contained in *Steel Pipe I*, which was based on an earlier Carbon Steel Butt Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand investigation. For a complete analysis of surrogate values used in the calculation of NV, see the November 21, 1995, memorandum from the team to Barbara R. Stafford, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations.

Romania-Wide Rate

The U.S. Embassy in Romania identified what we believe to be the only three Romanian exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. This information was confirmed by the Romanian embassy in Washington. All three exporters have responded in this investigation. We compared the respondents' sales data with U.S. import statistics for time periods including the POI and found no indication of unreported sales. Accordingly, we have based the Romania-wide rate on the weighted-average of the margins calculated in this proceeding.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information used in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of pipe from Romania, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The Customs Service will require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated dumping margins by which the normal value exceeds the export price, as shown below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Metagrimex, S.A.	46.12
Metalexportimport, S.A.	41.96

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Metanef, S.A.	46.34
Romania-Wide Rate	44.69

The Romania-wide rate applies to all entries of subject merchandise except for entries from exporters that are identified individually above.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

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 for Import Administration no later than February 27, 1996, and rebuttal briefs, no later than March 5, 1996. A list of authorities used and a summary of arguments made in the briefs should accompany these briefs. Such summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. We will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. At this time, the hearing is scheduled for March 8, 1996, the time and place to be determined, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B-099, within ten days of the publication of this notice. 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(b) oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by 135 days after the publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act.

Dated: November 21, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-29270 Filed 11-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Determination Not To Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor To Terminate Suspended Investigations

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

ACTION: Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings nor to terminate the suspended investigations listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 30, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482-4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an administrative review.

We had not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months. Therefore, pursuant to § 353.25(d)(4)(i) of the Department's regulations, on September 29, 1995, we published in the Federal Register a notice of intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations and served written notice of the intent to each domestic interested party on the Department's service list in each case. Within the specified time frame, we received objections from domestic interested parties to our intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders

and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations. Therefore, because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

Antidumping Proceeding

A-588-045

Japan, Steel Wire Rope

Objection Date: October 17, 1995
Objector: Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Specialty Cable Manufacturers

Contact: Davina Hashmi at (202) 482-3813

A-479-801

Yugoslavia, Industrial Nitrocellulose

Objection Date: October 13, 1995

Objector: Hercules Incorporated, Aqualon Division

Contact: Rebecca Trainor at (202) 482-0666

Dated: November 20, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-29265 Filed 11-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-791-803]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From South Africa

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 30, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Stagner or John Beck, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1673 or (202) 482-3464, respectively.

THE APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION: Because of the federal government shutdown, the deadline for this preliminary determination has been extended by the number of days of the shutdown, six days, to Tuesday, November 21, 1995.