Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (Percent)
For the A–588–054 Review:	
Koyo Seiko	38.64
For the A–588–604 Review:	
Koyo Seiko	46.03

In addition, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994 for the following firms:

Manufacturer/Reseller/Exporter	Margin (percent)
For the A–588–054 Review:	
Koyo Seiko	34.68
Nachi	47.63
NSK	7.61
Fuji	6.08
Kawasaki	47.63
Yamaha	47.63
MC International	2.36
Maekawa	47.63
Toyosha	47.63
Nigata Converter	47.63
Suzuki	47.63
For the A–588–604 Review:	
NTN	19.73
Koyo Seiko	41.21
Nachi-Fujikoshi Corp.	40.37
NSK Ltd.	7.15
Fuji	(1)
Kawasaki	40.37
Yamaha	40.37
MC International	(1)
Maekawa	40.37
Toyosha	40.37
Nigata Converter	40.37
Suzuki	40.37
Showa Seiko	(1)
Daido	40.37
Ichiyanagi Tekko	40.37
Kawada Tekkosho	40.37
Asakawa Screw Co.	40.37
Isshi Nut	40.37

[1] No shipments or sales subject to this review. The firm has no rate from any prior segment of this proceeding.

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 these administrative reviews including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. 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the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of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 TRBs from Japan as follows:

(1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established in the final results of these reviews. For Koyo, the cash deposit rates will be those rates established in the final results for the 1993–94 administrative reviews;

(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 these reviews, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigations, 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 these or any previous reviews conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate for the A–588–054 case will be 18.07 percent and 36.52 percent for the A–588–604 case (*see Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan*, 58 FR 51058, 51061 (September 30, 1993)).

All U.S. sales by each respondent will be subject to one deposit rate according to the proceeding.

The cash deposit rate has been determined on the basis of the selling price to the first unrelated customer in the United States. For appraisement purposes, where information is available, the Department will use the entered value of the merchandise to determine the appraisement rate.

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.

These administrative reviews 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: May 10, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12519 Filed 5–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–549–501]

Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: The countervailing duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand was revoked effective January 1, 1995, pursuant to section 753 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (the Act) (60 FR 40568). The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of this order to determine the appropriate assessment rate for entries made during the last review period prior to the revocation of the order (January 1, 1994, through December 31, 1994). We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be *de minimis* or zero for all companies for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 (*see* ''Preliminary Results of Review'' section). If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, shipments of the subject merchandise from all companies exported on or after January 1, 1994 and entered on or before December 31, 1994. Because this order has been revoked, the Department will not issue further instructions with respect to cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cameron Cardozo or Kelly Parkhill, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1503 or 482–4126, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 14, 1985, the Department published in the Federal Register (50 FR 32751) the countervailing duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. On August 1, 1995, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' (60 FR 39151) of this countervailing duty order. We received a timely request for review from Saha Thai Steel Pipe Co., Ltd. (Saha Thai). In accordance with section 355.22 of the Department's Interim Regulations, this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested (*see Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Interim Regulations; Request for Comments*, 60 FR 25130 (May 11, 1995) (*Interim Regulations*). A review was requested for Saha Thai. However, Saha Thai is affiliated with SAF Pipe Export Co., Ltd. (SAF), an export trading company that began operations in 1993. All pipe exported by SAF is produced by Saha Thai. Because these two companies are affiliated, we are treating them as one corporate entity for purposes of our calculations. Therefore, this review covers the following companies: Saha Thai/SAF.

On November 22, 1995, we extended the period for completion of the preliminary and final results pursuant to section 751(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. *See Extension of the Time Limit for Certain Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 60 FR 55699. As explained in the memoranda from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration dated November 22, 1995, and January 11, 1996, all deadlines were further extended to take into account the partial shutdowns of the Federal Government from November 15 through November 21, 1995, and December 15, 1995, through January 6, 1996. Therefore, the deadline for these preliminary results is no later than May 30, 1996, and the deadline for the final results of this review is no later than 180 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Act in effect as of January 1, 1995. The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. References to the *Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (*Proposed Regulations*), are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's countervailing duty practice. Although the Department has withdrawn the particular rulemaking proceeding pursuant to which the *Proposed Regulations* were issued, the subject matter of these regulations is being considered in connection with an ongoing rulemaking proceeding which, among other things, is intended to conform the Department's regulations to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). *See* 60 FR 80 (January 3, 1995).

Scope of Review

On March 29, 1994, the Department clarified the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) numbers that were applicable to the subject merchandise (*see Memorandum to Susan Esserman from Susan Kuhbach*, available in the Central Records Unit, Room B099, Main Commerce Building). This clarification was necessary because of annual changes in the HTS. The scope now reads:

Imports covered in this review are shipments of circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes (pipes and tubes) with an outside diameter of 0.375 inch or more but not over 16 inches, of any wall thickness. These products, commonly referred to in the industry as standard pipe or structural tubing, are produced to various ASTM specifications, most notably A–120, A–53 and A–135. During the review period, this merchandise was classified under item numbers 7306.30.10 and 7306.30.50 of the HTS. The HTS numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Programs

I. Programs Preliminarily Determined To Be Not Used

We examined the following programs and preliminarily determine based on the questionnaire responses filed by the government of Thailand and Saha Thai/SAF that Saha Thai/SAF did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs during the review period.

A. Export Packing Credit
B. Tax Certificates for Exporters
C. Electricity Discounts for Exporters
D. Tax and Duty Exemptions Under Section 28 of the Investment Promotion Act
E. Repurchase of Industrial Bills
F. Export Processing Zones
G. International Trade Promotion Fund/Export Promotion Fund
H. Reduced Business Taxes for Producers of Intermediate Goods for Export Industries
I. Additional Incentives under the IPA.

Preliminary Results of Review

For the period of January 1, 1994, through December 31, 1994, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be zero for Saha Thai/SAF. In accordance with the Act, any rate less than 0.5 percent *ad valorem* in an administrative review is *de minimis*.

The URAA replaced the general rule in favor of a country-wide rate with a general rule in favor of individual rates for investigated and reviewed companies. The procedures for countervailing duty cases are now essentially the same as those in antidumping cases, except as provided for in section 777(e)(2)(B) of the Act. Requests for administrative reviews must now specify the companies to be reviewed. *See* 19 CFR § 355.22(a). The requested review will normally cover only those companies specifically named. Pursuant to 19 CFR § 355.22(g), for all companies for which a review was not requested, duties must be assessed at the cash deposit rate previously ordered. Accordingly, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1994, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct the Customs to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise from Saha Thai/SAF exported on or after January 1, 1994, and entered on or before December 31, 1994.

This countervailing duty order was subject to section 753 of the Act. *See, Countervailing Duty Order; Opportunity to Request a Section 753 Injury Investigation*, 60 FR 27,963 (May 26, 1995). Because no domestic interested parties exercised their right under section 753(a) of the Act to request an injury investigation, the International Trade Commission made a negative injury determination with respect to this order, pursuant to section 753(b)(4) of the Act. As a result, the Department

revoked this countervailing duty order, effective January 1, 1995, pursuant to section 753(b)(3)(B) of the Act. *Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders,* 60 FR 40,568 (August 9, 1995). Accordingly, the Department will not issue further instructions with respect to cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties.

Public Comment

Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after the date of publication of this written notice. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. 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. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR § 355.38(e).

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR § 355.38(c), are due. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

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

Dated: May 13, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12516 Filed 5–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–351–818; C–201–810; C–412–815]

Notice of Court Decision: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Brazil, Mexico, and the United Kingdom

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

ACTION: Notice of Court Decision.

SUMMARY: On April 2, 1996, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the remand determinations made by the Department of Commerce (the Department) that the privatizations of Usinas Siderurgicas de Minas Gerais (USIMINAS), Altos Hornos de Mexico (AHMSA), and British Steel plc (BS plc), respectively, were sales of shares, and that the privatized entities continued to be, for all intents and purposes, the same entities that had received the subsidies prior to privatization. *British Steel Plc. et al.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 96–6011 (*British Steel II*). In so doing, the Court implicitly rejected the Department's ''repayment'' methodology set forth in the privatization portion of its *General Issues Appendix,* which is appended to the *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products from Austria,* 58 FR 37217, 37259 (July 9, 1993).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy A. Malmrose, Office of Countervailing Investigations, or Brian Albright, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5414 and (202) 482–2786 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In its *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from Brazil,* 58 FR 37295 (July 9, 1993), *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products From Mexico* 58 FR 37352 (July 9, 1993), and *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products From the United Kingdom,* 58 FR 37393 (July 9, 1993), the Department determined that subsidies provided to certain steel producers remained countervailable after those firms were privatized. The rationale for the Department's determinations was that the countervailing duty law does not require, as a prerequisite for countervailability, that a subsidy bestowed on a producer confer a demonstrable ''competitive benefit'' on that producer. However, the Department also determined that a portion of the sales prices for USIMINAS, AHMSA, and BS plc, respectively, represented partial repayment of prior subsidies. The Department's privatization methodology was fully set forth in the *General Issues Appendix.*

On February 9, 1995, the CIT held that the Department's privatization methodology was unlawful, and remanded the determinations in question. *British Steel plc et al.* v. *United States,* 879 F. Supp. 1254. In accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department reexamined the privatization transactions in question. The Department found that USIMINAS, AHMSA, and BS plc were privatized through sales of shares, and that the privatized entities continued to be, for all intents and purposes, the same entities that had received the subsidies prior to privatization. On this basis, and in accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department determined that the pre-privatization subsidies remained countervailable in full. The Department did not attribute any portion of the sales price for any of the producers to a partial repayment of prior subsidies.

On April 2, 1996, the CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination. *British Steel II.* In so doing, the Court implicitly rejected the ''repayment'' aspect of the Department's privatization methodology, as set forth in the *General Issues Appendix.*

In its decision in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. section 1516a(e), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision which is not ''in harmony'' with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a ''conclusive'' court decision. The CIT's decision in *British Steel II* on April 2, 1996, constitutes a decision not in harmony with the Departments final affirmative determinations. Publication of this notice fulfills the *Timken* requirement.

Accordingly, the Department will continue to suspend liquidation pending the expiration of the period of appeal, or, if appealed, until a ''conclusive'' court decision.

Dated: May 9, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12518 Filed 5–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Process to Revoke Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 94–00006.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to P & B International. Because this certificate holder has failed to file