AOC in order to remove from USP the import duties paid with respect to home market models, and instead add the import duties forgiven with respect to the exported models; investigate whether Shin-Shirasuna's sales to Canada were fictitious so as to manipulate the foreign market value for comparison with imports to the United States and thereby minimize the antidumping duty liability; recalculate Capetronic's dumping margins using production data related to a specific sale instead of using the weighted-average costs of production, remove from USP the value of certain proprietary selling expenses for Shirasuna; and correct certain programming errors. *See Zenith Electronics Corporation* v. *United States,* 770 F. Supp. 648 (CIT 1991). In addition, the Department requested a remand to explain the reasons underlying its *de minimis* determination. On January 31, 1992, the Department filed its second remand results with the Court.

On January 28, 1993, the Court ordered a third remand so that the Department could reconsider the tax pass-through in a manner consistent with the constant costs and imperfect competition characteristic of the Taiwanese color television market. In addition, the Court ordered the Department to ''cap'' the upward adjustment to USP for foreign tax at the amount of tax found to be passed through to home market purchasers, to make an adjustment for the difference in circumstances of sale included in the U.S. and home market taxable values, to insure that the general expenses component of CV was not reduced at any time to less than the statutory minimum amount by reason of adjustments for selling expenses associated with disregarded home market sales, and to correct two clerical errors. *See Zenith Electronic Corp.* v. *United States,* 812 F. Supp. 228 (CIT 1993). On May 5, 1993, the Department filed its third remand results with the Court.

On October 21, 1994, the Court, in *Zenith,* affirmed the Department's third remand results, and affirmed the prior remand determinations in this case to the extent that they were not subsequently modified by the Court. The Court also vacated its July 29, 1991 order to the extent that the order held that ''no assessment rate cap may be applied in liquidating the subject entries unless the importer paid a cash duty for an estimated dumping duty.'' As a result, the Court ordered the Department to apply the assessment rate cap to all subject imports entered between the publication dates of the Department's preliminary affirmative determination of sales at LTFV and the ITC's final affirmative injury determination, and it dismissed the case.

Because the Court's October 21, 1994 order affirmed the Department's recalculation of Capetronic's rate at 1.36 percent, the Department published amended final results of review for Capetronic in this administrative review. *See* 60 FR 11955 (March 3, 1995). As a result of this new rate, the Court issued an order in the third administrative review of CTVs from Taiwan to rescind its previous revocation of Capetronic from the antidumping duty order on CTVs from Taiwan because, as a result of the Department's redetermination of its rate in the first administrative review, Capetronic did not have three consecutive years of sales at not less than fair value. *See Tatung Company* v. *United States,* Court No. 90–12–00645 (March 8, 1995); *see also* 60 FR 29822 (June 6, 1995).

On January 17, 1995, the Department, consistent with the decision of the CAFC in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Timken), published a notice in the Federal Register stating that it would not order the liquidation of the subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption prior to a ''final and conclusive'' decision in this case. Although further action is required by the Court with regard to the Department's calculation of COS adjustments for AOC, this issue does not affect the other respondents in this review and, therefore, the Court's October 21, 1994 decision is ''final and conclusive'' for those respondents.

As a result of the Department's redeterminations on remand, we have determined the weighted-average dumping margins for CTVs from Taiwan for the following periods to be:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin percent
Fulet Elect. Industrial, Co	10/19/83–03/31/85	0.08
Sampo Corp	04/01/84–03/31/85	6.29
Tatung Co	10/19/83–03/31/85	2.56

The Department will determine, and the Customs Service will assess, antidumping duties on the appropriate entries for the above companies.

Once the Court remands *Zenith* back to the Department and the case is ''final and conclusive'' with respect to AOC, we will recalculate AOC's dumping margin in accordance with the Court's opinion, publish an amended Federal Register notice, and issue liquidation instructions for AOC for the first administrative review of CTVs from Taiwan.

This amendment of final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(f)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: June 4, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–15683 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–533–810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary results of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results in the new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India, covering the period February 1, 1995, through July 31, 1995, because the Department has concluded that the case is extraordinarily complicated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Davina Hashmi or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution

Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone : (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce received requests to conduct a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. On November 28, 1995, the Department of published in the Federal Register a notice of initiation of a new shipper review of Akai Asian and Viraj, two exporters of stainless steel bar to the United States (60 FR 58598). The review covers the period February 1, 1995, through July 31, 1995.

Because this review is extraordinarily complicated, we are unable to complete the review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (the Tariff Act). See Memorandum dated June 4, 1996. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results to October 15, 1996.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b).

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)(iv)).

Dated: June 5, 1996.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–15684 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–533–502]

Certain Welded Carbon Steel Standard Pipes and Tubes From India: Termination of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On January 22, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation of a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel standard pipes and tubes from India. The Department is now terminating this review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Davina Hashmi or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 22, 1996 (61 FR 1562), the Department published in the Federal Register notice of initiation of a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel standard pipes and tubes from India covering the exporter Rajinder Pipes, Ltd., and the period May 1, 1995 through October 31, 1995.

Based on Rajinder's questionnaire response, the Department determined that Rajinder made no sales to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers during the period of review or within a reasonable time after the period of review. Therefore, the Department is now terminating the review (see memorandum from Joseph A Spetrini to Paul L. Joffe, May 17, 1996).

This notice is published pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(h).

Dated: May 30, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–15685 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

University of Albany, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

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

Docket Number: 96–012. Applicant: University of Albany, Albany, NY 12222. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer, Model OPTIMA. Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 11614, March 21, 1996. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) A high sensitivity ion source yielding low H_3^+ ion production during H/D analysis, (2) an acid-bath workstation to permit simultaneous C:N ratio analysis and (3) a universal triple collector assembly consisting of three Faraday collector buckets capable of N_2, O_2, CO_2 and SO_2 analysis. Advice received from: The National Institutes of Health, March 27, 1966.

Docket Number: 96–014. Applicant: Columbia University, Palisades, NY 10964. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer, Model OPTIMA. Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 11614, March 21, 1996. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) A high sensitivity ion source yielding 1100 molecules CO_2 per mass 44 ion, (2) a universal triple collector assembly consisting of three Faraday collector buckets capable of N_2, O_2, CO_2 and SO_2 analysis and (3) a dual microinlet with automatic cold finger. Advice received from: The National Institutes of Health, March 28, 1996.

The National Institutes of Health advises in its memoranda that (1) the capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above are pertinent to each applicant's intended purpose and (2) they know of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the intended use of each instrument.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to either of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–15686 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Notice of Sea Grant Review Panel Meeting

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Sea Grant Review Panel. The meeting will have several purposes. Panel members and guest speakers will discuss matters related to the functions of the panel, visions for the future of the Sea Grant Program, setting directions and strategic planning, procedures for allocating Sea Grant funds to the Sea Grant programs, status of authorization and