methodology employed by the Department in these preliminary results of review is based on the facts particular to this review. The Department will continue to examine its policy for making level of trade comparisons and adjustments for its final results of review.

Because both respondents made sales at differing levels of trade in the home market and in the United States, and because we determined it was not possible to quantify the price differences resulting from the differing levels of trade, we made a CEP offset to NV for both respondents pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. The CEP offset consisted of an amount equal to the lesser of the weighted-average U.S. indirect selling expenses and U.S. commissions or home market indirect selling expenses. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of DRAMS by respondents to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the CEP to the NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2), we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the POR:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Hyundai Electronic Industries, Inc.	0.00
LG Semicon Co., Ltd	0.00

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of DRAMs from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Hyundai and LGS, because their weighted-average margins were de minimis, will be zero percent; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original LTFV investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of the most recent review, or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 3.85 percent, the ''all-others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Interested parties may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice, and may request a hearing within ten days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held as early as convenient for the parties but not later than 44 days after the date of publication or the first work day thereafter. Case briefs or other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttal comments, limited to issues in the case briefs, 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.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and 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: June 27, 1996/

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17462 Filed 7–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–580–807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film from Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Intent to Revoke the Order in Part, and Termination in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Intent to Revoke the Order in Part, and Termination in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from two respondents and three U.S. producers, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. The review indicates the existence of sales below normal value for certain manufacturers/exporters during the period of review.

We preliminarily determine the dumping margin for Kolon Industries (Kolon) to be [zero or de minimis] percent during the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. Based on three years of sales at not less than normal value (NV), we intend to revoke the order with respect to Kolon if the preliminary results of this review are affirmed in our final results.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States Price and NV.

On June 26, 1996, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25, we issued a revocation of the order with respect to Cheil Synthetics Inc. (Cheil). Accordingly, we are terminating this review of Cheil.

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 (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney or John Kugelman, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4475/0649.

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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea on June 5, 1991 (56 FR 25660). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity To Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1994/1995 review period on June 6, 1995 (60 FR 29821). On June 26, 1995, Cheil requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea. On June 29, 1995, the petitioners, E.I. DuPont Nemours & Co., Inc., Hoescht Celanese Corporation, and ICI Americas, Inc. requested reviews of Cheil, Kolon, SKC Limited (SKC), and STC corporation (STC). SKC and Kolon filed requests for review on June 29, 1995 and June 30, 1995, respectively. We initiated the review on July 14, 1995 (60 FR 36260).

The Department extended the time limits for completion of the preliminary and final results of review. *See Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews: Time Limits,* 61 FR 8911 (March 6, 1996).

On June xx, 1996, the Department revoked the order in part with respect to Cheil. Accordingly, we are terminating this review with respect to Cheil.

Intent to Revoke

In its submission of June 30, 1995, Kolon requested, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(b), revocation of the order with respect to its sales of PET film. Kolon certified in its June 30, 1995 submission that (1) it sold the subject merchandise at not less than NV during the relevant review period, and (2) that in the future it will not see the subject merchandise at less than NV. Kolon indicated in its June 30, 1995 submission that it did not believe that the agreement required under 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2)(iii) was applicable to its request because there had not been any finding that its sales were sold at less than NV.

On February 12, 1996, the Department issued an amended final results of the first review of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea (61 FR 5375). In this amended final, we determined that Kolon made sales at less than NV during the relevant period. Therefore, we permitted Kolon to perfect its timely request for revocation. On June 25, 1996, Kolon amended its request to include, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2)(iii), an agreement to immediate reinstatement in the order if any producer or reseller is subject to the order and the Department concludes that Kolon sold below NV under section 353.22(f) subsequent to revocation. Based on the final results of the two preceding reviews and the preliminary results of this review, Kolon has demonstrated three consecutive years of sales at not less than NV.

If the final results of this review demonstrate that Kolon sold the merchandise at not less than NV, and if the Department determines that it is not likely that Kolon will sell the subject merchandise at less than NV in the future, we intend to revoke the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Kolon.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

The review covers the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act, as amended.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by Kolon 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 version of the Kolon verification report.

United States Price (USP)

In calculating USP, the Department treated respondents' sales as export price (EP) sales, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation. The Department treated respondents' sales as constructed export price (CEP) sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unrelated U.S. purchasers after importation.

EP was based on the ex-factory, f.o.b. Korean port, f.o.b. customer's specific delivery point, c.i.f. U.S. port, or delivered, packed prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, terminal handling charges, truck loading charges, containerization charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, wharfage expenses, U.S. duties, and rebated in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act.

CEP was based on ex-warehouse, f.o.b. customer's specific delivery point, or delivered, packed prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, terminal handling charges, containerization charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, rebates, wharfage expenses, and U.S. duties, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made deductions for selling expenses associated with economic activities in the United States, including warranties, credit, commissions, postage expenses, bank charges and indirect selling expenses. Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP.

For SKC, we made an offset to interest expense for interest revenue, and for post-sale cost and quantity adjustments that were not reflected in the gross price. With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States by SKC prior to sale to unrelated customers, we deducted any increased value in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of PET film in the home market (HM) to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of home market sales of PET film to the volume of PET film sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. Each respondent's aggregate volume of HM sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its respective aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on HM sales.

Based on the fact that the Department had disregarded sales in the first administrative review because they were made below the cost of production (COP), the Department initiated a sales-below-cost of production (COP) investigation for each of the respondents in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act. (The first administrative review was the most recently completed review at the time that we issued our antidumping questionnaire.)

We performed a model-specific COP test in which we examined whether each HM sale was priced below the merchandise's COP. We calculated the COP of the merchandise using Kolon's, SKC's, and STC's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general expenses and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. We found that, for certain models of PET film, 20 percent or more of the home market sales were sold at below-cost prices. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made (1) in substantial quantities within the POR (*i.e.,* within an extended period of time) and (2) at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act (*i.e.,* the sales were made at prices below the weighted-average per unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis of determining NV if such sales existed, in accordance with section 773(b)(1). For those models of the subject merchandise for which there were no above-cost sales available for matching purposes, we compared U.S. price to constructed value (CV).

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, and general expenses. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondents in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses we used the weighted-average HM selling expenses. Pursuant to section 773(e)(3) of the Act, we included U.S. packing.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6), we adjusted NV, where appropriate, by deducting home market packing expenses and adding U.S. Packing expenses. We also adjusted NV to reflect deductions for HM inland freight, loading charges, and credit expenses. For comparisons to EP, we made an addition to NV for differences in warranty and credit expenses as circumstance-of-sale adjustments pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the URAA, *reprinted in* H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Session 829–831 (1994), to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale. When the Department is unable to find sale(s) in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale(s), the Department may compare sales in the U.S. and foreign markets at a different level of trade.

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, if we compare a U.S. sale at one level of trade to NV sales at a different level of trade, the Department will adjust the NV to account for differences in level of trade if two conditions are met. First there must be differences between the actual selling functions performed by the seller at the level of trade of the U.S. sale and at the level of trade of the comparison market sale used to determine NV. Second, the differences must affect price comparability as evidenced by a pattern of consistent price differences between sales at the different levels of trade in the market in which NV is determined. When CEP is applicable, section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act establishes the procedures for making a CEP ''offset'' when two conditions exist: (1) NV is established at a level of trade which constitutes a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP; and (2) the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for a level-of-trade adjustment.

In order to implement these principles, each of the respondents provided information with respect to its selling activities associated with each channel of distribution. All of the respondents identified two channels of distribution in the home market: (1) wholesalers/distributors and (2) end-users. For both channels, all of the respondents perform similar selling functions such as market research and after sales warranty services. Because channels of distribution do not qualify as separate levels of trade when the selling functions performed for each customer class are sufficiently similar, we determined that there exists one level of trade for each of the respondents' home market sales.

Each of the respondents made CEP and EP sales to the United States market and claimed either a level of trade adjustment for its CEP sales, or a CEP offset. The level of trade of the U.S. sale is determined by the adjusted price of the CEP sale. Based on each of the respondents' questionnaire responses to our requests for supplemental information, we determined a difference between the actual selling functions performed by respondents at the level of trade of the CEP sale and the level of trade of the HM sale. The adjusted CEP sales do not reflect the selling functions performed for end-users or distributors in the Korean market.

Kolon provides inventory maintenance, after-sales and warranty services, and advertising on behalf of its customer for HM sales. Kolon does not provide these services on its CEP sales. SKC provides market research,

engineering services, inventory maintenance, and delivery services on its HM sales. SKC does not provide these services on its CEP sales. STC provides inventory maintenance, after sales-services and warranty assistance, entertainment of customers, and marketing research on its HM sales. STC does not provide these services on its CEP sales. Therefore, the selling functions performed by each of the respondents for CEP sales are sufficiently different than for HM sales so as to establish different levels of trade.

Because we compared these CEP sales to HM sales at a different level of trade, we examined whether a level-of-trade adjustment may be appropriate. In this case each of the respondents only sold at one level of trade in the home market; therefore, there is no basis upon which any of the respondents has demonstrated a consistent pattern of price differences between levels of trade. Further, we do not have the information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns of respondents' sales of other similar products, and there is no other respondent's or other information on the record to analyze whether the adjustment is appropriate.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making a level-of-trade adjustment but the level of trade in Korea for each respondent is at a more advanced stage than the level of trade of the CEP sales, a CEP offset is appropriate in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. Each respondent claimed a CEP offset, which we applied to NV. We based the CEP offset amount on the amount of home market indirect selling expenses, and limited the deduction for HM indirect selling expenses to the amount of indirect selling expenses incurred on sales in the United States, in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act. The level-of-trade methodology used in this review is based on the facts particular to this review. The Department will continue to examine its policy for making level-of-trade comparisons and adjustments for the final results of this review.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of PET film in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared USP to the NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777(A) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin
Kolon	0.14
SKC	1.91
STC	4.98

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice and any interested party 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 working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of PET film from the Republic of Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for reviewed firms will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in these reviews but covered in the original less-than-fair value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in these reviews, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of these reviews, or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 4.82%, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during these review periods. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: July 1, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17464 Filed 7–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 070296B]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) will convene a public meeting of the Red Drum Stock Assessment Panel (Panel).

DATES: This meeting will begin at 1:00 p.m. on July 29, 1996, and will conclude at 5:00 p.m. on July 31, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, FL.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Swingle, Executive Director, 5401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 331, Tampa, FL 33609; telephone: (813) 228–2815.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Panel will review stock assessment information prepared by NMFS for the Gulf stock and will assess whether the