Background

The Department initiated the January 1, 1995 through December 31, 1995 administrative review for Rhone Poulenc on February 20, 1996 (61 FR 6347) at the request of the petitioner, the PQ Corporation. On June 18, 1996, the Department issued the preliminary results for this administrative review (61 FR 30853).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of ASM, a crystallized silicate (Na_2 SiO_3) which is alkaline and readily soluble in water. Applications include waste paper de-inking, ore-flotation, bleach stabilization, clay processing, medium or heavy duty cleaning, and compounding into other detergent formulations. This merchandise is classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 2839.11.00 and 2839.19.00. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Final Results of Review

The Department gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on its preliminary results. The Department did not receive any comments. Accordingly, for reasons discussed in the preliminary results, the Department has, pursuant to section 776 of the Act, used facts available. As discussed in the preliminary results, the Department used as facts available the 60-percent margin calculated in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation using information provided by Rhone Poulenc. For a discussion of the reasons for application of facts available, see *Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 30853 (June 18, 1996).

The Department will determine, and the Customs Service will assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. 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the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Rhone Poulenc will be 60 percent; (2) for companies not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 60 percent, the ''All Others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (45 FR 77498, November 24, 1980).

These deposit requirements will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final 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.

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: August 20, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–21857 Filed 8–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–602–803]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Australia: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: On May 29, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Australia (61 FR 26876). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 27, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Bolling or Jean Kemp, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 29, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 28676) the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Australia (58 FR 44161, August 9, 1993). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round 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).

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review constitute one ''class or kind'' of merchandise: certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products. The class or kind includes flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150

millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the HTS under item numbers 7210.31.0000, 7210.39.0000, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030, 7210.49.0090, 7210.60.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.21.0000, 7212.29.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.12.1000, 7217.13.1000, 7217.19.1000, 7217.19.5000, 7217.22.5000, 7217.23.5000, 7217.29.1000, 7217.29.5000, 7217.32.5000, 7217.33.5000, 7217.39.1000, and 7217.39.5000. Included are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been ''worked after rolling'')—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (''terne plate''), or both chromium and chromium oxides (''tin-free steel''), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%–60%–20% ratio. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers BHP and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995 (POR).

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We only received comments from petitioners, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group, a Unit of USX Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, AK Steel Corporation, Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, WCI Steel, Inc., and Lukens Steel Company, in this proceeding. Neither respondent (The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. (BHP)) nor petitioners requested a hearing.

Comment 1: Petitioners stated that the Department correctly concluded in its preliminary results that the use of facts available is appropriate in this review because BHP did not respond to Sections B, C, or D of the Department's antidumping duty questionnaire. In addition, petitioners noted that because BHP failed to cooperate and withheld requested information, Section 776(b) of the Act permits the Department to use an inference adverse to BHP in selecting from among the facts otherwise available. (See, *Certain Pasta from Italy,* 61 FR 30326, 30328 (June 14, 1996)) Moreover, the petitioners argue that the Department's practice under the old law was to view a respondent who refuses to participate as non-cooperative and to subject said respondent to the use of the most adverse facts available. (See, *Certain Carbon Steel Flat Products from Brazil,* 58 FR 37091, 37094 (July 9, 1993))

Additionally, petitioners stated that the Department correctly applied Section 776(c) of the Act and the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) in its preliminary results and correctly followed its practice for assessing the probative value of the information to be used by examining its reliability and relevance. (See, *Mechanical Transfer Presses from Japan,* 61 FR 15036 (April 4, 1996)) Also, petitioners note that the Department correctly recognized that in selecting as adverse facts available the margin calculated in the prior segment of this proceeding, ''it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period.'' Petitioners also noted that the Department did consider information as to whether there were circumstances that would render the margin not relevant, and stated that the Department correctly concluded that there were no such circumstances.

Department's Position: We agree with petitioners. Our final results are in accord with our reasoning in our preliminary results. Because BHP failed to submit a response to sections B through E of the Department's antidumping questionnaire we have determined that it is appropriate to use as an adverse inference in selecting from among the facts otherwise available, the margin calculated in a prior segment of the proceeding. The Department will apply the antidumping margin of 39.05 percent for these final results, which is the antidumping margin from the amended final results of the first administrative review.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that the following margin exists for the period August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
BHP	39.05

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements shall be effective, upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review, for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Australia that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for BHP will be the rate established above; (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 24.96 percent, the all others rate established in the final results of the less than fair value investigation (58 FR 44161, August 19, 1993).

The deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final 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.

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information

disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 355.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulation and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 20, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–21856 Filed 8–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews; Notice of Decision of Panel

AGENCY: North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Decision of the Panel.

SUMMARY: On July 31, 1996 the Binational Panel issued its decision in the matter of Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico, Secretariat File No. USA–95–1904–04.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James R. Holbein, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2016, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230, (202) 482–5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement (''Agreement'') establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* (''Rules''). These Rules were published in the Federal Register on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686). The panel review in this matter was conducted in accordance with these Rules.

Background Information

This Binational Panel reviewed the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value made by the International Trade Administration respecting Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico. That determination was published in the Federal Register on June 28, 1995 (60 FR 33567).

Decision of Panel

(1) The Panel upheld the Department's calculation of TAMSA's financial expense on the basis of Best Information Available and on the alternative basis that the 1993 financial data was not representative of the financial expenses incurred during the Period of Investigation.

(2) The Panel remanded the Final Determination to the Department for a detailed explanation as to the reasons for its rejection of the 1993 financial data as non-representative of the General and Administrative expenses incurred during the Period of Investigation.

(3) The Panel upheld the Department's rejection of TAMSA's nonstandard cost allocation method and its substitution of an allocation method based on standard costs. The Panel also granted the Department's request for a remand to re-calculate the nonstandard cost allocation for a particular subset of TAMSA's sales.

(4) The Panel determined that the challenge by TAMSA to the Final Determination, based on a statement made by the Department in the Team Concurrence Memorandum, is not ripe for consideration.

The Panel ordered the Department to make a determination on remand consistent with the instructions and findings set forth in the Panel's opinion. The Department shall allow an appropriate period of time for North Star and TAMSA to comment on the proposed remand results. The final determination on remand shall be issued within ninety (90) days of the date of this Order (not later than October 29, 1996).

Dated: August 6, 1996.

James R. Holbein,

U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 96–21749 Filed 8–26–96; 8:45 am]1

BILLING CODE 3510–GT–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000–0139]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request Entitled Federal Acquisition and Community Right-To-Know

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for an extension to an existing OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 35), the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Secretariat has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve an extension of a currently approved information collection requirement concerning Federal Acquisition and Community Right-to-Know. This OMB clearance currently expires on October 31, 1996. A request for public comments was published at 61 FR 31090, June 19, 1996. No comments were received.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* October 28, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, or obtaining a copy of the justification, should be submitted to: General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVRS), 18th & F Streets, NW, Room 4037, Washington, DC 20405. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000–0139, Federal Acquisition and Community Right-to-Know, in all correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ralph De Stefano, Office of Federal Acquisition Policy, GSA (202) 501–1758.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

The interim rule added FAR Subpart 23.9 and its associated solicitation provision and contract clause which implement the requirements of E.O. 12969 of August 8, 1995 (60 FR 40989, August 10, 1995), ''Federal Acquisition and Community Right-to-Know,'' and the Environmental Protection Agency's ''Guidance Implementing E.O. 12969; Federal Acquisition Community Right-