market research reports, we have accepted these as corroborative in light of the Department's practice of confirming the accuracy of such reports prior to initiation. *See Pasta From Turkey* at 30312. Thus, the LTFV BIA rate is corroborated.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the dumping margin (in percent) for the period August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995 to be as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
SSAB	24.23

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not 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 this administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in any written comments or at a hearing, not later than 180 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall 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the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) 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 (3) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rate made effective by the final results of the 1993–1994 administrative review of this order. (See, *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Sweden; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 61 FR 15772 (April 9, 1996).) As noted in these final results, this rate is the ''all others'' rate from the relevant LTFV investigation. (See, *Final Determination,* 58 FR 37213 (July 9, 1993).) These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(5).

Dated: September 25, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–25534 Filed 10–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–405–802]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Finland: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review

SUMMARY: In response to requests from the respondent, Rautaruukki Oy (Rautaruukki), and from petitioners (Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Company a Unit of USX Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., Geneva Steel, Gulf States Steel Inc. of Alabama, Sharon Steel Corporation, and Lukens Steel Company), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Finland. This review covers the above manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995.

We preliminarily determine the dumping margin for Rautaruukki to be 16.6 percent during the POR. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding should also submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and 2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 4, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robin Gray or Jacqueline Wimbush, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0159 or (202) 482–1394, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The 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 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 Fed. Reg. 25130).

Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 Fed. Reg. 37136) the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Finland. We published an antidumping duty order on August 19, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 44165). On August 1, 1995, the Department published the Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review of this order for the period August 1, 1994–July 31, 1995 (60 Fed. Reg. 39150). The Department received requests for an administrative review of Rautaruukki's exports from Rautaruukki itself, a producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, and from the petitioners. We initiated the review on September 8, 1995 (60 Fed. Reg. 46817).

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. On April 1, 1996, the Department extended the time limits for the preliminary and final results in this

case. *See Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 61 Fed.Reg. 14291 (April 1, 1996).

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this administrative review constitute one ''class or kind'' of merchandise: certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate. These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.,* flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000, 7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, and 7212.50.0000. 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 is grade X–70 plate. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by the respondent by using standard verification procedures, including on-site 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 verification reports, the public versions of which are available at the Department of Commerce, in Central Records Unit (CRU), Room B099.

Transactions Reviewed

In accordance with section 751(a)(2) of the Act, the Department is required to determine the normal value and export price (EP) of each entry of subject merchandise during the relevant review period.

In determining normal value, based on a review of Rautaruukki's submissions and verification findings, the Department determined that Rautaruukki need not report its home market downstream sales because they would most likely not be used in the calculation of normal value. See *Decision Memorandum on Reporting Downstream Sales,* July 26, 1996.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by the respondent, covered by the description in the *Scope of the Review* section, above, and sold in the home market during the POR, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in Appendix III of the Department's September 14, 1995 antidumping questionnaire.

Rautaruukki's reported control numbers were not prepared in accordance with the characteristics listed in Appendix III of the Department's September 14, 1995 antidumping questionnaire. Specifically, Rautaruukki has reported multiple plate specification codes under a single control number, rather than limiting a single control number to a unique plate specification code. Rautaruukki has also created multiple control numbers for products with the same identical physical characteristics, effectively adding new physical characteristics for beveling and plate manufactured by different processes or having different end uses. As we stated in the *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Finland,* 61 Fed. Reg. 2792, 2795 (January 29, 1996), the Department has no basis upon which to differentiate beveled plate from non-beveled plate for matching and price comparison purposes. Similarly, the Department does not have a basis to differentiate plate manufactured by different processes or having different end uses. Consequently, for these preliminary results, the Department has modified Rautaruukki's submitted control numbers so that they more closely conform to the Department's model match hierarchy. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondent and verified by the Department, modified as described above. We note that for future reviews, Rautaruukki must properly report its control numbers.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate by Rautaruukki to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the export price (EP) to the normal value (NV), as described in the ''Export 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.

Export Price

We used EP as defined in section 772(a) of the Act. We calculated EP based on packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for brokerage and handling, international freight, marine insurance, other transportation expenses, certification charges and credit.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, at the same level of trade as the export price (see level of trade analysis below).

Where appropriate, we deducted rebates, discounts, credit expenses, inland freight, certification charges, warranty and packing.

In comparisons to EP sales, we also increased NV by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of

the Act. We made adjustments to NV for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. In accordance with the Department's practice, where for the most similar product match the difference in merchandise adjustment for any product comparison exceeded 20 percent, we based NV on constructed value (CV).

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) at pages 829–831, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate normal values based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales. When the Department is unable to find sales 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 different levels of trade. *See, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy,* 61 Fed. Reg. 30326, 30330 (June 14, 1996) (''Pasta from Italy'').

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A), if sales at different levels of trade are compared, the Department will adjust the normal value to account for the difference in level of trade if two conditions are met. The differences between the level of trade 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 normal value is determined.

In its questionnaire responses, Rautaruukki stated that there were no differences in its selling activities by customer categories within each market. In order to independently confirm the absence of separate levels of trade within or between the U.S. and home markets, we examined Rautaruukki's questionnaire responses for indications that Rautaruukki's function as a seller differed among customer categories. Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, and the SAA at 827, in identifying levels of trade for directly observed (*i.e.*, not constructed) export price and normal values sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price, before any adjustments. Where possible, we further examined whether each selling function was performed on a substantial portion of sales. (*See Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,* 61 Fed. Reg. 7308, 7348 (February 27, 1996).

Rautaruukki sold to a single customer in the U.S. market. In the home market, Rautaruukki sold to three categories of customers and performed the same selling functions between sales to all its home market customers. Thus, our analysis of the questionnaire response leads us to conclude that sales within each market and between markets are not made at different levels of trade. Accordingly, we preliminarily find that all sales in the home market and the U.S. market are made at the same level of trade. Therefore, all price comparisons are at the same level of trade and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) is unwarranted.

Cost of Production Analysis

Based on the fact that the Department had disregarded sales in the LTFV investigation (the most recently completed investigation/review of Rautaruukki at the time of initiation in this review) pursuant to a cost investigation on Rautaruukki's home market sales, the Department found reasonable grounds in this review, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, to believe or suspect that respondent made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise. As a result, the Department initiated an investigation to determine whether the respondent made home market sales during the POR at prices below their COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. Before making any fair value comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below.

A. Calculation of COP

We calculated the COP based on the sum of respondent's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. Based on our verification of Rautaruukki's cost response, we adjusted Rautaruukki's reported COP and CV to reflect certain adjustments to the cost of manufacturing and the general and administrative expenses.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

We used the respondent's weighted-average COP, as adjusted (see above), for the period July 1994 to June 1995. We compared the weighted-average COP figures to home market sales of the foreign like product as required under section 773(b) of the Act. In determining whether to disregard home-market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether (1) within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities, and (2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges, rebates, discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C), where less than 20 percent of respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we found that sales of that model were made in ''substantial quantities,'' in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, and were not at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. When we found that below-cost sales had been made in ''substantial quantities'' and were not at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, we disregarded the below-cost sales in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. Where all sales of a specific product were at prices below the COP, we disregarded all sales of that product, and calculated NV based on CV.

D. Calculation of CV

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A, U.S. packing costs, interest expenses and profit as reported in the U.S. sales database. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent 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 home market selling expenses. Where we compared CV to EP, we deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses and added the weighted-average U.S. product-specific direct selling expenses, in accordance with Section 353.56(a)(2) of the Department's regulations.

Facts Available

We preliminarily determine that, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, the use of facts available is appropriate because the Department was unable to verify Rautaruukki's COP and CV data for certain home market plate products. (See the Department's cost verification report.) As a result of the failure on the part of Rautaruukki to provide verifiable COP and CV data for

certain home market products, the Department was unable to perform a cost test for home market sales of these products or to calculate a difference in merchandise adjustment. Accordingly, we must make our preliminary determination based on facts otherwise available, pursuant to section 776(a) of the Act. For those U.S. sales for which the best match is a home market sale for which we were unable to perform the cost test or to calculate a difference in merchandise adjustment, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 32.80 percent, as NV for comparison to these U.S. sales. This is the rate for Rautaruukki that was calculated in the LTFV investigation for the period January 1, 1992, through June 30, 1992. For those U.S. sales for which the best match included both sales for which we were unable to perform the cost test or to calculate a difference in merchandise adjustment and sales for which we were able to calculate the cost test or a difference in merchandise, we calculated a weighted-average margin. The weighted-average margin was calculated using a facts available component and a calculated component. *See* the Department's analysis memorandum (for Rautaruukki) dated September 24, 1996.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a ''fluctuation.'' In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined as a general matter that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation existed, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate. However, for the preliminary results in this review we have not determined that a fluctuation exists, and we have not substituted the benchmark for the daily rate, in accordance with Policy Bulletin 96–1 (Import Administration Exchange Rate Methodology).

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
Rautaruukki Oy	8/1/94–7/31/95	16.60

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. 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 business day thereafter. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in those 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 its analysis of issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, not later than 180 days after the date of publication of this notice.

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this antidumping duty review for all shipments of certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Finland, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of review; (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the LTFV investigation or previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate from the LTFV investigation; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the original LTFV 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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 36.00 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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.

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

Dated: September 25, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–25536 Filed 10–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS-P

[A–351–817]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Brazil: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the respondent, Companhia Siderúrgica de Tubarão (CST), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Brazil. This review covers the above manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is August 1, 1994, through July 31, 1995.

We preliminarily determine the dumping margin for CST to be 2.58 percent during the POR. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding should also submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 4, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen Kramer or Linda Ludwig, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade