discharging two employees. The nonprofit agency successfully performs several other janitorial contracts using people with severe disabilities, and the Government contracting activity waived its opportunity to assess the agency's capability before the service was added to the Procurement List. No blind persons will be involved in cleaning this facility. The Government pays a very small price for the service. While the contractor's refusal to provide sales data prevents the Committee from determining precisely the impact this Procurement List addition will have on the company, the Committee does not believe the impact will be severe, for the reasons just stated.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the commodities and services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the commodities and services listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46–48c and 41 CFR 51–2.4.

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

2. The action will not have a severe economic impact on current contractors for the commodities and services.

3. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

4. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the commodities and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

Accordingly, the following commodities and services are hereby added to the Procurement List:

Commodities

Tape, Electronic Data Processing
7045–01–354–3517

Cover, Helmet, Reversible
8415–00–NIB–0064 (camouflage)
(Requirements for the U.S. Soldier Systems Command, Natick, MA)

Services

Food Service
Goodfellow Air Force Base, TX

Janitorial/Custodial
Veterans Affairs Medical Center
Outpatient Clinic
Pensacola, FL

Janitorial/Custodial
Veterans Center
Roanoke, VA

Medical Transcription
Veterans Affairs Medical Center
Alexandria, LA.

This action does not affect current contracts awarded prior to the effective date of this addition or options that may be exercised under those contracts.

Beverly L. Milkman,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 97–14179 Filed 5–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–605]

Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil: 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 February 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil. This review covers exports of the subject merchandise to the United States by Branco Peres Citrus S.A. (Branco Peres). The period of review (POR) is May 1, 1995 through April 30, 1996. This is the ninth period of review.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the preliminary results. The review indicates that there is no dumping margin for the above producer/exporter during this POR.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 30, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fabian Rivelis or Irina Itkin, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Import Administration-Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3853 or (202) 482–0656, 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 by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act. 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).

Background

On February 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of its administrative review of the Antidumping Duty Order on FCOJ from Brazil (62 FR 5588). The Department has now completed that administrative review in accordance with § 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of FCOJ from Brazil. This merchandise is currently classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) subheading 2009.11.00. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive. The POR is May 1, 1995 through April 30, 1996.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments only from Branco Peres.

Comment 1: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order—In its Notice of Preliminary Results, the Department stated that it was not publishing a Notice of Intent to Revoke for Branco Peres because Branco Peres had not demonstrated that it sold subject merchandise at not less than normal value for three consecutive periods of review, in part because the respondent withdrew its request for review for the previous review period. Branco Peres argues that this rationale is incorrect. Branco Peres asserts that the Department's existing regulations for revocation do not require that there be sales at not less than normal value for three consecutive administrative periods of review, only that the Secretary must conclude that the exporter has ''sold the merchandise at not less than foreign market value for a period of three consecutive years.'' 19

CFR 353.25(a). Therefore, respondent maintains that the fact that it withdrew from the 1994–1995 administrative review is legally irrelevant. Moreover, Branco Peres states that the Department's proposed regulation 351.222(d) makes clear that revocation may be permitted so long as administrative reviews are undertaken in the first and third administrative reviews. Branco Peres maintains that the Department is already implementing the proposed regulations in a number of cases and the clarification set forth in proposed regulation 351.222(d) should apply to the current case.

Branco Peres notes that the revocation issue is moot in the current review because the Department has not yet issued its results of the 1993–1994 review. However, it argues that once the Department issues the result of the 1993–1994 review, and if that result is zero or *de minimis*, revocation will be appropriate under the Department's existing and proposed regulations. In this regard, Branco Peres claims that the liquidation of entries for the 1994–1995 review period demonstrates an absence of sales at not less than normal value for that period. Thus, Branco Peres asserts that the Department's final results for the current review should make clear that revocation is not yet appropriate only because the Department has not yet completed the results of the 1993–1994 review.

DOC Position: We disagree with Branco Peres. We are administering this review under the Department's existing regulations because the new regulations are not yet in effect. Where the existing regulations contain rules which were not overturned or modified by subsequent statutory enactment, the Department does not have discretion to ignore them. 19 CFR 353.25(a). The regulation governing company-specific partial revocations falls into this category. The respondent's suggestion that the Department is ignoring the current regulations and following the proposed regulations is erroneous.

Moreover, although 19 CFR 353.25(a) grants the Department broad discretion in ordering company-specific partial revocations, this discretion may be exercised only where, inter alia, the company in question has ''sold the merchandise at not less than foreign market value for a period of at least three consecutive years.'' In the third review of FCOJ from Brazil, the Department denied revocation for a respondent which had withdrawn from the second period of review. The respondent had argued that three consecutive individual findings of an absence of dumped sales are not required for revocation under 19 CFR 353.25(a). The Department responded that ''it is clear that each period used to justify a revocation under section 353.25(a) must, when considered individually, evidence a lack of sales at less than foreign market value.'' *See Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil; Final Results and Termination In Part of Antidumping Administrative Review; Revocation In Part of the Antidumping Duty Order,* 56 FR 52510, 52513, (October 21, 1991).

The liquidation of entries for the 1994–95 review period, pursuant to the automatic assessment provisions of the regulations, does not constitute evidence of an absence of dumped sales for that period. The Department can conclude that a producer has sold merchandise at not less than fair value for three consecutive years, within the meaning of 19 CFR 353.25(a), only pursuant to administrative reviews of each of the three years.

Final Results of the Review

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

Manufacturer/ exporter	Period	Margin percent-age
Branco Peres	5/1/95–4/30/96	0.00

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of FCOJ from Brazil entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by § 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Branco Peres will be zero percent; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review 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 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 review, the cash deposit rate will be 1.96 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.

This notice serves as a final 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 notice also 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 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: May 22, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 97–14177 Filed 5–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–810]

High-Tenacity Rayon Filament Yarn From Germany; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of changed circumstances antidumping