

Dated: April 2, 1996.
T. Jeremy Gunn,
General Counsel.
[FR Doc. 96-8526 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6118-01-P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the California Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the California Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 3:00 p.m. and adjourn at 6:00 p.m. on Friday, April 19, 1996, at the Holiday Inn Union Square, 480 Sutter Street, San Francisco, CA 94108. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the status of on-going projects and plan future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Michael Carney, 213-580-7900, or Philip Montez, Director of the Western Regional Office, 213-894-3437 (TDD 213-894-3435). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, April 3, 1996.
Carol-Lee Hurley,
Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.
[FR Doc. 96-8806 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6335-01-P

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Nebraska Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Nebraska Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 6:00 p.m. and adjourn at 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 1, 1996, at Ramada Inn-Airport, 2301 N.W. 12th, Lincoln, Nebraska 68521. The purpose of the meeting is to hold orientation for new Advisory Committee members and plan future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Melvin L. Jenkins, Director of the Central Regional Office, 913-551-1400 (TDD 913-551-1414). Hearing-impaired

persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, April 3, 1996.
Carol-Lee Hurley,
Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.
[FR Doc. 96-8805 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6335-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 811]

Approval for Manufacturing Authority (Cosmetics and Related Products) Within Foreign-Trade Zone 46; Springdale, Ohio

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

After consideration of the application submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Greater Cincinnati Foreign-Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 46 (filed 12-19-94), requesting authority on behalf of Avon Products, Inc., to manufacture cosmetics and related products under zone procedures within FTZ 46, the Board, finding that the requirements of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act and the Board's regulations would be satisfied, and that the proposal would be in the public interest if approval is subject to certain conditions, approves the application subject to the following conditions:

1. The authority for manufacturing under zone procedures is approved for an initial 3-year period (to 4-1-99), subject to extension upon review.

2. Avon shall report to the FTZ Board annually on any use of zone procedures that results in the application of a finished product Customs duty rate that is lower than any of its components, which merchandise had not been specifically listed in the application.

Approval is subject to the FTZ Act and the FTZ Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of March 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:
John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.
FR Doc. 96-8682 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Lapse of Authority for Inactive Foreign-Trade Zones; Correction

In notice document 96-7778 appearing on page 14290 in the issue of Monday, April 1, 1996, make the following correction:

On page 14291, the first paragraph should read:

Comments Invited: Comments are invited in writing until April 29, 1996, from grantees and interested parties as to any of the information, procedures or guidelines outlined in this notice. They should be addressed to: Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: April 3, 1996.
John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 96-8825 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

International Trade Administration

[A-421-805]

Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide From the Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide from the Netherlands.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on aramid fiber formed of poly para-phenylene terephthalamide (PPD-T aramid) from the Netherlands in response to requests by respondent, Akzo Nobel Fibers Inc. and Aramid Products V.o.F. (Akzo) and petitioner, E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company. This review covers sales of this merchandise to the United States

during the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Donald Little or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

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).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register the antidumping duty order on PPD-T aramid from the Netherlands on June 24, 1994 (59 FR 32678). On June 6, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 29821) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on PPD-T aramid from the Netherlands covering the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1), Akzo and petitioner requested that we conduct an administrative review of Akzo's sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on July 14, 1995 (60 FR 36260). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are all forms of PPD-T aramid from the Netherlands. These consist of PPD-T aramid in the form of filament yarn (including single and corded), staple fiber, pulp (wet or dry), spun-laced and

spun-bonded nonwovens, chopped fiber and floc. Tire cord is excluded from the class or kind of merchandise under review. This merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 5402.10.3020, 5402.10.3040, 5402.10.6000, 5503.10.1000, 5503.10.9000, 5601.30.0000, and 5603.00.9000. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of PPD-T aramid, Akzo, and the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

Constructed Export Price

The Department based its margin calculation on constructed export price (CEP), as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was first sold to unrelated purchasers after import into the United States.

We based CEP on packed, ex-U.S. warehouse and delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. The Department made the following adjustments to prices used to establish CEP, pursuant to section 772(c) of the Act. The price was increased for repacking pursuant to section 772(c)(1) and reduced for movement expenses (international freight, brokerage and handling, U.S. duties, domestic inland freight and insurance) pursuant to section 772(c)(2). The price used to establish CEP was also reduced by an amount for the following expenses incurred in selling the subject merchandise in the United States pursuant to section 772(d)(1): discounts, rebates, credit, warranty, technical services, and inventory carrying costs and other indirect selling expenses. Pursuant to section 772(d)(3), the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Akzo's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. Because Akzo's aggregate volume of the home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV for Akzo, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act.

On January 31, and February 7, 1996, petitioner submitted comments identifying its concerns regarding Akzo's cost calculations. In a letter dated February 28, 1996, Akzo commented on petitioner's submissions, and provided explanations for each of petitioner's points. In order to properly examine the cost issue, we would require that Akzo provide substantial additional cost information, including data from the period of investigation. Moreover, we would need time to analyze and verify this information. Given the above requirements, we have determined that petitioner did not provide its comments on the issue in time for the Department to adequately examine the issue in this review.

Cost of Production Analysis

In the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of Akzo, we disregarded sales found to be below the cost of production (COP). Therefore, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales below the COP may have occurred during this review period. Thus, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, in this review we initiated a COP investigation of Akzo.

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 Akzo's cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing 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. We relied on the home market sales and COP information provided by Akzo in its questionnaire responses.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of PPD-T aramid were made at prices below COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We compared model-specific COP to the reported home market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C), where less than 20 percent of Akzo's sales of a given model were at prices less than 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 home market sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded only the below-cost sales where such sales were found to be made within an extended period of time (in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act) and 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). We found that, for certain types of PPD-T aramid, more than 20 percent of the home market sales were sold at below-cost prices within the period of review in substantial quantities. We therefore find that these below-cost sales were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time, and were at prices which did not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. As a result, we excluded these below cost sales and 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 PPD-T aramid for which there were no above-cost sales available for matching purposes, we compared CEP to constructed value (CV).

Price-to-Price Comparisons

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2), we compared the CEPs of individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product where there was an adequate number of sales at prices above COP, as discussed above. We based NV on packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the home market. We made adjustments, where applicable, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where applicable, we made adjustments to home market price for discounts, rebates, inland freight and insurance. To adjust for differences in circumstances of sale between the home market and the United States, we reduced home market price by an amount for home market credit expenses. In order to adjust for differences in packing between the two markets, we increased home market price by U.S. packing costs and reduced it by home market packing costs. Prices were reported net of value added taxes (VAT) and, therefore, no deduction for VAT was necessary. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

Level of Trade/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 Uruguay Round Agreements Act, at 829-831, 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 in 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 the difference 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 NV sale. 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: (1) NV is at a different level of trade, and (2) the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for a level of trade adjustment from the U.S. sale. Also, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B), to qualify for a CEP offset, the level of trade in the home market must also constitute a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP sale.

Akzo reported one level of trade and one channel of distribution in the home market (direct to end users/converters). For the U.S. market, Akzo reported that all sales were made on a CEP basis. The level of trade of the U.S. sales is determined by the adjusted CEP rather than the starting price. The adjusted CEP sales do not reflect the selling functions to end users/converters, such as customer sales contacts, technical services, and inventory maintenance. The home market sales reflect these additional selling functions performed for direct sales to end users/converters. Therefore, the selling functions performed for CEP sales are sufficiently different than for home market sales to consider CEP sales and home market sales to be at different levels of trade.

Because we compared these CEP sales to home market sales at a different level of trade, we examined whether a level of trade adjustment may be appropriate.

In this case, Akzo only sold at one level of trade in the home market; therefore, there is no basis upon which Akzo can demonstrate a consistent pattern of price differences between levels of trade. Further, we do not have information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns on Akzo's sales of other products and there are no other respondents or other record information on which such an analysis could be based.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making a level of trade adjustment but the level of trade in the home market is a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP sale, a CEP offset is appropriate. Akzo has claimed a CEP offset. We applied the CEP offset to NV or CV, as appropriate.

We based the CEP offset amount on the amount of the home market indirect selling expenses. We limited the home market indirect selling expense deduction by the amount of the indirect selling expenses incurred on sales to the United States, in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(D).

Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Akzo's cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, SG&A and profit incurred and realized in connection with production and sale of the foreign like product, and U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A), we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by Akzo in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. We used the costs of materials, fabrication, and G&A as reported in the CV portion of Akzo's questionnaire response. We used the U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales portion of Akzo's questionnaire response. We based selling expenses and profit on the information reported in the home market sales portion of Akzo's questionnaire response. See *Certain Pasta from Italy; Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 61 FR 1344, 1349 (January 19, 1996). For selling expenses, we used the average of above-cost per-unit home market selling expenses weighted by the total quantity sold. For actual profit, we first calculated the difference between the home market sales value and home market COP for all above-cost home market sales, and divided the sum of these differences by

the total home market COP for these sales. We then multiplied this percentage by the COP for each U.S. model to derive an actual profit.

We derived the CEP offset amount from the amount of the indirect selling expenses on above-cost sales in the home market. We limited the home market indirect selling expense deduction by the amount of the indirect selling expenses incurred on sales to the United States.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of CEP and NV, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufac- turer/exporter	Period	Margin
Akzo	12/16/93–5/31/95	21.31

Parties to the 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 publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of PPD-T aramid from the Netherlands entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate 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, 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; and (3) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 66.92 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (59 FR 32678, June 24, 1994).

These deposit rates, 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.

Dated: March 29, 1996.
Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration.
[FR Doc. 96-8683 Filed 4-8-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-428-801]

Ball Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof, From Germany; Final Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On February 8, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) issued preliminary results in the 1994-1995 new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof, from Germany (ball bearings) (61 FR 4763). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is December 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995 (the POR).

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results and no comments were received. Therefore, the final

results remain unchanged from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 9, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas O. Barlow or Michael Rill, 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) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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).

Background

On February 8, 1996, the Department issued preliminary results (61 FR 4763) of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings from Germany (54 FR 20900, May 15, 1989). The preliminary results indicated that Miniaturkugellager GmbH (MKL) sold subject merchandise at not less than normal value during the POR. We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results.

The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 353.22 of its regulations.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of ball bearings and parts thereof. These products include all antifriction bearings that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10,