respondent asserts that its allocation methodology is not distortive or inaccurate. Finally, respondent notes that the Department reviewed Giant's interest revenue calculation at verification and found no discrepancies.

DOC Position: We found that Giant's record keeping system does not readily allow Giant's to report transaction-specific interest revenue. Therefore, we are allocating interest revenue only to those sales with no early payment discounts. Regarding bad debt expense, we agree with respondents that it was correctly reported as an indirect selling expense. We recommend making no adjustment to bad debt.

Overlord

Comment 38: Declaration Fees

At verification, we found that Overlord under-reported declaration fees paid to the Hong Kong government on U.S. shipments of bicycles through Hong Kong. Petitioners contend that the Department should increase the reported expenses by the average percentage by which the fees were under-reported.

DOC Position: We agree and have made the appropriate calculations for purposes of the final determination.

Universal

Comment 39: Methodology for Reporting Prices of Market-Economy Inputs

According to the petitioners, Universal's price reporting methodology is unacceptable. Based on Universal's unwillingness to provide information prior to the verification regarding the methodology it used to derive market-economy prices, and the inaccuracies discovered during the Department's price variation tests and component traces, the petitioners propose that, as facts available, the Department increase prices for all market-sourced components by the greatest disparity between reported and verified prices in the price variation tests.

Universal argues that the Department should not increase the prices reported for market-economy inputs because the majority of the input prices examined by the Department were accurately reported and the few discrepancies noted by the Department were only minor errors. Additionally, Universal contends that its reported prices are already overstated because these prices are charged by Universal's affiliated supplier. Universal maintains the Department verified that reported component prices, which are charged by Universal's affiliated supplier, are more than the prices the affiliated supplier pays to purchase those components from unrelated suppliers.

DOC Position: Universal failed to report the weight-average price of market-economy inputs purchased during the POI. Rather, Universal reported market-economy prices based on selected invoices which company officials considered to be representative of the prices paid during the POI. According to Universal officials, the company employed this reporting methodology because during the POI prices for most components remained stable. We tested ten components and found that four were under-reported by a small percentage. We disagree with petitioners that we should increase all of Universal's prices by the largest observed variation. This situation does not warrant the use of adverse acts available. Rather, as facts available, we applied the average variance to all purchases. *See,* Concurrence Memo for Final Determination.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

For Bo An, Giant, Hua Chin, and Overlord, we calculated a zero or *de minimis* margin. Consistent the with *Pencils,* merchandise that is sold by these producers but manufactured by other producers will not receive the zero margin. Instead, such entries will be subject to the ''PRC-wide'' margin.

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act and 735(c)(1), we are directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of bicycles from the PRC, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the NV exceeds the export price as shown below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until May 7, 1996. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percentage
Bo An	0.00
CBC	3.25
CATIC	13.67
Giant	0.97
Hua Chin	0.00
Merida	7.44
Overlord	0.00
Chitech	2.05
Universal	11.06
PRC-wide rate	61.67

PRC-Wide Rate

The PRC-Wide rate applies to all entries of subject merchandise except for entries from exporters that are identified individually above.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. As our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will, within 45 days, determine whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or canceled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order directing Customs officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation. This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act.

Dated: April 22, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–10555 Filed 4–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Intent To Revoke Countervailing Duty Order

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of intent to revoke countervailing duty order.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public of its intent to revoke the countervailing duty order listed below. Domestic interested parties who object to revocation of this order must submit their comments in writing not later than the last day of May 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 30, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Albright or Cameron Cardozo, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department may revoke a countervailing duty order if the Secretary of Commerce concludes that it is no longer of interest to interested parties. Accordingly, as required by the Department's regulations (at 19 C.F.R. 355.25(d)(4)), we are notifying the public of our intent to revoke the countervailing duty order listed below, for which the Department has not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months.

In accordance with section 355.25(d)(4)(iii) of the Department's regulations, if no domestic interested party (as defined in sections 355.2 (i)(3), (i)(4), (i)(5), and (i)(6) of the regulations) objects to the Department's intent to revoke this order pursuant to this notice, and no interested party (as defined in section 355.2(i) of the regulations) requests an administrative review in accordance with the Department's notice of opportunity to request administrative review, we shall conclude that the countervailing duty order is no longer of interest to interested parties and proceed with the revocation. However, if an interested party does request an administrative review in accordance with the Department's notice of opportunity to request administrative review, or a domestic interested party does object to the Department's intent to revoke pursuant to this notice, the Department will not revoke the order.

COUNTERVAILING DUTY ORDER

Brazil:	
Iron construction Castings (C–351–504).	05/15/86 51 FR 17220

Opportunity To Object

Not later than the last day of May 1996, domestic interested parties may object to the Department's intent to revoke this countervailing duty order. Any submission objecting to the revocation must contain the name and case number of the order and a statement that explains how the objecting party qualifies as a domestic interested party under sections 355.2 (i)(3), (i)(4), (i)(5), or (i)(6) of the Department's regulations.

Seven copies of any such objections should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

This notice is in accordance with 19 CFR 355.25(d)(4)(i).

Dated: April 19, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–10553 Filed 4–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P–M

Minority Business Development Agency

Business Development Center Application: State of Mississippi

AGENCY: Minority Business Development Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Executive Order 11625 and 15 U.S.C. 1512, the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) is soliciting competitive applications under its Minority Business Development Center (MBDC) program to operate a statewide Rural Minority Business Development Center (RMBDC) for approximately a 3-year period, subject to agency priorities, recipient performance and the availability of funds.

The RMBDC will provide business development services to the rural minority business community to help establish and maintain viable rural minority businesses. To this end, MBDA funds organizations to identify and coordinate public and private sector resources on behalf of rural minority individuals and firms; to offer a full range of management and technical assistance to rural minority entrepreneurs; and to serve as a conduit of information and assistance regarding rural minority business. The RMBDC will operate throughout the State of Mississippi. The headquarters of the RMBDC will be located in Jackson, Mississippi. The award number for this RMBDC will be 04–10–96005–01.

DATES: The closing date for applications is May 31, 1996. Applications must be received in the MBDA Headquarters' Executive Secretariat on or before May 31, 1996. A pre-application conference to assist all interested applicants will be held on May 15, 1996 at 10:00 a.m., at the following address: U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency, 401 West Peachtree Street, N.W., Room 1715, Atlanta, Georgia 30308–3516.

ADDRESSES: Completed application packages should be submitted to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency, Executive Secretariat, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room 5073, Washington, D.C. 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION AND AN APPLICATION PACKAGE, CONTACT: Robert Henderson, Regional Director, Atlanta Regional Office, (404) 730–3300.

Proper identification is required for entrance into any Federal Building.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Contingent upon the availability of Federal funds, the cost of performance for the first budget period (13 months) from September 1, 1996 to September 30, 1997, is estimated at $277,835. A 30-day start-up period will be added to their first budget period, making it a 13-month award. The application must include a minimum cost-share of $41,675 (15%) of the total project cost, through non-Federal contributions. The Federal share, to be in the amount of $236,160, includes $5,760 for an annual audit fee. Cost-sharing may be in the form of cash contributions, client fees, in-kind contributions or combinations thereof.

The funding instrument for this project will be a cooperative agreement. Competition is open to individuals, non-profit and for-profit organizations, state and local governments, American Indian tribes and educational institutions.

Applications will be evaluated on the following criteria: the experience and capabilities of the firm and its staff in addressing the needs of the business community in general and, specifically, the special needs of minority businesses, individuals and organizations (50 points); the resources available to the firm in providing rural/urban business development services (10 points); the firm's approach (techniques and methodologies) to performing the work requirements included in the application (20 points); and the firm's estimated cost for providing such assistance (20 points). An application must receive at least 70% of the points assigned to each evaluation criteria category to be considered programmatically acceptable and responsive. Those applications determined to be acceptable and responsive will then be evaluated by the Director of MBDA. Final award selections shall be based on the number of points received, the demonstrated responsibility of the applicant, and the determination of those most likely to further the purpose of the MBDC program. Negative audit findings and recommendations and unsatisfactory performance under prior Federal awards may result in an application not being considered for award. The applicant with the highest points score will not necessarily receive the award.

The RMBDC shall be required to contribute at least 15% of the total project cost through non-Federal