

manufactures the merchandise after receipt of a final confirmed order and sells directly to its customers in the comparison market and in the United States on a CIF basis. Viraj reported that it performs identical selling functions in both the third country comparison market and the United States. These selling functions include soliciting inquiries from customers, negotiating with customers, and procurement of export orders. Further, Viraj reported that it did not provide other sales-related services on any of its sales, such as inventory maintenance, technical advice, warranty services, or advertising. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude that Viraj performs identical selling functions in the comparison market and the United States and that a LOT adjustment is not warranted.

For a further discussion of the Department's LOT analysis with respect to Viraj, see *Memorandum to the File: Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Review for Viraj*, pp. 1-2, September 2, 1998.

#### *Panchmahal*

In both the home market and the United States, Panchmahal reported one level of trade. Panchmahal reported that in the home market, it made sales from its plant directly to end users and to retailers. The company also stated that it made sales in the home market through consignment agents and branch offices to end users and retailers. Its sole sale to the United States was to a reseller. Panchmahal stated that it sells directly to its buyers in the comparison market and in the United States on a CIF basis on the receipt of a confirmed order. We examined the company's selling functions and saw that it did not provide any sales-related services on any of its sales, other than transporting the merchandise to the Indian port. Because there are no differences between the selling functions on sales made to either end users or retailers in the home market, sales to both of these customer categories represent a similar stage of marketing. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude that end users and retailers constitute one level of trade in the home market. Furthermore, because Panchmahal's sale to the United States involved the identical selling functions as those in the comparison market, we consider it to be made at the same level of trade. Therefore, no LOT adjustment for Panchmahal is appropriate. For a further discussion of the Department's LOT analysis with respect to Panchmahal, see *Memorandum to the File: Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary*

*Results of Review for Panchmahal*, pg. 2, September 2, 1998.

#### **Preliminary Results of Review**

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period December 1, 1996, through November 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Mukand, Ltd. ....	0.00
Viraj .....	0.00
Panchmahal .....	0.00

The Department will disclose calculations performed in connection with this preliminary determination within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 2 days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the case briefs. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**; rebuttal briefs may be submitted not later than five days thereafter. 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 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of this review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on the merchandise subject to review. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. If applicable, we will calculate an importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. This is equivalent to dividing the total amount of antidumping duties, which are calculated by taking the difference between statutory NV and statutory EP, by the total statutory EP value of the sales compared, and adjusting the result by the average

difference between EP and customs value for all merchandise examined during the POR.

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 reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for Mukand, Viraj, and Panchmahal, no deposit will be required; (2) 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 (3) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 48.80 percent, the "All Others" rate made effective by the original investigation.

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 351.402(f)(2) 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 determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Date: August 28, 1998.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-24168 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

### **International Trade Administration**

#### **Finch University of Health Sciences; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument**

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and

Constitution Avenue, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C.

**Docket Number:** 98-036. **Applicant:** Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL 60064-3095.

**Instrument:** (4 each) Right and Left Hand Micromanipulators, Model SM-20. **Manufacturer:** Narishige Co., Japan.

**Intended Use:** See notice at 63 FR 41227, August 3, 1998.

**Comments:** None received. **Decision:** Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

**Reasons:** The foreign instrument provides the required stability, geometry and sensitivity and ability to change one electrode without disturbing operation of the others. The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum dated August 17, 1998 that: (1) This capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose, and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Frank W. Creel,**

*Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 98-24170 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

**Docket Number:** 98-032. **Applicant:** Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139. **Instrument:** Fish Tank System. **Manufacturer:** Klaus-Jurgen Schwarz, Germany. **Intended Use:** See notice at 63 FR 36879, July 8, 1998.

**Comments:** None received. **Decision:** Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is

intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

**Reasons:** The foreign instrument provides: (1) An optimal design based on small tank size, simple operation and uniformity for genetic analysis of early development using large numbers of zebra fish and (2) compatibility with an existing tank system. These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Frank W. Creel,**

*Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 98-24169 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-423-806]

#### Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Belgium Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain steel products from Belgium for the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be *de minimis*. For information on the net subsidy for non-reviewed companies, please see the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 9, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lorenza Olivas or Gayle Longest, Office CVD/AD Enforcement VI, 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

On August 7, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 42749) the countervailing duty order on certain steel products from Belgium. On August 4, 1997, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" (62 FR 41925) of this countervailing duty order. We received a timely request for review and we initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996, on September 25, 1997 (62 FR 50292).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers Fabrique de Fer de Charleroi, S.A. (Fabfer). This review covers 28 programs.

On April 13, 1998, we extended the period for completion of the preliminary results pursuant to section 751(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. See *Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Belgium; Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (63 FR 17990). The deadline for the final results of this review is no later than 120 days from the date on which these preliminary results are published in the **Federal Register**.

On August 13, 1998, Fabfer submitted a claim that the research and development loan provided under the Economic Expansion Law of 1970 constitutes a non-actionable green-light subsidy and therefore is not countervailable. The Government of Belgium (GOB) provided no support for this claim, and information in the record is not sufficient to determine whether the program under which the loan is provided satisfies the criteria in section 771(5B)(i) of the Act. Given the timing of Fabfer's claim and the deficiency of required information, we are denying Fabfer's request for green-light status in this review.

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. All citations to the Department's regulations reference 19 CFR Part 351 *et. seq.*, *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997), unless otherwise indicated.