

where the Department disregarded the highest margin as adverse BIA because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin).

In this case, the Department has preliminarily determined to assign to Rhone Poulenc a margin of 60 percent, the margin calculated in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation using information provided by Rhone Poulenc (see *Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate from France; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 45 FR 77498 (November 24, 1980)). There is no evidence of circumstances indicating that this margin is not appropriate.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily determines that a margin of 60 percent exists for Rhone Poulenc for the January 1, 1995 through December 31, 1995 period.

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. 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 will determine, and the Customs Service will 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upon publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of ASM from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Rhone Poulenc will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for companies not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3)

if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the 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 (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 60 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation (45 FR 77498, November 24, 1980).

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 (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: June 11, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-15464 Filed 6-17-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-412-602]

Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts From the United Kingdom; 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 interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged steel crankshafts from the United Kingdom. This review covers one producer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States for the review period September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the foreign market value (FMV).

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 18, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. David Dirstine or Lyn Johnson, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Background

On September 2, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" (59 FR 45664) of the antidumping duty order on certain forged steel crankshafts from the United Kingdom. We received a request from UES Ltd.-Forgings Division (UEF) to review its sales to the United States. On October 13, 1994, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c) (1994), we initiated an administrative review of this order for UES Ltd.-Forgings Division covering the period September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994 (59 FR 51939).

The Department has now conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are certain forged steel crankshafts. The term "crankshafts," as used in this review, includes forged carbon or alloy steel crankshafts with a shipping weight between 40 and 750 pounds, whether machined or unmachined. These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 8483.10.10.10, 8483.10.10.30, 8483.10.30.10, and 8483.10.30.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Neither cast crankshafts nor forged crankshafts with shipping weights of less than 40 pounds or more than 750 pounds are subject to this review. The HTS item numbers are

provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Such or Similar Merchandise

In determining similar merchandise comparisons pursuant to section 771(18) of the Act, we considered the following physical characteristics, which appear in order of importance: (1) twisted vs. untwisted; (2) number of throws; (3) forging method; (4) engine type; (5) number of bearings; (6) number of flanges; and (7) number of counterweights. We applied weight separately based on a range of plus or minus 20 percent of the weight of the U.S. model. If there were two or more potential home market matches after applying each of the matching criteria, including the 20-percent weight range, we chose the home market model that was closest in weight to the U.S. model. Our reasons for applying weight as we did are outlined in the *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom*, 60 FR 52150, 52151-152 (October 5, 1995).

United States Price

In calculating U.S. price (USP), we used purchase price as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act, because all sales to the first unrelated purchaser took place prior to importation into the U.S. We calculated purchase price based on the packed, c.i.f. price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States.

We made deductions, where appropriate, for ocean freight (which includes foreign inland freight), U.S. duties, marine insurance and U.S. brokerage and handling expenses in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act.

Foreign Market Value

Section 733(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act requires the Department to compare sales in the United States with home market sales of such or similar merchandise made in the ordinary course of trade if the home market is viable. Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we determined that the home market is viable, and it is therefore an appropriate basis for calculating FMV.

Where we used home market sales for comparisons, we calculated FMV based on packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to customers in the United Kingdom. We made deductions, where appropriate, for rebates. We also adjusted for home market movement charges.

Because all price-to-price comparisons involved purchase price sales, we also made circumstance-of-sale (COS) adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses, warranty expenses, customer-requested tooling expenses, and post-sale warehousing expenses in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a). UEF did not claim home market packing expenses since subject merchandise is loaded into bins as part of the production process with no packing material expenses incurred. In accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act, we then added U.S. packing costs to all home market prices.

For certain U.S. products, we found no home market product comparisons after applying the model-matching methodology, the 90/60-day contemporaneity test, and the difference-in-merchandise test. For these products, we based FMV on constructed value (CV) in accordance with section 773(e) of the Tariff Act. We calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's submitted cost of materials, fabrication, selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, U.S. packing and profit. In accordance with sections 773(e)(1)(B) (i) and (ii) of the Act, we included the actual general expenses calculated which exceeded the statutory minimum (ten percent of the cost of manufacturing (COM)). We used the statutory minimum profit, eight percent of the sum of COM and general expenses, because the actual profit amount was less than the statutory minimum.

We made adjustments to CV, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56, for differences in circumstances of sale. These adjustments were made for differences in credit expenses, warranties, and warehousing.

On February 10, 1995, the petitioner, the Krupp Gerlach Company (KGC) submitted an allegation that UES Ltd.-Forgings Division (UEF) sold unmachined subject merchandise in its home market at less than its cost of production (COP) during the period of review. After analyzing the allegation, the Department determined, on January 18, 1996 (see memo to file), that reasonable grounds did not exist to believe or suspect that home market sales were made below COP, as required to initiate a COP investigation under 773(b) of the Act. Therefore, we did not initiate an investigation of sales made below COP for this review period.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP with FMV, we preliminarily determine the following weighted-average margin

for the period September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994:

Producer/Exporter: UEF.

Margin (Percent): .52.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days and interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after publication of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results and may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than 7 days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 7 days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(e). The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in the case or briefs.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirement 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 this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this administrative review (except that no deposit will be required if the margin is zero or *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent); (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior 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 (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 6.55 percent, the adjusted "all others" rate from 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 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 is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22(c)(5)).

Dated: June 10, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-15460 Filed 6-17-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Minority Business Development Agency

Notice; Solicitation of Business Development Center Applications for CHICAGO I and CHICAGO II

SUMMARY: In accordance with Executive Order 11625 and 15 U.S.C. 1512, the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) is soliciting competitive applications from organizations to operate the Minority Business Development Centers (MBDC) listed in this document.

The purpose of the MBDC Program is to provide business development assistance to persons who are members of groups determined by MBDA to be socially or economically disadvantaged, and to business concerns owned and controlled by such individuals. To this end, MBDA funds organizations to identify and coordinate public and private sector resources on behalf of minority individuals and firms; to offer a full range of client services to minority entrepreneurs; and to serve as a conduit of information and assistance regarding minority business.

In accordance with the Interim Final Policy published in the Federal Register on May 31, 1996, the cost-share requirement for the MBDCs listed in this notice has been increased to 40%. The Department of Commerce will fund up to 60% of the total cost of operating an MBDC on an annual basis. The MBDC operator is required to contribute at least 40% of the total project cost (the

"cost-share requirement"). Cost-sharing contributions may be in the form of cash, client fees, third party in-kind contributions, non-cash applicant contributions or combinations thereof. In addition to the traditional sources of an MBDC's cost-share contribution, the 40% may be contributed by local, state and private sector organizations. It is anticipated that some organizations may apply jointly for an award to operate the center. For administrative purposes, one organization must be designated as the recipient organization.

DATES: The closing date for applications for each MBDC is JULY 19, 1996.

PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE: A pre-application conference will be held. For the exact date, time, and location, contact the Chicago Regional Office at (312) 353-0182.

Proper identification is required for entrance into any Federal building.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following are MBDCs for which applications are solicited:

1. *MBDC Application:* Chicago I.
Metropolitan Area Served: Chicago, Illinois.

Award Number: 05-10-96001-01.
For Further Information and an Application Package, Contact: David Vega, Regional Director, at (312) 353-0182.

Contingent upon the availability of Federal funds, the cost of performance for the first budget period (13 months) from October 1, 1996 to October 31, 1997, is estimated at \$460,834. The total Federal amount is \$276,500 and is composed of \$269,756 plus the Audit Fee amount of \$6,744. The application must include a minimum cost share of 40%, \$184,334 in non-federal (cost-sharing) contributions for a total project cost of \$460,834.

2. *MBDC Application:* Chicago II.
Metropolitan Area Served: Chicago, Illinois.

Award Number: 05-10-96003-01.
For Further Information and an Application Package, Contact: David Vega, Regional Director, at (312) 353-0182.

Contingent upon the availability of Federal funds, the cost of performance for the first budget period (13 months) from October 1, 1996 to October 31, 1997, is estimated at \$460,834. The total Federal amount is \$276,500 and is composed of \$269,756 plus the Audit

Fee amount of \$6,744. The application must include a minimum cost share of 40%, \$184,334 in non-federal (cost-sharing) contributions for a total project cost of \$460,834.

Standard Paragraphs

The following information and requirements are applicable to the listed MBDCs: Chicago I and Chicago II.

The funding instrument for this project will be a cooperative agreement. If the recommended applicant is the current incumbent organization, the award will be for 12 months. For those applicants who are not incumbent organizations or who are incumbents that have experienced closure due to a break in service, a 30-day start-up period will be added to their first budget period, making it a 13-month award. 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 knowledge, background and/or 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 (45 points); the resources available to the firm in providing business development services (10 points); the firm's approach (techniques and methodologies) to performing the work requirements included in the application (25 points); and the firm's estimated cost for providing such assistance (20 points). In accordance with Interim Final Policy published in the Federal Register on May 31, 1996, the scoring system will be revised to add ten (10) bonus points to the application of community-based organizations. Each qualifying application will receive the full ten points. Community-based applicant organizations are those organizations whose headquarters and/or principal place of business within the last five years have been located within the geographic service area designated in the solicitation for the award. Where an applicant organization has been in existence for fewer than five years or has been present in the geographic service area for fewer than five years, the individual years of experience of the applicant organization's principals may be applied toward the requirement of five years of organization experience. The individual years of experience must have been acquired in the geographic service area which is the subject of the solicitation. An application must receive at least 70% of the points