

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

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of lug nuts from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for Rudong, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for Nantong, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the highest margin ever in the LTFV investigation or in this or prior administrative reviews; (3) for the companies named above which have not been found to have separate rates, China National, Jiangsu, Yangzhou, Ningbo, Shanghai Automobile, and Tianjin, as well as for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate; and (4) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

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: July 1, 1996.  
Robert S. LaRussa,  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*  
[FR Doc. 96-17463 Filed 7-8-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### [A-580-812]

#### **Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above from the Republic of Korea; 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 three respondents and one U.S. producer, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period of May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995. The review indicates that there are no dumping margins for either manufacturer/exporter during this period of review.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price and the normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited 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:** July 9, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas F. Futtner, 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) 482-3814.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

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 May 10, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 27250) the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMs) from the Republic of Korea. On May 10, 1995, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of this antidumping duty order for the period of May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995 (60 FR 24831). We received timely requests for review from three manufacturers/exporters of subject merchandise to the United States: Hyundai Electronics Industries Co. (Hyundai), LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LGS, formerly Goldstar Electron Co., Ltd.), and Samsung Electronics Co. (Samsung). The petitioner, Micron Technologies Inc., requested an administrative review of these same three Korean manufacturers of DRAMS. On June 15, 1995, the Department initiated a review of the above Korean manufacturers (60 FR 31447). The period of review (POR) for all respondents was May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

In addition, on June 26, 1995, we automatically initiated an investigation to determine if Hyundai and LGS made sales of subject merchandise below the cost of production (COP) during the POR based upon the fact that we disregarded sales found to have been made below the COP in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, which was the most recent period for which a review had been completed.

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (Samsung), formerly a respondent in this administrative review, was excluded from the antidumping duty order on DRAMS from Korea on February 8, 1996. *See Final Court Decision and Partial Amended Final Determination: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit and Above From the Republic of Korea*, 61 FR 4765 (February 8, 1996). Accordingly, we terminated this review with respect to Samsung.

### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of DRAMS of one megabit or above from the Republic of Korea (Korea). For purposes of this review, DRAMS are all one megabit and above DRAMS, whether assembled or unassembled. Assembled DRAMS include all package types. Unassembled DRAMS include processed wafers, uncut die and cut die. Processed wafers produced in Korea, but packaged, or assembled into memory modules in a third country, are included in the scope; wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review includes memory modules. A memory module is a collection of DRAMS, the sole function of which is memory. Modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs), single in-line memory modules (SIMMs), or other collections of DRAMS, whether unmounted or mounted on a circuit board. Modules that contain other parts that are needed to support the function of memory are covered. Only those modules which contain additional items which alter the function of the module to something other than memory, such as video graphics adapter (VGA) boards and cards, are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review also includes video random access memory semiconductors (VRAMS), as well as any future packaging and assembling of DRAMS.

The scope of this review also includes removable memory modules placed on motherboards, with or without a central processing unit (CPU), unless the importer of motherboards certifies with the Customs Service that neither it, nor a party related to it or under contract to it, will remove the modules from the motherboards after importation. The scope of this review does not include DRAMS or memory modules that are reimported for repair or replacement.

The DRAMS subject to this review are classifiable under subheadings 8542.11.0001, 8542.11.0024, 8542.11.0026, and 8542.11.0034 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Also included in the scope are those removable Korean DRAMS contained on or within products classifiable under subheadings 8471.91.0000 and 8473.30.4000 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review remains dispositive. The POR is May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995.

### United States Price

In calculating U.S. price, the Department used constructed export price (CEP), as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, when the merchandise was first sold to an unaffiliated U.S. purchaser after importation.

We calculated CEP based on packed, ex-U.S. warehouse prices to unrelated customers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts, rebates, foreign brokerage and handling, foreign inland insurance, air freight, air insurance, U.S. duties, credit expenses, warranty expenses, royalty payments, U.S. commissions, advertising and promotion expenses, foreign banking charges, U.S. subsidiary packing, and U.S. and Korean indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs in accordance with sections 772(c)(2) and 772(d)(1) of the Act. The U.S. price was increased for packing expense in accordance with section 772(c)(1) of the Act. We added duty drawback, where applicable, pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we reduced the United States price by the amount of profit to derive the CEP.

For DRAMS that were further manufactured into memory modules after importation, we deducted all value added in the United States, pursuant to section 772(e) of the Act. The value added consists of the costs of the materials, fabrication, and general expenses associated with the portion of the merchandise further manufactured in the United States, as well as a proportional amount of profit or loss attributable to the value added. Profit or loss was calculated by deducting from the sales price of the memory module all production and selling costs incurred by the company for the memory module. The total profit or loss was then allocated proportionately to all components of cost. Only the profit or loss attributable to the value added was deducted. In determining the costs incurred to produce the memory module, we included materials, fabrication, and general expenses, including selling expenses and interest expenses. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

### Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales of DRAMS in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared respondents' 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 the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like products for all respondents was greater than five percent of the respective aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV for all respondents, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act.

Because LGS made some home market sales to related parties during the POR, we tested these sales to ensure that, on average, the related party sales were at "arms-length". To conduct this test, we compared the gross unit prices of sales to related and unrelated customers net of all movement charges, direct and indirect selling expenses, value-added tax and packing. Based on the results of that test, we discarded from LGS' home market database all sales made to a related party where that related party failed the "arm's-length" test.

We disregarded many of Hyundai's and LGS' sales found to have been made below the COP during the original LTFV investigation, the most recent period for which a review had been completed. Accordingly, the Department, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, initiated COP investigations of both respondents for purposes of this administrative review.

We calculated COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and the cost of all expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed ready for shipment, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We relied on the home market sales and COP information provided by respondents in the questionnaire responses.

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in order to determine whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether, within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we found that sales of that model were

made in "substantial quantities," in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act. We then determined whether the below-cost sales of a given product are 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. If we found that sales had been made in "substantial quantities" and were not at prices which would permit recovery within a reasonable period of time, we disregarded the below-cost sales, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, and based normal value on constructed value (CV).

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on respondents' cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, SG&A and profit incurred and realized in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product, and U.S. packing costs. We used the costs of materials, fabrication, and G&A as reported in the CV portion of the questionnaire response. We used the U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales portion of respondents' questionnaire responses. We based selling expenses and profit on the information reported in the home market sales portion of respondents' questionnaire responses. 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 HM selling expenses weighted by the total quantity of home market sales sold. For actual profit, we first calculated the difference between the home market sales value and home market COP, and divided the difference by the home market COP. We then multiplied this percentage by the COP for each U.S. model to derive an actual profit.

For both respondents, the Department relied on the submitted COP and CV information. There were no adjustments to respondents' reported COP and CV data.

For price-to-price comparisons, we based NV on the price at which the foreign like product is first sold for consumption in the exporting country, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, and to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade, as defined by section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. We compared the U.S. prices of individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product. We calculated NV based on delivered prices to unrelated customers

and, where appropriate, to related customers in the home market. In calculating NV, we made adjustments, where appropriate, for inland freight, inland insurance, discounts, rebates, and Korean brokerage and handling charges.

Both respondents only had CEP sales during the POR. For comparisons to CEP sales, we reduced NV, where appropriate, for home market credit expenses, advertising expenses, royalty expenses, and bank charges in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, due to differences in circumstances of sale. We also reduced NV by packing costs incurred in the home market, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Act. In addition, we increased NV for U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act. We also made further adjustments, when applicable, to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.57 of the Department's regulations.

#### *Level of Trade and CEP Offset*

As set forth in section 773(a)(2)(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 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 normal value 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, in order to determine that there are distinct levels of trade, 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 normal value is determined. When constructed export price is applicable, section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act establishes the procedures for making a constructed export price 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. Also, in accordance

with section 773(a)(7)(B), to qualify for a CEP offset, the level of trade in the home market must constitute a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP sales.

In order to identify levels of trade, the Department must review information concerning selling functions of the manufacturer/exporter. We reviewed the questionnaire responses of both respondents to establish whether there were sales at different levels of trade based on selling functions performed and services offered to each customer or customer class. For both respondents, we identified one level of trade in the home market with direct sales by the parent corporation to the domestic customer. These direct sales were made by both respondents to original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) and to distributors. In addition, all sales, whether made to OEM customers or to distributors, included the same selling functions. For the U.S. market, all sales for both respondents were reported as CEP sales. The level of trade of the U.S. sales is determined for the sale to the affiliated importer rather than the resale to the unaffiliated customer. We examined the selling functions performed by the Korean companies for U.S. CEP sales and preliminarily determine that they are at a different level of trade from the Korean companies' home market sales because the Korean companies engaged in fewer selling functions for the adjusted CEP sales than for their home market sales. For instance, the Korean companies did not engage in any general promotion, marketing activities, or price negotiations for U.S. sales.

Because we compared 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, both respondents only sold at one level of trade in the home market; therefore, there is no basis upon which either respondent 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 based on the respondents' sales of other products and there is no 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 HM is a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP sales, a CEP offset is appropriate. Both respondents claimed a CEP offset. We applied the CEP offset to normal value or constructed value, as appropriate. The level of trade

methodology employed by the Department in these preliminary results of review is based on the facts particular to this review. The Department will continue to examine its policy for making level of trade comparisons and adjustments for its final results of review.

Because both respondents made sales at differing levels of trade in the home market and in the United States, and because we determined it was not possible to quantify the price differences resulting from the differing levels of trade, we made a CEP offset to NV for both respondents pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. The CEP offset consisted of an amount equal to the lesser of the weighted-average U.S. indirect selling expenses and U.S. commissions or home market indirect selling expenses. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

#### *Fair Value Comparisons*

To determine whether sales of DRAMS by respondents to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the CEP to the NV, as described in the "United States Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2), we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

#### *Preliminary Results of the Review*

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the POR:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Hyundai Electronic Industries, Inc.	0.00
LG Semicon Co., Ltd .....	0.00

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of DRAMS from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after publication date of the final results of these

administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Hyundai and LGS, because their weighted-average margins were de minimis, will be zero percent; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original 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 reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 3.85 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.

Interested parties may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice, and may request a hearing within ten days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held as early as convenient for the parties but not later than 44 days after the date of publication or the first work day thereafter. Case briefs or other written comments from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttal comments, limited to issues in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments.

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1)

of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

DATED: June 27, 1996/

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-17462 Filed 7-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### **[A-580-807]**

#### **Polyethylene Terephthalate Film from Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Intent to Revoke the Order in Part, and Termination in Part**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Intent to Revoke the Order in Part, and Termination in Part.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from two respondents and three U.S. producers, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. The review indicates the existence of sales below normal value for certain manufacturers/exporters during the period of review.

We preliminarily determine the dumping margin for Kolon Industries (Kolon) to be [zero or de minimis] percent during the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. Based on three years of sales at not less than normal value (NV), we intend to revoke the order with respect to Kolon if the preliminary results of this review are affirmed in our final results.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States Price and NV.

On June 26, 1996, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25, we issued a revocation of the order with respect to Cheil Synthetics Inc. (Cheil). Accordingly, we are terminating this review of Cheil.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue