limited to a specific enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. Petitioners acknowledge this finding, but argue that there is no indication that the Department considered a 1985 amendment to Law 46/82. Specifically, Article 14 of the law was amended at that time to authorize government assistance for several additional agricultural and/or industrial purposes. Innovations in pasta production is one of the newly enumerated purposes. Petitioners also claim that under Article 14 pasta may have received a disproportionate share of the benefits.

Petitioners have not provided a sufficient basis to believe that the program has changed since the determination of non-countervailability in *GOES*. Because the period of investigation for *GOES* was 1992, the Department's specificity analysis did take into account any changes to Law 46/82 made in 1985. In addition, petitioners have not provided a sufficient basis to believe that pasta received a disproportionate share of the benefits under this program. Therefore, we are not including Law 46/82 grants in our investigation.

5. Miscellaneous Italian Government Subsidies

Petitioners have reviewed the annual reports of four Italian pasta producers and noted numerous references to items such as "subsidies" which petitioners were unable to link to any alleged programs. Petitioners recognize that many of these items might be covered by programs which have been alleged; however, they request that we investigate them under a separate program of Miscellaneous Italian Government Subsidies.

The allegation does not provide a basis for investigating these as subsidy programs. However, to the extent that our investigation includes the four relevant producers as respondents, we will make appropriate inquiries about the items in question.

6. European Investment Bank ("EIB") Loans

Petitioners allege that Italian pasta producers may have received countervailable loans from the EIB.

These loans have been investigated in past investigations and, most recently, were found not countervailable in the *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products From Belgium* (58 FR 37273, 37285, July 9, 1993). In that case the Department found at verification that the EIB provides loans to numerous sectors in all parts of the various EU countries. However, petitioners have not addressed this finding. Petitioners have neither alleged that the circumstances have changed nor that pasta producers may have received a disproportionate share of the benefits provided by this program. For these reasons, we are not including EIB loans in our investigation.

7. European Agriculture Fund ("EAGGF") Aid

The EAGGF is a Structural Fund initiative similar to the ERDF and the ESF. However, while the ERDF and ESF have been investigated previously, the EAGGF has not. Petitioners allege that because these funds are allocated specifically to agriculture, pasta producers may have received benefits.

However, petitioners have provided no information regarding the types of benefits available under this program. In addition, section 355.43(b)(8) of our Proposed Regulations, which reflects our past practice, states that a program cannot be found specific solely on the basis of being limited to agriculture. For these reasons, we are not including EAGGF aid in our investigation.

B. Turkey

We are including in our investigation the following programs alleged in the petition to have provided subsidies to producers of the subject merchandise in Turkey:

- 1. The Support and Price Stabilization Fund
- 2. Payments for Exports Shipped on Turkish Ships
- 3. Export Promotion Program
- 4. Pre-Shipment Export Loans
- 5. Export Credit Program
- 6. Tax Exemption for Export Earnings/ Advance Refunds of Tax Savings
- 7. Export Credit Through Foreign Trade Corporate Companies Rediscount Credit Facility
- 8. Normal Foreign Currency Export Loans
- 9. Performance Foreign Currency Export Loans
- 10. Export Credit Insurance
- Regional Subsidy Programs

 a. Investment Allowances
 b. Mass Housing Fund Levy Exemptions
 - c. Customs Duty Exemption
 - d. Rebate of VAT on Domestic Goods
 - e. Postponement of VAT on
 - Imported Goods
 - f. Additional Refunds of VAT
 - g. Other Tax Exemptions
 - h. Payment of Certain Obligations of Firms Undertaking Large Investments
 - i. Corporate Tax Deferral
 - j. Subsidized Turkish Lira Credit Facilities

- k. Subsidized Credit for Proportion
- of Fixed Expenditures
- 1. Subsidized Credit in Foreign Currency
- m. Land Allocation
- 12. General Incentives Program a. Exemptions from Customs Duties
- b. Investment Allowances
- c. Employee Tax Exemptions
- d. Investment Financing Fund
- e. Building Construction Licensing Charge Immunity
- f. Tax, Duty and Charge Exemptions
- g. Foreign-Exchange Allocation h. Other Tax, Duty and Charge
- h. Other Tax, Duty and Charge Exemptions
- i. Interest Spread Return
- j. Deferment of VAT on Machinery and Equipment
- k. Incentive Premium on Domestically Obtained Goods
- 1. Incentive Credit for Investment Goods Manufacturers
- m. Wharfage Exemption
- n. Authorization to Seek Foreign Financing
- o. Interest Řebates on Export Financing
- 13. Exemption from Mass Housing Fund Levy (Duty Exemptions)

We are not including in our investigation the following programs alleged to be benefitting producers of the subject merchandise in Turkey:

1. Direct Payments to Exporters of Wheat Products to Compensate for High Domestic Input Prices; Resource Utilization Support Fund; Preferential Export Financing

Petitioners have asked the Department to investigate three programs which, based on all evidence, were terminated prior to 1994. Petitioners argue that the Government of Turkey ("GOT") has a practice of revoking and reinstituting programs, and as such, the Department should investigate whether these programs were available in 1994.

Petitioners' assertion that the GOT revokes and reinstitutes programs is based solely on the revision of the Export Tax Rebate and Supplemental Tax Rebate Programs described in *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Acetylsalicylic Acid (Aspirin) from Turkey* (52 FR 24404, July 1, 1987) ("*Aspirin*"). We do not believe this action provides a sufficient basis for us to conclude that the Turkish government has reinstated the programs at issue here. Therefore, we are not including these three programs in our investigation.

2. Direct Payments to Exporters of Wheat Products Based on Tonnage Exported

Petitioners allege that in December 1994, the GOT introduced a program to