

**Comment 15:** The petitioners state that in its test for sales below cost in the home market, the Department neglected to subtract after-sale rebates and freight charges. The petitioners further state that in calculating total cost, the Department neglected to include home market packing expenses.

**Department's Position:** We disagree with the petitioners. After-sale rebates, home market packing expenses, and freight are included in reported costs, and are therefore also included in price for the purpose of the cost test.

**Comment 16:** The petitioners state that the Department failed to add U.S. packing expenses to CV.

**Department's Position:** We disagree with the petitioners; U.S. packing expenses were included in CV for the preliminary results. However, since CV was not used in these final results, this point is moot. Clerical Errors Alleged in the Fifth and Sixth Reviews

**Comment 17:** The petitioners state the Department double-counted after-sale rebates by including them in both direct and indirect selling expenses.

**Department's Position:** We agree with the petitioners, and have amended the final results to remove after-sale rebates from home market indirect selling expenses.

**Comment 18:** The petitioners state that in the 1992-1993 review, the Department failed to include inventory carrying costs in the calculation of U.S. indirect selling expenses.

**Department's Position:** We agree and have added inventory carrying costs to indirect selling expenses for ESP sales.

**Comment 19:** Petitioner states that the Department should increase both the adjustment for different alloys and the adjustment for other differences in merchandise to account for the VAT.

**Department's Position:** We inadvertently failed to increase the adjustments for differences in merchandise and differences in alloys by the VAT rate. We have corrected this oversight for these final results.

### Final Results of Reviews

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, we determine that the following margins exist for Wieland:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Percent margin
Wieland-Werke AG	3/1/90-2/28/91	2.04
	3/1/91-2/28/92	2.36
	3/1/92-2/28/93	0.46

Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the above percentages. The Department shall

instruct the Customs Service to liquidate all appropriate entries.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for Wieland will be zero, since the rate published in the final results of review for the 1993-1994 period is *de minimis*;

(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 these reviews, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (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 conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 8.87%, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also serves as a final 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 the review periods. 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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction. These administrative reviews and this 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 11, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-18397 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-428-821, A-588-837]

### Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, From Germany and Japan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 27, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bill Crow or James Maeder, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0116 and 482-3330, respectively.

### Initiation of Investigations

#### *The Applicable Statute*

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).

#### *The Petitions*

On June 30, 1995, we received petitions filed in proper form by Rockwell Graphic Systems, Inc. and its parent company, Rockwell International Corporation (the petitioner). Supplements to the petitions were received on July 17 and 19, 1995. In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, the petitioner alleges that large newspaper printing presses from Germany and Japan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV) within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

The petitioner has stated that it has standing to file these petitions because it is an interested party, as defined under section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The petitioner also states that it has filed the petitions on behalf of the U.S. industry producing the product that is subject to this investigation.