

rate from the first administrative review is sufficient for the purposes for which BIA is intended. There is no indication that Silarsa is engaging in injurious price discrimination to a greater degree than at the time of the first administrative review. Should such evidence come to light in a future review, and the Department determines that a BIA rate is appropriate, it is not precluded from evaluating the rate in order to assign one that would accomplish the purpose for which a BIA rate is intended.

Finally, we also disagree with the petitioners' argument that PRC Sodium Thiosulfate supports the conclusion that a higher BIA rate is warranted in this instance. In PRC Sodium Thiosulfate the Department reconsidered the BIA rate because the petitioner presented evidence that costs and prices in the industry had changed substantially since the investigation, making the BIA rate from the investigation "no longer sufficiently adverse." See PRC Sodium Thiosulfate: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 58 FR 12934 (March 8, 1993). That is not the case in this review. There is no evidence on the record that costs or prices have changed, let alone changed substantially, that would warrant a reconsideration of the current BIA rate assigned to Silarsa.

As explained above, the present BIA rate is sufficiently adverse to Silarsa. Therefore, since we see no reason to deviate from our well-established two-tiered BIA methodology in this review, we have continued to use 24.62 percent as Silarsa's first-tier BIA rate for this third administrative review.

Final Results of Review

As a result of comments received, we have not revised our preliminary results. Therefore, we determine that the following margin exists for the period September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (per-cent)
Silarsa, S.A.	24.62

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1)

The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company, Silarsa, will be the rate listed above; (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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 17.87 percent, the "all other" rate established in the final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *American Alloys, Inc. v. United States*, Ct. No. 91-10-00782, p. 4 (April 7, 1995).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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 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 notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibilities concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO. Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)(B)) as amended and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: December 7, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-30606 Filed 12-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 120895A]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) will convene a public meeting of its Shrimp Advisory Panel (AP).

DATES: The meeting will be held on January 9, 1996 beginning at 9:00 a.m. and will conclude at 4:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the New Orleans Airport Hilton Hotel, 901 Airline Highway, Kenner, LA; telephone: 504-469-5000.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 5401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 331, Tampa, FL 33609.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Antonio B. Lamberte, Economist; telephone: 813-228-2815.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The AP will review scientific information on the cooperative shrimp closure with the State of Texas, royal red shrimp regulatory amendment (tentative) and comparison of shrimp vessel effort and bycatch characterization effort. The AP consists principally of commercial shrimp fishermen, dealers and association representatives. The AP will develop recommendations to the Council regarding the extent of the closure of Federal waters off Texas in 1996 concurrent with the closure of Texas waters. If Amendment 8 to the Shrimp Fishery Management Plan is approved, the AP will review a regulatory amendment that would provide a procedure for setting a total allowable catch of royal red shrimp. The AP will also develop recommendations regarding the level of effort in the shrimp fishery after reviewing information that compares levels of effort collected using the current method and effort collected from the bycatch characterization study.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Anne Alford at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) by January 2, 1996.