computers and related devices, printers, electronic test and measurement devices, electronic medical products, and related electronic products and components. A number of components are purchased from abroad (an estimated 40% of value on manufactured products), including printed circuit boards, silicon wafers, rectifiers, integrated circuits, memory modules, CD-ROM drives, disk drives, scanners, hard drives, keyboards, monitors/displays (CRT and LCD type), LEDs, speakers, microphones, belts, valves, bearings, plastic materials, industrial chemicals, sensors, filters, resistors, transducers, fuses, plugs, relays, ink cartridges, toner cartridges, switches, fasteners, cards, transformers, DC/electric motors, magnets, modems, batteries, cabinets, power supplies, cables, copper wire, power cords, optical fiber, casters, cases, labels, and packaging materials (1997 duty range: free-14.2%).

Zone procedures would exempt Hewlett-Packard from Customs duty payments on foreign components used in export production. On its domestic sales, Hewlett-Packard would be able to choose the lower duty rate that applies to the finished products (free-13.2%) for the foreign components noted above. The application indicates that the savings from zone procedures would help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and three copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is August 29, 1997. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to September 15, 1997.

A copy of the application and the accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230

U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, Suite 550, 704 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dated: June 20, 1997.

John J. DaPonte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–17053 Filed 6–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–504]

Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware From Mexico: Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 30, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katherine Johnson or Mary Jenkins, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone, (202) 482–4929 or (202) 482–1756, respectively.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise covered by this review is porcelain-on-steel cookware, including tea kettles that do not have self-contained electric heating elements. All of the foregoing are constructed of steel and are enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses. This merchandise is currently classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) subheading 7323.94.00. Kitchenware currently entering under HTSUS subheading 7323.94.00.30 is not subject to the order. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Amendment of Final Results

On May 12, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico (62 FR 25908). This review covered Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. (Cinsa) the exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is December 1, 1993, through November 30, 1994.

On May 13, 1997, counsel for petitioner, General Housewares Corporation, filed an allegation of ministerial errors with regard to the final results in this review. We also received allegation of ministerial errors from counsel for respondent on May 16, 1997. On May 20, 1997, respondent submitted comments regarding petitioner's allegation of ministerial errors and on May 23, 1997, petitioner submitted comments regarding respondent's allegation of clerical errors (*see* May 28, 1997, memorandum to Louis Apple for a detailed description of petitioner's and respondent's allegations and the Department's responses). All submissions from both parties were filed in a timely manner.

Petitioner's Allegations

Petitioner alleged that:

1. The Department added an incorrect amount for profit in the constructed value (CV) calculation.

DOC Response

We agree that, in the calculation program for CINSA, we inadvertently transposed the sequence of commands to calculate the profit amount to be added to CV. We have corrected the ministerial error for the amended final results.

2. The final results computer program performed separate cost tests for first- and second-quality merchandise of each model.

DOC Response

Petitioner has raised a methodological issue rather than a ministerial issue in reference to its cost test allegation. The record indicated that second quality POS cookware is normally sold as a physically different product group in a different channel of trade from first quality cookware. Accordingly, we concluded that combining first quality and second quality sales for cost comparisons would not accurately reflect Cinsa's selling practices for such merchandise. Since our calculation methodology properly reflects our intention, we have not made any changes for these final results.

Respondent's Allegations

Respondent alleged that:

1. The Department improperly limited its calculation of CV profit earned from above-cost home market sales, rather than all home market sales of the subject merchandise.

DOC Response

In accordance with section 353.28(d) of the Department's regulations, we have considered the programming for the calculation of profit an unintentional ministerial error and have made a correction for the amended final results. *In the* Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube from

Turkey, 62 FR 16547 (April 7, 1997), the case cited by petitioner in objecting to such a change, the Department's intention was to limit the application of a change in policy. In the instant case, however, the Department's calculation of profit for CV was unintentionally based on a methodology called for in the new definition of ''ordinary course of trade'' found at 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) using only above-cost sales, rather than the pre-URAA methodology which applies to this proceeding.

2. The Department improperly used ''neutral'' best information available (BIA) in calculating a margin for Cinsa's sales of heavy gauge (HG) cookware in lieu of using ENASA's home market sales of HG cookware.

DOC Response

Respondent's argument does not reflect a ministerial error. As stated in the notice, we did not collapse Cinsa and ENASA for purposes of this review. During the relevant POR, Cinsa purchased HG cookware from ENASA; Cinsa then resold that cookware to customers in the United States. Only ENASA sold HG cookware in the home market. Because the record contains no information on home market sales by Cinsa of HG cookware to which Cinsa's sales of HG cookware to the United States could be compared, and because an adverse selection of BIA was not warranted under these circumstances, the Department used ''neutral'' BIA for calculating margins for Cinsa's U.S. sales of HG cookware.

3. The Department incorrectly articulated the basis for not initiating the cost investigation for ENASA.

DOC Position

Respondent's argument does not reflect a ministerial error within the meaning of section 735(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The Department's position, as reflected in the *Final Determination,* accurately reflects our rationale for not requesting cost data for Cinsa's sales of HG merchandise produced by ENASA.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Review period	Margin (percent)
Cinsa	12/1/93–11/30/94	6.86

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective, upon publication of this notice of amended final results of review for all shipments of porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate for the firm as stated above; (2) for previously 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, or the original 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 29.52 percent for porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, 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 also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely 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 Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: June 19, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–17050 Filed 6–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–489–501]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube From Turkey

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received a request to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Turkey. This order has a May anniversary date. In accordance with the Department's regulations, we are initiating this administrative review. The review period is from May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 30, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian C. Smith or Kris Campbell, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–1766 or (202) 482–3813, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 19, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a list of antidumping and countervailing duty cases with May order anniversary dates for which we had received timely requests for review. In addition, during May 1997, we received a timely request from the U.S. petitioners to initiate an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel pipe and tube from Turkey. This case was inadvertently omitted from the June 19, 1997, initiation notice. In accordance with sections 19 C.F.R. 353.22(c) and 355.22(c), we are initiating an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Turkey. The Department is not initiating an administrative review of any exporters and/or producers who were not named in the review request