PROPOSED REVISIONS TO FISCAL YEAR 1997 AMP

Material	Units	Quantity
Chromium, Ferro	SDT	35,000
Diamond Dies, Small PCs.	CT	25,473
Fluorspar, Acid Grade	SDT	180,000
Fluorspar, Metallurgical.	SDT	50,000
Quinidine	Av Oz	750,000
Quinine	Av Oz	750,000
Silicone Carbide	ST	9,000
Vegetable Tannin Extract, Chestnut.	LT	7,500
Vegetable Tannin Extract, Quebrac.	LT	10,000
Vegetable Tannin Extract, Wattle.	LT	10,000

The following list of new materials is presently under consideration by the Congress for disposal authority in both FY 1997 and FY 1998. The Committee is seeking public comment on the potential market impact of the sale of these materials in the event that Congress does grant such disposal authority.

PROPOSED NEW MATERIAL DISPOSAL AUTHORITY FOR FY 1997 AND FY 1998

Material	Units	FY 1997 Quantity	FY 1998 Quantity
Aluminum.	ST	62,881	62,881
Cobalt	LBCO	6,000,000	6,000,000
Columbium, Ferro.	LBCB	60,000	100,000
Germanium.	KG	4,000	4,000
Indium	TROZ	35,000	35,000
Palladium.	TROZ	15,000	15,000
Platinum.	TROZ	10,000	10,000
Rubber	LT	125,000	125,000
Tantalum Carbide Powder.	LBTA	2,000	2,000
Tantalum Minerals.	LBTA	100,000	100,000
Tantalum Oxide.	LBTA	20,000	20,000

The Committee requests that interested parties provide written comments, supporting data and documentation, and any other relevant information on the potential market impact of the sale of any commodity in the above three lists. Although comments in response to this Notice must be received by November 1, 1996 to ensure full consideration by the Committee, interested parties are encouraged to submit additional comments and supporting information at any time thereafter to keep the Committee informed as to the market impact of the sale of the AMP commodities. Public comment is an important element of the Committee's market impact review process.

Public comments received will be made available at the Department of Commerce for public inspection and copying. Material that is national security classified or business confidential will be exempted from public disclosure. Anyone submitting business confidential information should clearly identify the business confidential portion of the submission and also provide a non-confidential submission that can be placed in the public file. Communications from agencies of the United States Government will not be made available for public inspection.

The public record concerning this notice will be maintained in the Bureau of Export Administration's Records Inspection Facility, Room 4525, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482–5653. The records in this facility may be inspected and copied in accordance with the regulations published in Part 4 of Title 15 of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR 4.1 *et seq.*).

Information about the inspection and copying of records at the facility may be obtained from Ms. Margaret Cornejo, the Bureau of Export Administration's Freedom of Information Officer, at the above address and telephone number.

Dated: September 26, 1996.

John A. Richards,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Strategic Industries and Economic Security.

[FR Doc. 96–25156 Filed 10–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–P

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 69–96]

Foreign-Trade Zone 147—Reading, PA Request for Manufacturing Authority Precision Components Corporation (Inc.) (Nuclear Fuel Containment Vessels)

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Foreign-Trade Zone Corporation of Southeastern Pennsylvania, grantee of FTZ 147, pursuant to § 400.28(a)(2) of the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400), requesting authority on behalf of Precision Components Corporation (Inc.) (PCC), to manufacture nuclear fuel containment vessels under zone procedures within FTZ 147. It was formally filed on September 24, 1996.

The PPC plant (400,000 sq.ft. on 12 acres) is located at 500 Lincoln Street within a proposed site of FTZ 147 in the International Trade District of York, in the City of York, Pennsylvania (Docket 3–96, 61 FR 2487, 1–26–96). The PPC plant (448 employees) is used to manufacture nuclear fuel containment vessels (HTSUS# 7309.00.0090, duty rate-1.6%) for the transport and storage of spent radioactive nuclear fuel. Components sourced from abroad (from 28 to 70% of finished product value) include forgings and plates of iron or steel, which are classified under the same HTSUS category as the finished nuclear fuel containment vessels. The application indicates that over 50 percent of the plant's shipments are exported.

Zone procedures would exempt PPC from Customs duty payments on the foreign components used in export production. On its domestic sales, PPC would be able to defer duty payments on the foreign components until the finished vessels are processed for Customs entry, and scrap and waste foreign status material would be exempt from Customs duties. The request 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 December 2, 1996. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period (to December 16, 1996).

A copy of the application and the accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at the following location: Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: September 25, 1996.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–25244 Filed 10–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

[A–421–805]

Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide from the Netherlands; Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of the antidumping duty administrative review; aramid fiber formed of poly para-phenylene terephthalamide from the Netherlands.

SUMMARY: On April 9, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on aramid fiber formed of poly para-phenylene terephthalamide (PPD-T aramid) from the Netherlands. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 2, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Little or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

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). 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).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register the antidumping duty order on PPD–T aramid from the Netherlands on June 24, 1994 (59 FR 32678). On June 6, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 29821) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on PPD–T aramid from the Netherlands covering the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1), Aramid Products V.o.F. (Aramid) and Akzo Nobel Fibers Inc. (collectively ''Akzo'') and petitioner, E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, requested that we conduct an administrative review of Akzo's sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on July 14, 1995 (60 FR 36260). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

On April 9, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results in the Federal Register (61 FR 15766). The Department has now completed the review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are all forms of PPD–T aramid from the Netherlands. These consist of PPD–T aramid in the form of filament yarn (including single and corded), staple fiber, pulp (wet or dry), spun-laced and spun-bonded nonwovens, chopped fiber and floc. Tire cord is excluded from the class or kind of merchandise under review. This merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 5402.10.3020, 5402.10.3040, 5402.10.6000, 5503.10.1000, 5503.10.9000, 5601.30.0000, and 5603.00.9000. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of PPD–T aramid, Akzo, and the period December 16, 1993 through May 31, 1995.

Analysis of the Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received comments from Akzo and petitioner.

Comment 1: The petitioner contends that Akzo's accounting method for goodwill expense resulting from Akzo Nobel N.V.'s (Akzo Nobel's) increased ownership in Aramid significantly understates the amount of these charges included in the company's reported production costs. Most egregious, in petitioner's view, is that Akzo's submission allegedly ignores the normal treatment of goodwill as recorded by Akzo Nobel and, instead, relies on an inappropriate amortization period that is inconsistent with both Dutch generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and international accounting standards. According to petitioner, Akzo's submitted amortization period grossly distorts actual costs by artificially extending the useful lives of certain assets.

The petitioner also notes that certain parts of Akzo's goodwill adjustment relate to items appropriately included in the cost of manufacturing rather than in general expenses as Akzo included them for its submitted costs. Thus, the petitioner maintains, the Department should reclassify amounts related to these items from general expenses to cost of manufacturing and recognize the full amount of each item rather than an amortized portion.

Akzo argues that the submitted amortization of goodwill does not distort its reported costs. Akzo contends that Akzo Nobel properly revalued the assets of Aramid to conform to Akzo Nobel's accounting polices and calculated goodwill based on the revalued amount. Akzo maintains that prior Department practice indicates that goodwill should be amortized over a predetermined useful life. Thus, for submission purposes, Akzo amortized the goodwill over a reasonable period in accordance with U.S. GAAP.

Akzo claims that adjustment to the asset values should not be depreciated over the remaining useful lives of the assets as suggested in the Department's July 11, 1996 memorandum because this method does not conform to Aramid's records. Akzo asserts that the most appropriate methodology to account for the revaluation of assets is through Akzo Nobel's goodwill calculation. However, Akzo states that, should the Department decide to adjust production costs for the revalued assets, then it should exclude the entire amount of amortized goodwill from general expenses.

Department's Position: Due to the proprietary nature of this issue, we have addressed this comment in our September 25, 1996 Cost of Production Analysis Memorandum. We note, however, that we adjusted Akzo's submitted costs to account for the revalued assets. Moreover, in making this adjustment, we excluded the entire amount of the goodwill amortization