

Dated: July 31, 1997.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 97-20755 Filed 8-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Economic Analysis

Proposal To Collect Information on the Initial Report on a Foreign Person's Direct or Indirect Acquisition, Establishment, or Purchase of a U.S. Business Enterprise

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before October 6, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Engelmeier, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instruments and instructions should be directed to: R. David Belli, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, BE-50(OC), Washington, D.C. 20230 (Telephone: 202-606-9800).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The Initial Report on a Foreign Person's Direct or Indirect Acquisition, Establishment, or Purchase of the Operating Assets, of a U.S. Business Enterprise, Including Real Estate (Form BE-13) and the Report by a U.S. Person Who Assists or Intervenes in the Acquisition of a U.S. Business Enterprise by, or Who Enters Into a Joint Venture with, a Foreign Person (Form BE-14) obtain initial data on new foreign direct investment in the United States. The survey collects identification information on, and limited financial and operating data for, the U.S. entity being established or acquired. It also collects identification information on the new foreign owner. The data are

needed to measure the amount of new foreign direct investment in the United States, monitor changes in such investment, assess its impact on the U.S. economy, and, based upon this assessment, make informed policy decisions regarding foreign direct investment in the United States.

This survey is being revised to bring it into conformity with the proposed design of the BE-12, Benchmark Survey of Foreign Direct Investment in the United States—1997. Beginning with reports covering 1998 transactions, BEA plans to raise the exemption level for reporting to \$3 million (measured by the acquired or established company's total assets) from \$1 million, thereby reducing respondent burden for small companies. A concomitant requirement that a report be filed for all acquisitions of 200 or more acres of U.S. land will not be changed. BEA also proposes to base industry coding of reporting companies on the new North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) in place of the current system, which is based on the U.S. Standard Industrial Classification System. No changes are being proposed for Form BE-14, except that the exemption for reporting is raised to correspond to the new threshold for Form BE-13.

II. Method of Collection

The BE-13 survey must be filed by every U.S. business with over \$3 million of assets or 200 or more acres of U.S. land that is acquired to the extent of 10 percent or more, or is established, by a foreign investor. It is a one-time report that must be filed within 45 days of the acquisition or establishment. An exemption claim must be filed for transactions that do not meet the exemption levels of \$3 million of assets or 200 acres of land. The BE-14 survey is filed by a person who assists in an investment transaction, such as a real estate broker or attorney, or who enters into a U.S. joint venture with a foreign person. Its purpose is to provide BEA with the name and address of the newly established or acquired U.S. company, so that a BE-13 form can be mailed to it for completion.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0608-0035.

Form Number: BE-13/BE-14.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,200 annually.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1½ hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 1,800 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: \$54,000 (based on an estimated reporting burden of 1,800 hours and an estimated hourly cost of \$30).

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: July 31, 1997.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 97-20756 Filed 8-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 912]

Expansion of Foreign-Trade Subzone 183A Dell Computer Corporation; Austin, TX

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, an application from the Foreign Trade Zone of Central Texas, Inc., grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 183, for authority to expand Foreign-Trade Subzone 183A at the Dell Computer Corporation plant in Austin, Texas, was filed by the Board on March 27, 1997 (FTZ Docket 24-97, 62 FR 17147, 4/9/97); and,

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in **Federal Register** and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and

that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to expand Subzone 183A is approved, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 25th day of July 1997.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-20736 Filed 8-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand; Preliminary Results and Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results and partial termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests by respondents Siam Food Products Public Company Ltd. (SFP), The Thai Pineapple Public Company, Ltd. (TIPCO), and Thai Pineapple Canning Industry Corp., Ltd. (TPC), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit (CPF) from Thailand. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is January 11, 1995, through June 30, 1996.

We have preliminarily found that sales of subject merchandise have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit case briefs in this proceeding should provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gabriel Adler, at (202) 482-1442, or Kris Campbell, at (202) 482-3813; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 refer to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 353, as they existed on April 1, 1997.

Background

On July 18, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. See 60 FR 36775. On July 8, 1996, the Department published a notice providing an opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order for the period January 11, 1995, through June 30, 1996. See 61 FR 35712. On July 31, 1996, we received timely requests for review from the following respondents: SFP; TIPCO; TPC; Dole Food Company, Inc., Dole Packaged Foods Company, and Dole Thailand, Ltd. (collectively referred to hereafter as "Dole"); Thai Bonanza International Corp., Ltd. (Thai Bonanza); and Vita Food Factory (Vita Food). On September 5, 1996, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to the six companies that had requested a review.

Thai Bonanza and Vita Food withdrew their requests for review on September 9, 1996, and Dole withdrew its request for review on November 7, 1996. Because there were no other requests for review of these companies from any other interested parties, and because the letters withdrawing the requests for review were timely filed, we are terminating the review with respect to these companies in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5).

On December 12, 1996, Maui Pineapple, Ltd. (the petitioner) alleged that SFP and TPC had each sold the foreign like product at prices below their respective cost of production (COP). On January 13, 1997, we initiated a sales-below-cost investigation with respect to these two companies. We also initiated a COP investigation of sales by TIPCO because we disregarded sales

below the COP in the last completed segment of the proceeding for this company. See "Cost of Production Analysis" below.

On January 29, 1997, we published a notice of postponement of the preliminary results. See 62 FR 4250.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is canned pineapple fruit. For purposes of this review, CPF is defined as pineapple processed and/or prepared into various product forms, including rings, pieces, chunks, tidbits, and crushed pineapple, that is packed and cooked in metal cans with either pineapple juice or sugar syrup added. CPF is currently classifiable under subheadings 2008.20.0010 and 2008.20.0090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). HTSUS 2008.20.0010 covers CPF packed in a sugar-based syrup; HTSUS 2008.20.0090 covers CPF packed without added sugar (i.e., juice-packed). Although these HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope is dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified sales and cost information provided by all three respondents. We used standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities and examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification results are outlined in the verification reports placed in the case file.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used EP or CEP as defined in sections 772(a) and 772(b) of the Act, as appropriate.

TPC

In accordance with sections 772 (a) and (c) of the Act, we calculated an EP for sales where the merchandise was sold directly by TPC to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation, and CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record. In accordance with sections 772 (b), (c) and (d) of the Act, we calculated a CEP for sales that took place after importation into the United States and for which U.S. sales activities, including the setting of prices, took place in the United States through affiliated U.S. resellers. EP and CEP were based on the packed FOB, CIF, or delivered price to unaffiliated