(1994). The charges included foreign inland freight, foreign inland insurance, and foreign brokerage and handling. We also made deductions in accordance with section 773(a)(4)(B) of the Act (1994), where appropriate, for bank charges.

We made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for differences in credit expenses, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2) (1994). For third-country sales with missing payment dates, we used the date of the preliminary determination of this investigation in order to calculate imputed credit.

TIPCO

We based FMV on FOB prices charged to unrelated customers in Germany. We deducted post-sale movement charges from FMV under the circumstance-of-sale provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a) (1994). The charges included foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, port charges, and liner fees. We also made deductions in accordance with section 773(a)(4)(B) of the Act (1994), where appropriate, for bank charges.

We made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for differences in credit expenses, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2) (1994).

Dole

We calculated FMV based on packed, ex-warehouse, C&F port of import, ex-quay and delivered prices to unrelated customers.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(4)(B) of the Act (1994) and 19 CFR 353.56(a)(2)(1994), we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments for unrelated commissions as well as credit, bank, and merchandising expenses. We deducted post-sale movement charges from FMV under the circumstance-of-sale provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a) (1994). The charges included freight expenses, foreign brokerage and handling, European Community (EC) duty and EC brokerage and handling. For movement expenses where it was not possible to determine from information on the record how the expense directly applies to the sales under investigation (i.e., movement expenses associated with sales made on an ex-warehouse or delivered basis), we assumed all expenses to be indirect selling expenses for purposes of the preliminary determination. We deducted from FMV the weighted-average third country indirect selling expenses including, where appropriate, pre-sale movement expenses, warehousing and inventory carrying costs in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b)(2)(1994). In accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(b) (1) and (2) (1994), because commissions were paid in both the United States and third country markets, the deduction for third country indirect selling expenses was capped by the sum of U.S. indirect selling expenses. We recalculated Dole's reported credit expense in instances where Dole had not reported a shipment and/or payment date because the merchandise had not yet been shipped and/or paid for at the time of the filing of this response. For those sales missing both a shipment and payment date, we used the average credit days of all transactions with a reported shipment and payment date. For those sales missing a payment date only, we inserted the date of the preliminary determination.

As noted above, in accordance with sections 773(a)(1) and 771(16) of the Act (1994), we excluded from our analysis certain reported sales of subject merchandise which was not produced by Dole.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act (1994), we will verify information used in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act (1994), we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of CPF from Thailand, as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigation'' section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** (except those that represent sales by Dole). The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated preliminary dumping margins, as shown below. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturers/producers/exporters	Margin percent
Dole	0.30 (De minimus)
TIPCO	7.81
SAICO	9.55
Malee	1.12
All Others	6.73

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act (1994), we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether imports of the subject merchandise are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry before the later of 120 days after the date of the preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination.

Public Comment

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B–099, within ten days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38 (1994), case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than May 1, 1995, and rebuttal briefs no later than May 3, 1995. A hearing, if requested, will be held on May 8, 1995, at the U.S. Department of Commerce in Room 4830. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours prior to the scheduled time. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b) (1994), oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act (1994) and 19 CFR 353.15(a)(4) (1994).

Date: January 4, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–687 Filed 1–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–201–003]

Ceramic Tile From Mexico; Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Amended Final Result of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On August 8, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) submitted to the Court of International Trade (CIT) the final results of redetermination pursuant to a remand in *Ceramica Regiomontana,*

S.A., et al. (Slip Op. 94–74, May 5, 1994). On September 14, 1994, the CIT affirmed our redetermination (Slip Op. 94–142). In accordance with that affirmation, we are hereby amending the final results of the countervailing duty administrative review of ceramic tile from Mexico, covering the period January 1, 1986, through December 31, 1986. During the above period, the country-wide rate for ceramic tile for the companies that are not *de minimis* is 4.02 percent *ad valorem*.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest or Kelly Parkhill, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone:(202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 9, 1989 (54 FR 19930), the Department published the final results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on ceramic tile from Mexico, covering the period January 1, 1986, through December 31, 1986. For purposes of the final results, the Department calculated the ''all others'' countervailing duty rate by weight averaging the benefits received by companies, excluding zero rate and *de minimis* firms. The resultant countervailing duty rate applicable to non-*de minimis* firms was 4.28 percent *ad valorem*.

On May 5, 1994, the CIT, in *Ceramica Regiomontana S.A.* v. *United States* (Slip Op. 96–74, May 5, 1994), remanded to the Department for redetermination the final results of this review. The CIT ordered the Department to ''recalculate the country-wide countervailing duty rate applicable to non-*de minimis* firms by weight averaging the benefits received by all companies by their proportion of exports to the United States, inclusive of zero rate firms and *de minimis* firms pursuant to the methodology set forth in *Ipsco* v. *United States*, 899 F.2d 1192 (Fed. Cir. 1990).''

Final Remand Results

On August 8, 1994, the Department filed with the CIT its final results of redetermination upon remand, in which the Department complied with the CIT's order and recalculated the ''all others'' countervailing duty rate by weight averaging the benefits received by all of the 42 companies, including 36 *de minimis* or zero rate firms subject to the 1986 review. The resultant ''all others'' rate of 4.02 percent *ad valorem*, which included *de minimis* and zero rate firms, was assigned to the remaining six non-*de minimis* firms—Barros Tlaquepaque, Ceramica Regiomontana, Ceramica y Pisos Industriales de Culiacan, Ima Regiomontana, Industrias Intercontinental and O.H. Internacional.

Final Results of Redetermination

On September 14, 1994, the CIT affirmed the Department's redetermination upon remand (Slip Op. 94–142). In accordance with that affirmation, we are hereby amending the final results of the administrative review for the period January 1, 1986, through December 31, 1986. We determined that the ''all others'' countervailing duty rate for companies that are not *de minimis* is 4.02 percent *ad valorem*.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

This notice is in accordance with section 516(a)(e) of the Act.

Dated: December 29, 1994.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–688 Filed 1–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

U.S. Geological Survey, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 94–124. *Applicant:* U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, CO 80225. *Instrument:* Open Split Interface Attachment for Mass Spectrometer. *Manufacturer:* Finnigan MAT, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 59 FR 59212, November 16, 1994.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* This is a compatible accessory for an instrument previously imported for the use of the applicant. The accessory is pertinent to the intended uses and we know of no domestic accessory which can be readily adapted to the previously imported instrument.

Pamela Woods,

Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 95–691 Filed 1–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–F

University of California, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 94–125. *Applicant:* University of California, San Diego, CA 92121. *Instrument:* Seasor System. *Manufacturer:* Chelsea Instruments Ltd., United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 59 FR 59212, November 16, 1994.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides an instrument platform that can be towed to depths of 400 m at speeds to 10 knots with a dive/climb rate to 2.5 m/second. A university research department advised December 14, 1994 that (1) these capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Pamela Woods,

Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 95–692 Filed 1–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–F