

manufacture and the resulting figure was added to the constructed value in the petition's margin calculation. Selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit in the petition's margin calculations for pure magnesium from Ukraine were also recalculated accordingly to account for factory overhead. In addition, the Indonesian surrogate value for one of the missing input values was also figured in the revised margin calculation. The petitioners requested that the missing material values be based on material values originally reported in the petition. However, the petition's unit value for one of the material inputs at issue was already determined by the Department to be inappropriate. Accordingly, the Department determined that the surrogate value for the factor more reasonably reflects the value of the factor in the production process.

The other material input in question could not be valued since the petition provided no specific quantity data or description of the factor for determining an appropriate unit value.

#### Addenda to Preliminary Determinations

In our October 27, 1994, preliminary determinations in these proceedings, we stated that we would impose company-specific duty deposit rates on certain non-participating mandatory respondents whose identities were business proprietary and thus could not be disclosed. Subsequent to publication of those determinations, we were informed by the U.S. Customs Service that it could not administer suspension-of-liquidation instructions that involved unidentified companies. Accordingly, we did not assign company-specific deposit rates to these companies; instead, entries of merchandise sold by these companies are subject to the "All Others" deposit rate.

#### Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(2) of the Act, the Department will direct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to require cash deposit or posting of bond on all entries of subject merchandise from Russia and Ukraine for non-cooperative respondents and for "all others" at the newly calculated rates, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension-of-liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The revised company-specific BIA margins for non-cooperative respondents and the "all others" rate as well as Gerald Metals'

revised margin for pure magnesium from Ukraine are as follows:

	Pure magnesium (percent)	Alloy magnesium (percent)
Russia:		
F&S .....	100.25	153.65
W&O Bergmann .....	100.25	153.65
Derek Raphael & Co. ....	100.25	153.65
Marco Trading .....	100.25	153.65
Wogen Group .....	100.25	153.65
Alex .....	100.25	153.65
"All others" .....	94.30	153.65
Ukraine:		
Gerald Metals .....	83.32	
Alusuisse-Lonza .....	104.27	
Derek Raphael .....	104.27	
Marco Trading .....	104.27	
Wogen Group .....	104.27	
Alex .....	104.27	
Mages .....	104.27	
F&S .....	104.27	
"All others" .....	99.81	

#### ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of the amended preliminary determinations. If our final determinations are 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 original preliminary determinations (October 27, 1994) or 45 days after our final determinations.

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

Dated: January 31, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-3133 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-201-504]

#### Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware From Mexico; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment to final results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** We are amending the final results of our administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico, published on January 9, 1995 (60 FR 2378). The amended notice reflects the correction of a ministerial

error made in the calculation of cost of production in the final results. We are publishing this amendment in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 8, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lorenza Olivas or Rick Herring, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2786.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The review covered two exporters, Cinsa, S.A., and Acero Porcelanizado, S.A. (APSA), and the period December 1, 1990 through November 30, 1991. The Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results on February 11, 1994 (59 FR 6616), and the final results on January 9, 1995 (60 FR 2378) of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico (58 FR 43327).

##### Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of porcelain-on-steel cooking ware, including tea kettles, which 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 (HTS) item number 7323.94.00. Kitchenware currently entering under HTS item number 7323.94.00.30 is not subject to the order. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

##### Amendment of Final Results

On January 13, 1995, Cinsa, S.A., alleged that the Department made a clerical error in calculating the cost of production. Cinsa argues that, in accounting for the effects of inflation on depreciation expense, the Department overstated the cost of production by applying an incorrect factor to fixed overhead expense.

Petitioner argues that the Department accurately implemented its intention in calculating the cost of production.

We agree with Cinsa. We reviewed our calculation and have determined that the computer instructions applied an incorrect factor to total fixed overhead. Our intent was to account only for the effects of inflation on depreciation expense because all other