antidumping duty order is not likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury.

Scope of the Antidumping Findings and Antidumping Duty Order

The product covered by these determinations is titanium sponge. Titanium sponge is chiefly used for aerospace vehicles, specifically, in the construction of compressor blades and wheels, stator blades, rotors, and other parts in aircraft gas turbine engines. Imports of titanium sponge are currently classifiable under subheading 8108.10.50.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). The HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes. Our written description of the scope of these antidumping findings and antidumping duty order remains dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determination by the Commission that revocation of these antidumping findings and antidumping duty order is not likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, pursuant to section 751(d)(1) of the Act, the Department hereby revokes the antidumping findings on titanium sponge from Kazakstan, Russia and Ukraine and the antidumping duty order on titanium sponge from Japan. The revocation is effective August 13, 1998, the date of publication in the Federal Register of the Commission's determination. The Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate without regard to dumping duties entries of the subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse on or after August 13, 1998 (the effective date), and to discontinue collection of cash deposits on entries of the subject merchandise as of the same date. For all entries of the subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse prior to the effective date of revocation (i.e., through August 12, 1998), the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties at either (1) the rate determined in the context of ongoing administrative reviews of imports of titanium sponge from Kazakstan and Russia during the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997 [62 FR 50292, September 25, 1997], (2) the rate determined in the context of a review conducted in response to an appropriately filed request [August is the opportunity month for Kazakhstan, Russia, and Ukraine; November is the opportunity month for Japan], or (3) in the absence of a request for review, at the duty deposit rate in effect at the time of entry. In addition, the Department is terminating the sunset reviews of these antidumping findings and antidumping duty order.

Dated: August 26, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration. [FR Doc. 98–23465 Filed 8–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Texas A&M University; 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, NW, Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 98–022. Applicant: Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843–2474. Instrument: Robot, Model X8000. Manufacturer: Genetix Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 63 FR 25015, May 6, 1998.

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 a unique multi-tasking robot for selecting recombinant bacterial colonies containing DNA inserts from noninfectious sources based on routing blue/white selection at a rate of 3500 colonies per hour. The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum dated June 8, 1998 that (1) this capability is 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.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff. [FR Doc. 98–23382 Filed 8–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Application to Amend Certificate.

SUMMARY: The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs ("OETCA"), International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, has received an application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review. This notice summarizes the proposed amendment and requests comments relevant to whether the amended Certificate should be issued.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. A Certificate of Review protects the holder and the members identified in the Certificate from state and federal government antitrust actions and from private, treble damage antitrust actions for the export conduct specified in the Certificate and carried out in compliance with its terms and conditions. Section 302(b)(1) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.6(a) require the Secretary to publish a notice in the Federal Register identifying the applicant and summarizing its proposed export conduct.

Request for Public Comments

Interested parties may submit written comments relevant to the determination whether an amended Certificate should be issued. If the comments include any privileged or confidential business information, it must be clearly marked and a nonconfidential version of the comments (identified as such) should be included. Any comments not marked privileged or confidential business information will be deemed to be nonconfidential. An original and five copies, plus two copies of the nonconfidential version, should be submitted no later than 20 days after the date of this notice to: Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, Room 1800H, Washington, DC 20230. Information submitted by any person is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). However, nonconfidential

versions of the comments will be made available to the applicant if necessary for determining whether or not to issue the Certificate. Comments should refer to this application as "Export Trade Certificate of Review, application number 92–5A001."

The Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc.'s ("AIA") original Certificate was issued on April 10, 1992 (57 FR 13707, April 17, 1992) and previously amended on September 8, 1992 (57 FR 41920, September 14, 1992); October 8, 1993 (58 FR 53711, October 18, 1993); November 17, 1994 (59 FR 60349, November 23, 1994); and June 26, 1995 (60 FR 36262, July 14, 1995). A summary of the application for an amendment follows.

Summary of the Application

Applicant: Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc. ("AIA"), 1250 I Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Contact: Mac S. Dunaway, Legal Counsel, Telephone: (202) 862–9700.

Application No.: 92–5A001. Date Deemed Submitted: August 19, 1998.

Proposed Amendment: AIA seeks to amend its Certificate to:

1. Add the following companies as new "Members" of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(1)of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(1)): The Aerostructures Corporation, Nashville, TN (Controlling Entity: The Carlyle Group, Washington, DC); Alliant Techsystems Incorporated, Hopkins, MN; Barnes Aerospace, Windsor, CT (Controlling Entity: Barnes Group, Inc., Bristol, CT); CMS, Inc., Tampa, FL (Controlling Entity: Daimler-Benz North American Corporation, New York, NY); Ducommun Incorporated, Long Beach, CA; Dynamic Engineering Incorporated, Newport News, VA; Esterline Technologies, Bellevue, WA; Intertubine Corporation, Peabody, MA (Controlling Entity: NV Interturbine, The Netherlands); Kistler Aerospace Corporation, Kirkland, WA; Litton Industries, Inc., Woodland Hills, CA; MOOG Inc., East Aurora, NY; Pacific Scientific Company, Duarte, CA; Robinson Helicopter Company, Inc., Torrance, CA; Rockwell Collins, Inc., Cedar Rapids, IA (Controlling Entity: Rockwell International Corporation, Costa Mesa, CA); Rolls-Royce North America, Inc., Reston, VA (Controlling Entity: Rolls Royce plc, London, England); Triumph Controls, Inc., North Wales, PA (Controlling Entity: Triumph Group, Inc., Wayne, PA); United Defense, L.P., Arlington, VA (Controlling Entity: The Carlyle Group, Washington, DC); Veridian Corporation,

Alexandria, VA; and Woodward Governor Company, Rockford, IL.;

2. Delete as "Members" of the Certificate: Ceridian Corporation, Minneapolis, MN; Chrysler Technologies Corporation, Arlington, VA; E-Systems, Inc., Dallas, TX; FMC Corporation, Chicago, IL; Heath Tecna Aerospace Co., Kent, WA; Hercules Incorporated, Wilmington, DE; Loral Vought Systems Corporation, Dallas, TX; Lord Corporation, Erie, PA; Martin Marietta Corporation, Bethesda, MD; McDonnell Douglas Corporation, Berkeley, MO; Rockwell International Corporation, Seal Beach, CA; Rohr, Inc., Chula Vista, CA; Teledyne, Inc., Los Angeles, CA; Texas Instruments Incorporated, Dallas, TX; Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Pittsburgh, PA; and Williams International Corporation, Walled Lake, MI; and

3. Change the listing of the company name for the current "Members" cited in this paragraph to the new listing cited in parenthesis as follows: GEC-Marconi Electronic Systems Corporation (Marconi North America Inc.); General Motors Hughes Electronics (Hughes Electronics Corporation); Lockheed Corporation (Lockheed Martin Corporation); and Thiokol Corporation (Cordant Technologies Inc.).

Dated: August 26, 1998.

Morton Schnabel,

Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–23354 Filed 8–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904 NAFTA Panel Reviews; Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On August 17, 1998, the CINSA, S.A. de C.V. and Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the final Antidumping Duty Administrative Review made by the International Trade Administration, respecting Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 38,373), on July 16, 1998. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA–MEX–98–1904–04 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James R. Holbein, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on August 17, 1998, requesting panel review of the final antidumping duty administrative review described above.

The Rules provide that:

(a) A Party or interested person may challenge the final determination in whole or in part by filing a Complaint in accordance with Rule 39 within 30 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Complaint is September 16, 1998);

(b) A Party, investigating authority or interested person that does not file a Complaint but that intends to appear in support of any reviewable portion of the final determination may participate in the panel review by filing a Notice of Appearance in accordance with Rule 40 within 45 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Notice of Appearance is October 1, 1998); and

(c) The panel review shall be limited to the allegations of error of fact or law, including the jurisdiction of the investigating authority, that are set out in the Complaints filed in the panel review and the procedural and