on an aggregate basis due to the large number of growers of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we collected information on program usage from the government rather than from individual producers. The GON does not maintain records on the grants provided under this program on a product-specific basis. However, the grants under this program were provided to greenhouse growers, and we allocated the grants over greenhouse sales. Therefore, the Department has not understated the benefits under this program attributable to the subject merchandise.

Comment 4: Petitioner argues that the Department should recalculate the 1994 subsidy flowing from the SES program. Petitioner contends that the amount calculated for the 1994 review was based on the grant amount reported in the original questionnaire response, which was smaller than the total amount reported in the supplemental response.

Department's Position: The Department used the correct amount in calculating the benefit for the review period, which was the amount reported in the original response. The amount reported in the supplemental response was actually the total amount of grants earmarked for the horticultural industry, while the actual amount of grants disbursed was what was reported in the original response. The Department's practice is to countervail the amount of grants actually provided, not the amount awarded. (*See* section 355.44(a) of the *Proposed Regulations.*)

Final Results of Review

In accordance with section 777A(e)(2)(B) of the Act, we calculated a country-wide rate to apply to all producers and exporters of the subject merchandise. For the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, we determine the net subsidy to be 0.43 percent *ad valorem*. As provided for in the Act, any rate less than 0.5 percent *ad valorem* is *de minimis.*

Accordingly, the Department intends to instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise exported on or after January 1, 1994 and on or before December 31, 1994. The Department will also instruct Customs to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties of zero on all shipments of subject merchandise from the Netherlands entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 355.43(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 355.22.

Dated: August 30, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–23231 Filed 9–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 960801215–6215–01]

RIN 0693–XX22

Laboratory Accreditation Working Group: Proceedings of Open Forum

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: A single copy of NIST Special Publication SP–902, ''Proceedings of the Open Forum on Laboratory Accreditation'' may be requested from the NIST Office of Standards Services. Multiple copies may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents.

DATES: Request for a single copy will be honored by NIST until the supply is exhausted.

ADDRESSES: At NIST: Office of Standards Services, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Building 820, Room 282, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, telephone 301–975–4000, e-mail jbaker@nist.gov, or facsimile 301–963–2871. At Superintendent of Documents: P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250, telephone 202–512–1800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judith Baker, Office of Standards Services, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Building 820, Room 282, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, telephone 301–975–4000.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NIST SP–902, ''Proceedings of the Open Forum on Laboratory Accreditation'' includes presented papers and discussions at a meeting on the proposed development of a U.S. laboratory accreditation infrastructure, held at NIST on October 13, 1995.

The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and ACIL (formerly American Council of Independent Laboratories) requested that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) work with them in an informal Laboratory Accreditation Working Group (LAWG) to evaluate the current situation in laboratory accreditation in the United States. This group sponsored a Forum on October 13, 1995, to hear reports from various sectors and to arrive at some consensus on the need to improve the current situation and infrastructure for laboratory accreditation in the United States. Sectors included laboratories, accreditors, manufacturers, government (both federal and states), standards organizations, and international trade experts.

In the Forum, reports from the different sectors focused on the need for agreement on common procedures, reduction of overlap and duplicate programs, and development of coordination among sectors. The invited speakers presented examples of the high price in both time and money, as well as in lack of domestic (and international) acceptance of accreditation, resulting from the multiple, often duplicative accreditation required by organizations in government and the private sector. Examples given by many of the speakers included:

—Multiple assessments of a single laboratory with similar testing protocols applied each time, increased total cost, and frequent conflicts among requirements;
—Programs tailored to narrow customer demands but lacking recognition by other bodies;
—Non-uniformity of requirements and lack of reciprocity among accreditors and those requiring accreditation;
—Failure to recognize U.S. accreditation in international trade; and
—Problems stemming from the need for compliance with regulatory programs without consideration of comparable private sector accreditation.

Keynote addresses provided:

—Historical review of prior efforts to streamline the laboratory accreditation infrastructure;
—An overview of the effect of failure to accept testing by accredited laboratories on commercial trade relations, especially limits on the free trade of products designed for acceptance in overseas markets due to lack of common procedures and mutual recognition agreements; and
—A description of procedures used by both the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) and

European Council on Accreditation of Laboratories (EAL) organizations.

The LAWG Steering Group presented a ''Vision'' statement. This informal group consists of the three sponsoring organizations and representatives of each of the stakeholders: Laboratories, accreditors, and the government and private sector entities that require accreditation of laboratories for their own purposes. The Vision statement was intended to provide a philosophy for developing broad cooperation on accreditation procedures and infrastructure that would be much more effective than the present chaotic system and which would meet the needs of all those affected by laboratory accreditation. A set of ''Principles'' was also offered as a guide for developing a possible infrastructure. These principles include recognition of competent organizations that accredit laboratories, use of procedures and requirements based on international standards and guides, elimination of domestic barriers, and improved access to foreign markets for U.S. products.

Throughout the Forum, speakers supported the opportunity to achieve a coordinated, cost effective system for unified procedures for determining the competency of laboratories by qualified accreditors.

Dated: September 15, 1996.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 96–23188 Filed 9–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–M

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

New Transshipment and Misclassification Charges for Certain Cotton, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textiles and Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the People's Republic of China

September 5, 1996.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs charging transshipments and misclassified merchandise to 1996 limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 11, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Aldrich, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

In a notice published in the Federal Register on May 3, 1995 (60 FR 21792), CITA announced that Customs would be conducting other investigations of transshipments of textiles produced in China and exported to the United States. Based on these investigations, the U.S. Customs Service has determined that textile products in certain categories, produced or manufactured in China and entered into the United States with the incorrect country of origin or with the incorrect classification, were entered in circumvention of the Bilateral Textile Agreement, effected by exchange of notes dated March 29, 1995 and June 8, 1995, between the Governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China. Consultations were held between the Governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China on this matter March 25 through March 27, 1996. Accordingly, in the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to charge the following amounts to the 1996 quota levels for the categories listed below. The quota levels for Categories 339–S, 348, 351, 641 and 840 have been triple charged in accordance with paragraph 13(E) of the Bilateral Textile Agreement between the Governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China.

Category	Amounts to be charged
200	2,268 kilograms.
335	136 dozen.
338–S [1]	73,420 dozen.
339	16,983 dozen.
339–S [2]	5,120 dozen.
347	19,360 dozen.
348	37,699 dozen.
351	18,000 dozen.
369–D [3]	15,511 kilograms.
369–S [4]	116,250 kilograms.
433	520 dozen.
641	22,680 dozen.
840	1,083 dozen.

[1] Category 338–S: all HTS numbers except 6109.10.0012, 6109.10.0014, 6109.10.0018 and 6109.10.0023.

[2] Category 339–S: all HTS numbers except 6109.10.0040, 6109.10.0045, 6109.10.0060 and 6109.10.0065.

[3] Category 369–D: only HTS numbers 6302.60.0010, 6302.91.0005 and 6302.91.0045.

[4] Category 369–S: only HTS number 6307.10.2005.

U.S. Customs continues to conduct other investigations of such transshipments of textiles produced in China and exported to the United States. The charges resulting from these investigations will be published in the Federal Register.

The U.S. Government is taking this action pursuant to U.S. letter dated February 6, 1996, and the Bilateral Textile Agreement, effected by exchange of notes dated May 29, 1995 and June 8, 1995, between the Governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see Federal Register notice 60 FR 65299, published on December 19, 1995). Also see 60 FR 65292, published on December 19, 1995.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

September 5, 1996.

Commissioner of Customs,

Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: To facilitate implementation of the Bilateral Textile Agreement, effected by exchange of notes dated May 29, 1995 and June 8, 1995, between the Governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China, I request that, effective on September 11, 1996, you charge the following amounts to the following categories for the 1996 restraint period (see directive dated December 13, 1995):

Category	Amounts to be charged
200	2,268 kilograms.
335	136 dozen.
338–S [a]	73,420 dozen.
339	16,983 dozen.
339–S [b]	5,120 dozen.
347	19,360 dozen.
348	37,699 dozen.
351	18,000 dozen.
369–D [c]	15,511 kilograms.
433	520 dozen.
641	22,680 dozen.
840	1,083 dozen.

[a] Category 338–S: all HTS numbers except 6109.10.0012, 6109.10.0014, 6109.10.0018 and 6109.10.0023.

[b] Category 339–S: all HTS numbers except 6109.10.0040, 6109.10.0045, 6109.10.0060 and 6109.10.0065.

[c] Category 369–D: only HTS numbers 6302.60.0010, 6302.91.0005 and 6302.91.0045.

Also, you are directed to deduct 116,250 kilograms from the charges made to Category 369–D for the 1996 quota period. This same