

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The SIPP represents a source of information for a wide variety of topics and allows information for separate topics to be integrated to form a single, unified data base so that the interaction between tax, transfer, and other government and private policies can be examined. Government domestic policy formulators depend heavily upon SIPP information concerning the distribution of income received directly as money or indirectly as in-kind benefits, and the effect of tax and transfer programs on this distribution. They also need improved and expanded data on the income and general economic and financial situation of the U.S. population. The SIPP has provided these kinds of data on a continuing basis since late 1983, permitting levels of economic well-being and changes in these levels to be measured over time.

The survey is molded around a central "core" of labor force and income questions that will remain fixed throughout the life of a panel. The core is supplemented with questions designed to answer specific needs such as estimating eligibility for government programs, examining pension and health care coverage, and analyzing individual net worth. These supplemental questions are included with the core and are referred to as "topical modules."

The topical modules for the 1996 Panel Wave 3 are the following: (1) Assets and Liabilities; (2) Medical Expenses and Work Disability, and (3) Real Estate, Shelter Costs, Dependent Care, and Vehicles; and (4) the Poverty Module. Also, additional topical module items will be asked at the end of the core instrument concerning Earnings and Employment, General Income Amounts, Stocks and Mutual Fund Shares, Rental Income, Mortgages, Royalties, and Other Financial Investments. Wave 3 interviews will be conducted from December 1996 through March 1997.

II. Method of Collection

The SIPP is designed as a continuing series of national panels of interviewed households that are introduced every 4 years, with each panel having a duration of about 4 years in the survey. All household members 15 years old or older are interviewed using regular proxy-respondent rules. They are interviewed a total of 12 times (12 waves) at 4-month intervals, making the SIPP a longitudinal survey. Sample persons (all household members present at the time of the first interview) who

move within the country and reasonably close to a SIPP Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) will be followed and interviewed at their new address. Persons 15 years old or older who enter the household after Wave 1 will be interviewed; however, if these persons move, they are not followed unless they happen to move along with a Wave 1 sample person. A reinterview with a sample of participants is also conducted to ensure quality in responses.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0607-0813.
Form Number: SIPP-16303 Reminder Card; SIPP/CAPI Automated Instrument.
Type of Review: Regular.
Affected Public: Individuals or Households.
Estimated Number of Respondents: 77,700 (interview), 2,500 (reinterview).
Estimated Time Per Response: 30 minutes (interview), 10 minutes (reinterview).
Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 116,550*

Interview	* 116,500
Reinterview	* 1,250
Total	117,800

* Estimates based on conducting 3 waves in a year.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: \$28,000,000.

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 shall have 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: May 7, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96-11828 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

Economics and Statistics Administration

Bureau of the Census

Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics; Notice of Renewal

In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, (1973), and after consultation with the General Services Administration, the Secretary of Commerce has determined that the renewal of the Census Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics is in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department by law.

The Committee was established July 16, 1962. It was initially chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act in January 1973. The Committee's purpose is to advise the Director, Bureau of the Census, on the conduct of the periodic censuses and surveys of agriculture and related surveys and the kind of information to obtain from respondents associated with agriculture production. The Committee also prepares recommendations regarding the content of agriculture reports, and presents the views and needs for data of major suppliers and users of agriculture statistics. The Committee draws on the experience and expertise of its members to form a collective judgment concerning agriculture data collected and the statistics the Census Bureau issues.

The committee will function solely as an advisory body and will comply fully with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The advisory committee shall consist of 21 member organizations. Each of the member organizations shall appoint a representative to the committee, subject to the concurrence of the Director, Bureau of the Census.

The committee shall report to the Director, Bureau of the Census.

The Department of Commerce will file copies of the committees' renewal charters with appropriate committees in Congress.

You may address inquires or comments to Maxine Anderson-Brown, Committee Liaison Officer, Bureau of the Census, Room 3039, FB 3, Washington, D.C. 20233, telephone (301) 457-2308, TDD (301) 457-2540.

Dated: May 7, 1996.

Martha Farnsworth Riche,

Director, Bureau of the Census.

[FR Doc. 96-11888 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-BS-P

International Trade Administration

[A-412-817]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Foam Extruded PVC and Polystyrene Framing Stock From the United Kingdom

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 13, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Grebasch, Dorothy Tomaszewski, or Erik Warga, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3773, (202) 482-0631, or (202) 482-0922, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act") are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act ("URAA").

Preliminary Determination

As explained in the memoranda from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration dated November 22, 1995, and January 11, 1996, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") has exercised its discretion to toll all deadlines for the duration of the partial shutdowns of the Federal Government from November 15 through November 21, 1995, and December 16, 1995, through January 6, 1996. Thus, the deadline for the preliminary determination in this investigation has been extended by 28 days, *i.e.*, one day for each day (or partial day) the Department was closed. As such, the deadline for this determination is no later than May 3, 1996.

We preliminarily determine that foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock ("framing stock") from the United Kingdom ("U.K.") is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation (Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Foam

Extruded PVC and Polystyrene Framing Stock from the United Kingdom (60 FR 52370, October 6, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On October 25, 1995, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case (see ITC Investigation No. 731-TA-738).

On November 9, 1995, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to each of the three U.K. companies (Ecoframe Ltd., ("Ecoframe") Magnolia Group PLC, ("Magnolia") and Robobond Ltd., ("Robobond")) that produced and sold the subject merchandise during the period of investigation ("POI"), September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995. The questionnaire is divided into four sections. Section A requests general information concerning a company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all of its markets. Sections B and C request home market sales listings and U.S. sales listings, respectively. Section D requests information on the cost of production ("COP") of the foreign like product and constructed value ("CV") of the subject merchandise.

On January 11, 1996, Robobond submitted a letter requesting that it be excused from reporting its home market and U.S. sales made from inventory, referred to as "501 stock" sales, on the grounds that the transactions were small quantities, represented a small percentage of overall sales, and would be burdensome to report and verify. See "Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice, below.

Ecoframe requested on January 11 and March 3, 1996, that the Department exclude from its margin analysis "ecopasta," "special offer" and scrap sales in both the United States and home markets, as well as a "special circumstance" sale to one U.S. customer. See "Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice, below.

On February 9, 1996, Magnolia requested (1) a quantity adjustment (see "Normal Value" section of this notice, below) and (2) the exclusion of certain home market sales from reporting requirements. The Department granted Magnolia's exclusion request by a March 25, 1996, letter.

Based on timely allegations by petitioner, Marley Mouldings, the Department began investigations into whether the three respondents had made sales in the home market at prices that were below COP pursuant to

section 773(b) of the Act (see February 28 and March 4, 1996, memoranda from team to Gary Taverman).

On February 16, 1996, petitioner made a timely request that, pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act, the Department postpone its preliminary determination in this proceeding. Accordingly, we postponed the preliminary determination until not later than May 3, 1996 (61 FR 7240, February 27, 1996). (As noted above, all deadlines were tolled 28 days as a result of the two federal government shutdowns totaling 28 days; therefore, the original deadline of February 15, 1996, had already been extended to March 14, 1996.)

Respondents submitted responses to the various sections of the questionnaire from December 1995 through April 1996. For respondents' responses to sections A, B and C, the Department issued supplemental requests for information from February through April 1996. Responses to these supplemental requests were received in March and April 1996. Robobond and Ecoframe also filed supplements to their section D responses on April 17 and May 1, 1996, respectively.

Petitioner filed comments on Robobond's response to section D on April 29, 1996. Robobond argued in April 30 and May 2, 1996, letters that petitioner's comments were too late to be considered for the preliminary determination.

Postponement of Final Determination

On April 25, 1996, Robobond requested that, pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone its final determination until not later than 135 days after the publication of the affirmative preliminary determination in the Federal Register. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.20(b), inasmuch as our preliminary determination is affirmative, Robobond accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and we are not aware of the existence of any compelling reasons for denying the request, we are granting Robobond's request and postponing the final determination.

Consistent with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade ("GATT"), section 773(d) of the Act permits the Department to extend suspension of liquidation from four to six months at the request of exporters representing a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise. The structure of the statute integrally links a

request to extend the final determination and extension of suspension of liquidation. This linkage balances the goals of providing an expeditious remedy to the domestic industry against the desire to avoid undue harm to the exporters who have requested extension of the final determination. Accordingly, we consider a request by an exporter to extend the final determination as containing an implied request to extend suspension of liquidation. We are, therefore, extending suspension of liquidation in this case.

Scope of Investigation

This investigation covers all extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock regardless of color, finish, width or length. Finished frames assembled from foam extruded PVC and polystyrene framing stock are excluded. The merchandise under investigation is currently classifiable under subheadings 3924.90.20.00; 3926.90.90.90; 3926.90.95.90; and 3926.90.98.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States ("HTS"). Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The POI is September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of the subject merchandise by respondents to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the export price ("EP") to the Normal Value ("NV"), as described in the "Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(1)(A)(i), we compared POI-wide weighted-average EPs to weighted-average NVs. In determining averaging groups for comparison purposes, we considered the appropriateness of such factors as physical characteristics and level of trade.

A. Physical Characteristics

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products covered by the description in the *Scope of Investigation* section, above, produced in the United Kingdom and sold in the home market during the POI, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product

on the basis of the characteristics listed in the Department's antidumping questionnaire. In making the product comparisons, we relied on the following criteria (in order of preference): material; weight per linear foot; profile type; width; finish type (pasta/compo, foil, mylar, laminated/wrapped, embossed plain substrate, embossed substrate with foil, embossed substrate with mylar, wet system (e.g., paint), or other); and total number of finishes.

B. Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act and the Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("SAA"), H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 829-831 (1994), to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale. When the Department is unable to find sale(s) in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales(s), the Department may compare sales in the U.S. and foreign markets at one or more different levels of trade.

Of the three respondents in this proceeding, only Robobond reported that different levels of trade existed, claiming that its sales from inventory are at a different level than its non-inventory sales.

We preliminarily find that different levels of trade do not exist for Robobond. In its level-of-trade claim, Robobond stated that sales from inventory constituted a separate level from non-inventory sales. We are not satisfied that this difference rises to the level of a different level of trade. See May 3, 1996, memorandum, on file in Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building. However, we will examine this issue further at verification and consider arguments that parties may make during the briefing process.

What Robobond has characterized as a level-of-trade difference appears to stem from a concern that comparisons be made using comparable quantities. However, Robobond has not explained how comparable quantities might be defined or whether price comparability is affected by comparing different quantities. The Department must, in considering the question of level of trade categorization, ensure there are different selling functions at the alleged different levels, and distinguish differences in level of trade from other differences among sales, such as quantity differences. See SAA at 830. While differences in quantity may be an appropriate factor to consider in making fair value comparisons, such differences

do not constitute level-of-trade differences.

Accordingly, we preliminarily find that no level of trade differences exist and that level of trade does not need to be considered in price averaging.

Export Price

We calculated EP, in accordance with subsections 772(a) and (c) of the Act, for each of the respondents, where the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and use of constructed export price was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record.

We made company-specific adjustments as follows:

Ecoframe

We calculated EP based on packed, ex-works, FOB port, and delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for the following charges: international freight (including plant-to-port-of-exit freight; brokerage and handling; and ocean freight).

For sales of a particular model to one U.S. customer, Ecoframe requested exclusion because certain designing and tooling costs had been paid separately by the customer. Rather than exclude these sales, we increased export price to account for the revenue. The Department may consider such revenue to be a component of the price charged to the customer. See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom (56 FR 5975, February 14, 1991). We will fully examine the nature of this revenue during verification of Ecoframe's questionnaire response.

We excluded Ecoframe's scrap sales to U.S. customers. These were sales that were discounted when it was discovered after sale that the merchandise sold as prime merchandise was actually substandard. The sales involved relatively insignificant quantities. We did not exclude "ecopasta" or "special offer" sales because Ecoframe did not adequately explain why such sales should be excluded nor does the record indicate that the sales were extraordinary.

Finally, we recalculated credit expenses because the reported figure did not comport with the narrative description.

Magnolia

We calculated EP based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where

appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for the following charges: international freight (including plant-to-port-of-exit freight; U.K. inland insurance; brokerage and handling; ocean freight; marine insurance; U.S. inland port-to-warehouse freight; U.S. inland warehouse-to-customer freight; U.S. inland insurance; and other U.S. transportation charges) and U.S. duty.

Robobond

We calculated EP based on packed, delivered/duty unpaid and ex-works prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for the following charges: international freight (including UK inland freight, UK brokerage & handling, ocean freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, and U.S. inland freight). We added to the starting price an amount for reported freight revenue, where appropriate. We recalculated reported credit expenses using the average U.S.-dollar prime interest rate because the interest rate used for the reported figures was not based on information from the POI but rather on information provided by a bank for purposes of the questionnaire response.

We did not exclude "501 stock" sales because the record does not indicate that these sales were materially different from Robobond's other U.S. sales. Although Robobond characterized these sales as being a separate level of trade based on seller function, such a difference, if found to exist, is properly considered in the context of making fair value comparisons rather than by exclusions. As discussed above, Robobond has not established that these sales are at a different level of trade.

Normal Value

Cost of Production Analysis

As noted in the "Case History" section above, based on the petitioners' allegations, the Department found reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that each respondent made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise. As a result, the Department initiated investigations to determine whether the respondents made home market sales during the POI at prices below their respective COPs within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act.

Before making any fair value comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below.

A. Calculation of COP

We calculated the COP based on the sum of each respondent's cost of

materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general, and administrative expenses ("G&A") and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We relied on the respondents' submitted COP amounts except in the following specific instances wherein the reported costs were improperly valued:

Ecoframe: different costs had been reported for identical products and were weight averaged to derive a single, product-specific cost; and the reported amount for variable overhead was recalculated to exclude packing expenses.

Magnolia: indirect selling expenses were recalculated to adjust for improper allocation.

Robobond: reported G&A expenses were adjusted to reflect expenses for all affiliated companies; and reported depreciation expenses were revised to reflect Robobond's historical treatment of depreciation rather than an accounting practice adopted after the filing of the petition.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

We used the respondents' adjusted weighted-average COP for the POI. We compared the weighted-average COP figures to home market sales of the foreign-like product as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at below-cost prices within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and were not at prices which permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges and direct and indirect selling expenses.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POI were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time (in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act) and at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time (in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act).

Where there were no above-cost sales available for matching purposes, export prices that would have been compared to home market prices for these models were instead compared to CV.

D. Calculation of CV

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of a respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, selling, general, and administrative expenses ("SG&A") and U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales databases. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. Where appropriate, we calculated each respondent's CV based on the methodology described in the calculation of COP above. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses. For Robobond, we calculated interest based on actual interest expenses incurred rather than the reported figure, which improperly included an adjustment for imputed interest.

Adjustments to Prices

We made company-specific adjustments to prices used as NV, as follows:

Ecoframe

We calculated NV based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions from the starting price for inland freight. In addition, where appropriate, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses, credit insurance expenses, and commissions (including appropriate offsets). We adjusted reported gross unit prices to reflect the actual unit price of the quantity delivered.

We excluded Ecoframe's scrap sales to home market customers. Some were sales that were discounted when it was discovered after sale that the merchandise sold as prime merchandise was actually substandard; others were off-prime production sold as scrap. All types of excluded sales involved relatively insignificant quantities. We did not exclude "ecopasta" or "special offer" sales because Ecoframe did not adequately explain why such sales should be excluded nor does the record indicate that the sales were extraordinary.

Magnolia

We calculated NV based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions from the starting price for inland freight and early payment discounts. In addition, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit

expenses (which we recalculated using the proper base price). Magnolia also reported an amount upon which to base an adjustment for differences in quantities sold between the U.S. and U.K. markets, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.55(a). Although Magnolia claimed that it incurred differing manufacturing costs depending on quantity, it did not demonstrate, nor did data on the record show, that pricing differences were related to quantity. Accordingly, we have not made the requested adjustment.

Robobond

We calculated NV based on packed, ex-works or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions from the starting price for inland freight, where appropriate. We added to the starting price an amount for reported freight revenue, where appropriate. In addition, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses, post-sale clearing of accounts receivable (U.S. and home market), bank charges (U.S. and home market), post-sale "overcharging" credits, post-sale "shortage" credits, and customer-specific freight charges not allocable to specific sales. We reclassified as indirect selling expenses reported direct selling expenses for bad debt and for net expense freight on return merchandise. Neither expense was attributable to specific customers. We recalculated reported credit expenses using the average U.K.-pound-sterling lending rate because the interest rate used for the reported figures was not based on information from the POI but rather on information provided by a bank for purposes of the questionnaire response.

For each respondent, we made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Where the difference in merchandise adjustment for every comparison product exceeded 20 percent, we based NV on CV. In addition, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B), we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs for all respondents.

We did not exclude "501 stock" sales from the home market sales listing for the reasons described in the "Export Price" section of this notice, above.

Price to CV Comparisons

Where we compared CV to export prices, we deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses and added the weighted-average U.S. product-specific

direct selling expenses (where appropriate) in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars. Further, section 773A(b) directs the Department to allow a 60-day adjustment period when a currency has undergone a sustained movement. A sustained movement has occurred when the weekly average of actual daily rates exceeds the weekly average of benchmark rates by more than five percent for eight consecutive weeks. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. (For an explanation of this method, see Policy Bulletin 96-1: Currency Conversions (61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996)). Such an adjustment period is required only when a foreign currency is appreciating against the U.S. dollar. The use of an adjustment period was not warranted in this case because the U.K. pound did not undergo a sustained movement, nor were there currency fluctuations during the POI.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information determined to be acceptable for use in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the export price, as indicated in the chart below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Ecoframe	27.26
Robobond/Simons	2.60
Magnolia	81.24
All Others	4.29

Pursuant to section 733(d)(1)(A) and section 735(c)(5) of the Act, the Department has not included zero and *de minimis* weighted-average dumping margins and margins determined entirely under section 776 of the Act, from the calculation of the "all others" deposit rate.

ITC Notification

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

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than August 1, 1996, and rebuttal briefs, no later than August 8, 1996. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Such summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on August 15, 1996, the time and place to be determined, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, 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. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by 135 days after the publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act.

Dated: May 3, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-11822 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-570-825]

Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Extension of Time Limits of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limits of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits for preliminary and final results in the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC), covering the period July 13, 1994, through June 30, 1995, because it is not practicable to complete the review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) (the Act).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 13, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrea Chu or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department received a request to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC. On September 15, 1995, the Department published a notice of initiation of this administrative review covering the period July 13, 1994, through June 30, 1995. The Department adjusted the time limits by 28 days due to the government shutdowns, which lasted from November 14, 1995, to November 20, 1995, and from December 15, 1995, to January 6, 1996. See memoranda to the file from Susan G. Esserman, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated November 22, 1995, and January 11, 1996. As adjusted, the current time limits are April 29, 1996, for the preliminary results and August 27, 1996, for the final results.

It is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to August 27, 1996, and for the final results to February 24, 1997.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b).

These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: April 29, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96-11821 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5510-DS-M

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology; Meeting

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology (NIST) will meet on Tuesday, June 11, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and on Wednesday, June 12, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. The Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology is composed of fifteen members appointed by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology who are eminent in such fields as business, research, new product development, engineering, labor, education, management consulting, environment, and international relations. The purpose of this meeting is to review and make recommendations regarding general policy for the Institute, its organization, its budget, and its programs within the framework of applicable national policies as set forth by the President and the Congress. On June 11, 1996, the agenda will include an update on NIST programs by NIST Director Prabhakar; presentations on strategic planning for Standards in Trade, Information Technology and Biotechnology; predictions about the future of the internet; impact of advancing technology on metrology needs; and a laboratory tour. On June 12, 1996, the agenda will include presentations on the ATP Focused Program, Tools for DNA Diagnostics and the Baldrige Pilot Programs in Education and Health Care.

DATES: The meeting will convene June 11, 1996, at 8:30 a.m., and will adjourn at 9:30 a.m. on June 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Employees Lounge (seating capacity 80, includes 38 participants), Administration Building, at NIST, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris E. Kuyatt, Visiting Committee Executive Director, NIST, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, telephone number (301) 975-6090.

Dated: May 7, 1996.

Samuel Kramer,

Associate Director.

[FR Doc. 96-11929 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

National Technical Information Service

Advisory Board Meeting

AGENCY: National Technical Information Service, Technology Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of closed meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, notice is hereby given that the National Technical Information Service Advisory Board (the "Board") will meet on Monday, June 17, 1996, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This meeting will be closed to the public.

The Board was established under the authority of 15 U.S.C. 3704b(c), and was Chartered on September 15, 1989. The Board is composed of five members appointed by the Secretary of Commerce who are eminent in such fields as information resources management, information technology, and library and information services. The purpose of the meeting is to review and make recommendations regarding general policies and operations of NTIS, including policies in connection with fees and charges for its services. The session will be closed because premature disclosure of the information to be discussed would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of NTIS' business plans.

DATES: The meeting will convene on June 17, 1996, at 9:00 a.m. and adjourn at 4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in Room 2029, Sills Building, National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: This one-day meeting will be closed to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: