

Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of binational panel decision.

**SUMMARY:** On September 13, 1996 the Binational Panel issued its decision in the review of the final antidumping duty administrative review made by the International Trade Administration (ITA) respecting Gray Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Mexico, Secretariat File No. USA-95-1904-02. The Binational Panel unanimously affirmed the final determination. A copy of the complete Panel decision is available from the NAFTA Secretariat.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

James R. Holbein, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 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). The Binational Panel review in this matter was conducted in accordance with these Rules.

**Background**

On June 16, 1995 Cemex, S.A. de C.V. filed a First Request for Panel Review with the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the final antidumping determination that was published in the Federal Register on January 9, 1995 (60 FR 2378) and Amended on May 19, 1995 (60 FR 26,865). Briefs were filed by all participants and oral argument was held in accordance with the Rules.

**Panel Decision**

In its September 13 decision, the Binational Panel unanimously affirmed the Commerce Department's final determination in all respects.

Dated: September 26, 1996.

James R. Holbein,

*United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*

[FR Doc. 96-26853 Filed 10-18-96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-GT-M**

**North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of binational panel decision.

**SUMMARY:** On September 12, 1996 the Binational Panel issued its decision in the review of the final antidumping duty administrative review made by the Secretaria de Comercio y Fomento Industrial de Mexico (SECOFI) respecting Solid and Crystal Polystyrene from the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America, Secretariat File No. MEX-94-1904-03. A majority of the Binational Panel affirmed the final determination. A copy of the complete Panel decision in Spanish is available from the NAFTA Secretariat, and an English translation of the majority opinion is also available.

**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). The Binational Panel review in this matter was conducted in accordance with these Rules.

**Background**

On December 9, 1994 Muehlstein International, Ltd. filed a First Request for Panel Review with the Mexican Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the final antidumping determination that was published in the *Diario Oficial* on November 11, 1994. Briefs were filed by all participants and oral argument was held in accordance with the Rules.

**Panel Decision**

In its September 12 decision, the Binational Panel majority affirmed the final determination in all respects. One panelist wrote a concurring opinion agreeing in the result but differing in several areas from the majority's reasoning. One panelist dissented completely from the majority opinion.

Dated: September 26, 1996.

James R. Holbein,

*United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*

[FR Doc. 96-26854 Filed 10-18-96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-GT-M**

**Patent and Trademark Office**

[Docket #: 950411100-6267-02]

**RIN 0651-XX01**

**Extension of the Payor Number Practice (Through "Customer Numbers") to Matters Involving Pending Patent Applications**

**AGENCY:** Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of change in procedure.

**SUMMARY:** The Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) is extending the Payor Number practice to matters involving pending patent applications. Payor Numbers are currently used to establish a "fee address" for receipt of maintenance fee correspondence. Through the use of "Customer Numbers," the PTO will extend the Payor Number practice to matters involving patent applications. Under this Customer Number practice, an applicant (or patentee) will be able to use a Customer Number to: (1) designate the address associated with the Customer Number as the correspondence address for an application (or patent); (2) designate the address associated with the Customer Number as the fee address (37 CFR