

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board's Executive Secretary at the first address listed above, and at the Lubbock International Airport, 5401 Martin Luther King Boulevard, Lubbock, Texas 79401.

Dated: August 19, 2003.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-21843 Filed 8-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-827]

Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 27, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Stolz or Magd Zalok, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4474 or (202) 482-4162, respectively.

TIME LIMITS:

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department of Commerce (the Department) to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order or finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the 245-day time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and the time limit for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On January 22, 2003, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cased pencils from the People's Republic of China, covering the period December 1, 2001, through November 30, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 3009, 3010 (January 22, 2003). The preliminary results are currently due no later than September 2, 2003.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results by 120 days until no later than December 31, 2003. *See* Decision Memorandum from Thomas Futtner, Acting Office Director for Import Administration, Group II, Office IV to Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group II, dated concurrently with this notice, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Department's main building. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: August 19, 2003.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group II.

[FR Doc. 03-21904 Filed 8-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-602-805, A-484-802, A-419-802, A-588-864, A-791-818, A-570-889]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide From Australia, Greece, Ireland, Japan, South Africa and the People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 27, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine Bertrand (Australia) at 202-482-3207, Doug Kirby (Greece) at 202-482-3782, John Drury (Ireland) at 202-482-0195, Brandon Farlander (Japan) at 202-482-0182, Matthew Renkey (South Africa) at 202-482-2312, Rachel Kreissl (PRC) at 202-482-0409 or Alex Villanueva at 202-482-3208, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Initiation of Investigations

The Petition

On July 31, 2003, the Department of Commerce ("Department") received an antidumping duty petition ("Petition") filed in proper form by Kerr-McGee Chemical LLC ("Kerr-McGee or Petitioner"). Kerr-McGee is a domestic producer of electrolytic manganese dioxide ("EMD"). On August 13, 2003, Petitioner submitted information to supplement the Petition ("Supplemental Response"). Additionally, on August 13, 2003, the Department asked Petitioner to clarify the sales-below-cost allegations and the countries for which the allegations were made. *See Memorandum to the File from Alex Villanueva, Case Analyst through James C. Doyle, Program Manager; EMD: Regarding Sales-Below-Cost Allegations*, dated August 13, 2003. On August 14, 2003, Petitioner submitted a letter indicating that the sales-below-costs allegations were made only for Ireland, Japan and South Africa. Consequently, Petitioner did not request a sales-below-cost allegation for Australia and Greece. On August 20, 2003, Petitioner submitted revised lost sales and revenue information. In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), Petitioner alleges imports of EMD from Australia, Greece, Ireland, Japan, South Africa and the People's Republic of China ("PRC") are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the U.S. industry.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed its Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the investigations it is presently seeking. *See Determination of Industry Support for the Petition* section below.