Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act requires the Department to determine, prior to the initiation of an investigation, that a minimum percentage of the domestic industry supports an antidumping petition. A petition meets these minimum requirements if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

The petitioner is the only known U.S. producer of persulfates. Accordingly, the Department determines that the petition is supported by the domestic industry.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this petition are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The chemical formulae for these persulfates are, respectively, $(NH_4)_2S_2O_8$, $K_2S_2O_8$, and $Na_2S_2O_8$. Ammonium and potassium persulfates are currently classified under subheading 2833.40.60 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (''*HTSUS*''). Sodium persulfate is classified under HTSUS subheading 2833.40.20. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Export Price

The petitioner based export prices for ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates on price quotes obtained from U.S. importers. Petitioner reduced these prices to account for estimated importer mark-ups, and for U.S. duties and customs fees, ocean freight, insurance, foreign inland freight and foreign handling fees.

Normal Value

In previous investigations, the Department has determined that the PRC is a nonmarket economy (''NME'') country within the meaning of section 771(18) of the Act. *See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Manganese Metal from the People's Republic of China* (60 FR 56045, 56047 (November 6, 1995)). In accordance with section 771(18)(C), the presumption of NME status for the PRC shall continue for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. In the course of this investigation, all parties will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the NME status of the PRC and the assignment of separate rates to individual exporters. (*See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the PRC* (59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994))).

In antidumping investigations in which the comparison market is not a market economy, section 773(c) of the Act requires that the normal value of the foreign like product be based on the producer's factors of production valued in a surrogate market economy country or countries that is/are a significant producer of comparable merchandise and at a level of economic development comparable to the NME country. Publicly available published information from India was used by the petitioner to value the factors of production because India is the only persulfate producer among surrogate countries that the Department typically uses for the PRC. The petitioner based the fixed factory overhead, selling, general and administrative, and profit elements of its normal value calculation on data from an annual report of an Indian producer of hydrogen peroxide. According to the petitioner, it relied on data from a producer of hydrogen peroxide because public financial data for Indian persulfate producers was not available, and the production processes for hydrogen peroxide and persulfates are comparable.

The petitioner based the quantities of factors (*i.e.*, raw materials, labor, and energy) used in production of ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates on the experience of certain PRC producers. The petitioner relied on its own production experience where PRC usage factors were not available. *See, Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Brake Drums and Certain Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China* (61 FR 14740 (April 3, 1996)). The petitioner maintains that it is reasonable to use its own production experience because the production process is the same whether the persulfates are produced in the United States or in the PRC.

Based on comparisons of the export prices with normal values constructed from factors of production, the calculated dumping margins range from 15.87 percent to 182.37 percent. If it becomes necessary at a later date to consider the petition as a source for facts available, we may re-examine the information in the petition and, if necessary, revise the margin calculations therein.

Normal Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of persulfates from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

Initiation of Investigation

We have examined the petition on persulfates from the PRC and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirements concerning allegations of material injury or threat of material injury to the domestic producers of domestic like products by reason of the complained-of imports, allegedly sold at less than fair value. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of persulfates from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless the investigation is extended, we will make our preliminary determination by December 18, 1996.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the Government of the PRC.

International Trade Commission (''ITC'') Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by August 26, 1996, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of persulfates from the PRC are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination in this investigation will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–19997 Filed 8–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

A–201–504

Porcelain on Steel Cookware From Mexico; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Extension of Time Limits for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the preliminary and final results of the ninth antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain on steel cookware from Mexico. The review covers the period December 1, 1994 through November 30, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas F. Futtner, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4195 or (202) 482–3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results until January 2, 1997, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. (*See* Memorandum to Robert S. LaRussa dated July 29, 1996.) We will issue our final results for this review 120 days from the publication of our preliminary results.

These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: July 29, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–20001 Filed 8–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–533–808]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India; Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received a request to conduct a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from India, which has a December anniversary date. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(h)(1995), we are initiating this new shipper administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Little or Maureen Flannery, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department received a timely request on June 28, 1996, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 353.22(h) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25130, 25134 (May 11, 1995)) (Interim Regulations) for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rod from India, which has a December anniversary date. *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India,* 58 FR 63335, (December 1, 1993). *See also* memorandum to the file dated July 30, 1996.

Initiation of Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, and section 19 CFR 353.22(h)(6), we are initiating a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rod from India. We will issue the preliminary results of these reviews not later than 180 days from the date of publication of this notice and the final results within 90 days after issuance of the preliminary results, unless these time limits are extended in accordance with section 751 (a) (2) (B) (iv) of the Act.

Antidumping duty proceeding	Period to be reviewed
India: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod, A–533–808 ..... Isibars Limited.	1/01/96–6/30/96

We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting, until the completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise exported by the above listed companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(h)(4)(1995).

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with Section 353.34(b) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.34(b) (1995)).

This initiation and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) and section 353.22(h) of the Interim Regulations.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 96–19998 Filed 8–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 020696C]

Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of establishment of a Large Whale Take Reduction Team.

SUMMARY: The following individuals have been invited to participate on a Take Reduction Team (TRT) to address bycatch of large baleen whales, specifically the northern right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) and the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the following fisheries: The Gulf of Maine/U.S. mid-Atlantic lobster trap/pot fishery, the mid-Atlantic coastal gillnet fishery, the southeastern U.S. Atlantic shark gillnet fishery, and the Gulf of Maine sink-gillnet fishery. These large whale marine mammal stocks are considered strategic under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) because they are listed as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and because the level of human-caused mortality is greater than their Potential Biological Removal (PBR) levels.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kathy Wang, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, (813) 570–5312, or Dr. Sal Testaverde, Northeast Regional Office, NMFS, (508) 281–9254, or Michael Payne, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, (301) 713–2322.