

countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to send a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping Compliance, Attention: Pamela Woods, in room 3065 of the Main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be sent to every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of "Initiation of Antidumping (Countervailing) Duty Administrative Review," for requests received by April 31, 1996. If the Department does not receive, by April 31, 1996, a request for review of entries covered by an order or finding listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute, but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: March 28, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.  
[FR Doc. 96-8024 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-570-845, A-570-846]

**Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Brake Drums and Certain Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 3, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Katherine Johnson at (202) 482-4929 or James Terpstra at (202) 482-3965, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigations

*The Applicable Statute*

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

*The Petition*

On March 7, 1996, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") received a petition filed in proper form by The Coalition for the Preservation of American Brake Drum and Rotor Aftermarket Manufacturers ("petitioner"), whose members consist of Brake Parts, Inc., Iroquois Tool Systems, Inc., and Wagner Brake Corporation, a Division of Wagner Electric Corp. (domestic producers of both brake drums and rotors) and Kinetic Parts Manufacturing, Inc. (domestic producer of brake rotors).

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, the petitioner alleges that imports of both brake drums and brake rotors from 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, respective U.S. industries.

The petitioner is a coalition, the majority of whose members are producers of both domestic like products as defined in the petition. Therefore, it has standing to file the petition because it is an interested party, as defined under section 771(9)(E) of the Act, with respect to both products.

*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.

A review of the production data provided in the petition and other information readily available to the Department indicates that the petitioner accounts for more than 50 percent of the total production of each of the domestic like products. The Department received no expressions of opposition to the petition from any domestic producer or workers. Accordingly, the Department determines that the petition is supported by the respective domestic industries.

*Scope of the Investigations*

The products covered by these two investigations are 1) certain brake drums and 2) certain brake rotors.

*Brake Drums*

Brake drums are made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, ranging in diameter from 8 to 16 inches (20.32 to 40.64 centimeters) and in weight from 8 to 45 pounds (3.63 to 20.41 kilograms). The size parameters (weight and dimension) of the brake drums limit their use to the following types of motor vehicles: automobiles, all-terrain vehicles, vans and recreational vehicles under "one ton and a half," and light trucks designated as "one ton and a half."

Finished brake drums are those that are ready for sale and installation without any further operations. Semi-finished drums are those on which the surface is not entirely smooth, and has undergone some drilling. Unfinished drums are those which have undergone some grinding or turning.

These brake drums are for motor vehicles, and do not contain in the casting a logo of an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) which produces vehicles sold in the United States (e.g., General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Honda, Toyota, Volvo). Brake drums covered in this investigation are not certified by OEM producers of vehicles sold in the

United States. The scope also includes composite brake drums that are made of gray cast iron, which contain a steel plate, but otherwise meet the above criteria.

Brake drums are classifiable under subheading 8708.39.5010 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

#### *Brake Rotors*

Brake rotors are made of gray cast iron, whether finished, semifinished, or unfinished, ranging in diameter from 8 to 16 inches (20.32 to 40.64 centimeters) and in weight from 8 to 45 pounds (3.63 to 20.41 kilograms). The size parameters (weight and dimension) of the brake rotors limit their use to the following types of motor vehicles: automobiles, all-terrain vehicles, vans and recreational vehicles under "one ton and a half," and light trucks designated as "one ton and a half."

Finished brake rotors are those that are ready for sale and installation without any further operations. Semi-finished rotors are those on which the surface is not entirely smooth, and has undergone some drilling. Unfinished rotors are those which have undergone some grinding or turning.

These brake rotors are for motor vehicles, and do not contain in the casting a logo of an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) which produces vehicles sold in the United States (e.g., General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Honda, Toyota, Volvo). Brake rotors covered in this investigation are not certified by OEM producers of vehicles sold in the United States. The scope also includes composite brake rotors that are made of gray cast iron, which contain a steel plate, but otherwise meet the above criteria.

Brake rotors are classifiable under subheading 8708.39.5010 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

#### *Export Price and Normal Value*

The following are descriptions of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which our decisions to initiate are based. Petitioners have provided separate margin calculations for brake drums and brake rotors. Should the need arise to use any of this information in our preliminary or final determinations, we will re-examine the

information and may revise the margin calculations, if appropriate.

#### *Export Price*

The petitioner based export price on prices charged by U.S. distributors of Chinese brake drums and brake rotors, and deducted from these prices a distributor mark-up. In addition, the petitioner deducted an amount for freight, insurance and duties based on the percentage difference between the c.i.f. price and the Customs value price of PRC imports of like products during the POI.

#### *Normal Value*

The petitioner asserts that the PRC is a nonmarket economy country (NME) within the meaning of section 771(18) of the Act. Thus, pursuant to section 773(c) of the Act and in accordance with the Department's usual practice with respect to NMEs, the normal value of the products should be based on the producer's factors of production, valued in a surrogate market economy country. In previous investigations, the Department has determined that the PRC is an NME, and the presumption of NME status continues for the initiation of these investigations. See, e.g., *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from the People's Republic of China*, 60 FR 16437 (March 30, 1995).

It is our practice in NME cases to calculate normal value based on the factors of production of those factories that produced subject merchandise sold to the United States during the period of investigation.

In the course of these investigations, 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).

The petitioner based the factors of production (i.e., raw materials, labor, and energy) for brake drums and brake rotors on its own experience, claiming that its production process is similar to that of the Chinese producers. These factors were valued by the petitioner, where possible, using publicly available published Indian data. India is an acceptable surrogate country because its level of economic development is comparable to that of the PRC and it is a producer of both brake drums and brake rotors.

Where Indian data were unavailable, the petitioner valued the factor of production on the basis of its own costs. Except as noted below for the

ferromanganese input, we disregarded factor values where the inputs were based on prices in the United States because the petitioner (1) failed to follow the Department's established hierarchy regarding selection of surrogate countries for the PRC with respect to factor valuation by failing to examine possible values in other appropriate surrogate countries, and (2) provided no basis for determining that United States values are representative of the appropriate surrogate country values. See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Furfuryl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China, the Republic of South Africa, and Thailand*, 59 FR 32953, 32954, June 27, 1994.

Because of the similarity in production processes, the petitioner valued factory overhead, selling general, and administrative expenses and profit using data from a State Department cable contained in the public record of the *Final Results of the Antidumping Administrative Review: Certain Iron Construction Castings from the People's Republic of China*, 57 FR 10644 (March 27, 1992.)

To value the ferromanganese input, the petitioner used its own costs. Although the petitioner was able to identify an Indian value for this input material, it rejected this value claiming that it was not representative of the true price of ferromanganese. The petitioner claimed that the use of its own cost of ferromanganese was not only conservative, but comparable to world prices for this commodity product.

We excluded from our petition analysis the margin calculation of a particular model for which the petitioner was unable to provide a surrogate value for purchased castings.

Based on comparisons of export price to the factors of production, the calculated dumping margins, as revised by the Department, ranged from 46.76 percent to 105.56 percent for brake drums and from 52.08 percent to 62.55 percent for brake rotors.

#### *Fair Value Comparisons*

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

#### *Initiation of Investigations*

We have examined the petition on brake drums and brake rotors and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirements concerning allegations of the 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 antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of brake drums and brake rotors from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless the investigations are extended, we will make our preliminary determinations by August 14, 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 initiations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

#### *Preliminary Determinations by the ITC*

The ITC will determine by April 22, 1996, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of brake drums and brake rotors from the PRC are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination in either of the investigations will result in that investigation being terminated; otherwise, the investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Dated: March 27, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,  
*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-8022 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

A-583-816

#### **Certain Welded Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan, Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Time Limits**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Extension of Time Limits.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits of the preliminary and final results of the second antidumping duty administrative review of stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 3, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert M. James at (202) 482-5222 or John Kugelman at (202) 482-5253, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the preliminary results until July 16, 1996. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Susan G. Esserman, March 22, 1996, on file in Room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building. We will issue our final results for this review by January 16, 1996.

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: March 28, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 96-8023 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### **National Institute of Standards and Technology**

**[Docket No. 960227052-6052-01]**

**RIN: 0693-ZA06**

#### **Continuation of Fire Research Grants Program—Availability of Funds**

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

**ACTION:** Announcing NIST continuation of fire research grants program.

**SUMMARY:** The purpose of this notice is to inform potential applicants that the Fire Research Program, National Institute of Standards and Technology, is continuing its Fire Research Grants Program.

**DATES FOR APPLICATION:** September 30, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Applicants must submit one signed original and two (2) copies of the proposal along with the Application for Federal Assistance, Standard Form 424, (Rev. 4-92), as referenced under the provisions of OMB Circular A-110 to: Building and Fire Research Laboratory, Attention: Sonya Parham, Building 226, Room B206, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899-0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Technical questions concerning the NIST Fire Research Grants Program should be directed to Sonya Parham, (301) 975-6854. Administrative questions concerning the NIST Fire Research Grants Program may be directed to the NIST Grants Office at (301) 975-6329.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Name and Number: Measurement and Engineering Research Standards; 11.609.

Authority: As authorized by section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C.; 278f), the NIST Building and Fire Research Laboratory conducts directly and through grants and cooperative agreements, a basic and applied fire research program. The annual budget for the Fire Research Program is approximately \$1.4 million. Because of commitments for the support of multi-year programs, only a portion of the budget is available to initiate new programs, only a portion of the budget is available to initiate new programs in any one year. Most grants and cooperative agreements are in the \$10,000 to \$100,000 per year range. The Fire Research Program is limited to innovative ideas which are generated by the proposal writer on what research to carry out and how to carry it out. The issuance of awards is contingent upon the availability of funding.

All grant proposals submitted must be in accordance with the programs and objectives listed below.

#### **Program Objectives**

**A. Fire Modeling and Applications:** To perform research, develop, and demonstrate the application of analytical models for the quantitative prediction of the consequences of fires and the means to assess the accuracy of those models. This includes: Developing methods to assess fire hazard and risk; creating advanced, usable models for the calculation of the effluent from building fires; modeling the ignition and burning of furniture, contents, and building elements such as walls; developing methods of evaluating and predicting the performance of building safety design features; developing a protocol for determining the accuracy of algorithms and comprehensive models; and developing data bases to facilitate use of fire models.

**B. Large Fire Research:** To perform research on and develop techniques to measure, predict the behavior of, and mitigate large fire events. This includes: Understanding the mechanisms of large fires that control gas phase combustion, burning rate, thermal and chemical emissions, transport processes; developing field measurement