

Inspection Facility, Room 6020, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. For further information or copies of the minutes, contact Lee Ann Carpenter on (202) 482-2583.

Dated: August 16, 1996.

Lee Ann Carpenter,

Director, Technical Advisory Committee Unit.

[FR Doc. 96-21355 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

International Trade Administration

[A-557-805]

Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; 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 limits of the preliminary and final results of the third antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. The review covers the period October 1, 1994 through September 30, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 22, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel LaCivita 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) 482-4740 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 November 27, 1996, and the final results until 180 days after publication of the preliminary results of review, 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 the file dated July 22, 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: July 24, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-21462 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-560-801]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products From Indonesia

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 22, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger, Everett Kelly, or Barbara Wojcik-Betancourt, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4136, (202) 482-4194, or (202) 482-0629, 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 Round Agreements Act ("URAA").

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that melamine institutional dinnerware products ("MIDPs") from Indonesia are being, or are 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 Investigations: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products from Indonesia, Taiwan and the People's Republic of China* (61 FR 8039, March 1, 1996), the following events have occurred:

On March 22, 1996, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case (see ITC Investigation Nos. 731-TA-741, -742, and -743).

On April 15, 1996, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to the following companies identified by petitioners or

by the U.S. embassy in Indonesia as possible exporters of the subject merchandise: P.T. Multi Raya Indah Abadi ("Multiraya"), P.T. Meiwa Indonesia ("Meiwa"), P.T. Mayer Crocodile, and P.T. Impack Pratama. 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 April 24, 1996, Meiwa advised the Department in a fax that it neither produces nor exports the subject merchandise. In a letter dated May 23, 1996, Impack Pratama stated it does not manufacture the subject merchandise. Multiraya filed a timely questionnaire response in this investigation (see below). P. T. Mayer Crocodile did not respond to the Department's questionnaire.

On May 30, 1996, petitioner, the American Melamine Institutional Tableware Association ("AMITA"), alleged that Multiraya had made sales in the home market at prices that were below COP, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act. As a result, the Department began a COP investigation on June 11, 1996 (see June 11, 1996, memorandum from MIDP team to Gary Taverman, Acting Office Director, Office of Antidumping Investigations).

On June 6, 1996, the Department postponed the preliminary determination of this investigation and the companion investigations on melamine dinnerware products from the People's Republic of China and Taiwan until August 14, 1996, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(B) of the Act (61 FR 30219, June 14, 1996).

Multiraya submitted its questionnaire responses in May and June 1996. We issued a supplemental request for information in June and received the response to this request in July 1996. Multiraya submitted additional information supplementing its response during July 1996.

Petitioner filed comments on Multiraya's questionnaire responses in June, July and August 1996.

Postponement of Final Determination

On August 5, 1996, Multiraya 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, Multiraya 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 Multiraya's request and postponing the final determination. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly. See *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, from Japan* (61 FR 8029, March 1, 1996).

Scope of Investigation

This investigation covers all items of dinnerware (e.g., plates, cups, saucers, bowls, creamers, gravy boats, serving dishes, platters, and trays) that contain at least 50 percent melamine by weight and have a minimum wall thickness of 0.08 inch. This merchandise is classifiable under subheadings 3924.10.20, 3924.10.30, and 3924.10.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Excluded from the scope of investigation are flatware products (e.g., knives, forks, and spoons).

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation ("POI") is January 1, 1995, through December 31, 1995.

Fair Value Comparisons

A. P.T. Mayer Crocodile

We did not receive a response to our questionnaire from P.T. Mayer Crocodile. Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party withholds information that has been requested by the Department, fails to provide such information in a timely manner and in the form requested, significantly impedes a proceeding, or provides such information but the information cannot be verified, the Department shall use the facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. Because P.T. Mayer Crocodile failed to submit the information that the Department specifically requested, we must base our

determination for that company on the facts available.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used against a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information. The Department has determined that, in selecting from among the facts otherwise available, an adverse inference is warranted.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that where the Department selects from among the facts otherwise available and relies on "secondary information," the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information from independent sources reasonably at the Department's disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. (1994) (hereinafter, the "SAA"), states that the petition is "secondary information" and that "corroborate" means to determine that the information used has probative value. See SAA at 870.

In this proceeding, we considered the petition as the most appropriate information on the record to form the basis for a dumping calculation for this uncooperative respondent. In accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, we attempted to corroborate the data contained in the petition. Specifically, the petitioner based both the export price and normal value in the petition on Multiraya's ex-factory prices for nine-inch plates obtained from a market research report. We compared the petitioner's submitted price data to actual prices reported in Multiraya's questionnaire response for products of the same size and shape. We found the Multiraya normal value data from the market research report to be consistent with normal value data in Multiraya's questionnaire response. Thus, we consider the normal value data in the petition to have been corroborated and will therefore utilize such data in our margin calculation for P.T. Mayer Crocodile. We did not, however, consider the export price from the petition to be corroborated because the Multiraya export price data in the market research report was substantially different than the actual data reported by Multiraya in its questionnaire response. Therefore, we have not used the export price in the petition.

In selecting from among the facts otherwise available with regard to export price, we have used the lowest ex-factory export price reported by Multiraya for a nine-inch plate. We found this information to be sufficiently adverse to effectuate the purpose of the statute, and we also note that the

number of EP sales to select from was small. We compared that export price to the ex-factory normal value used in the petition in order to calculate a margin for P. T. Mayer Crocodile. This methodology is, of course, subject to Multiraya's verification results.

B. Multiraya

To determine whether Multiraya's sales of the subject merchandise 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.

(i) 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 of this notice, above, produced in Indonesia by Multiraya 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 (listed in order of preference): shape type (i.e., flat, e.g., plates, trays, saucers, etc.; or container, e.g., bowls, cups, etc.), specific shape, diameter (where applicable), length (where applicable), capacity (where applicable), thickness, design (i.e., whether or not a design is stamped into the piece), and glazing (i.e., where a design is present, whether or not it is also glazed). See also *Model Match Methodology for the Preliminary Determinations* memorandum from MIDP team to Louis Apple, Acting Office Director, dated August 12, 1996.

(ii) Level of Trade

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the SAA at 829-831, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate normal values based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales. When the Department is unable to find sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the

U.S. sale(s), the Department may compare sales in the U.S. and foreign markets at different levels of trade. See, also, *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy* (61 FR 30326, June 14, 1996) (“*Pasta from Italy*”).

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A), if sales at different levels of trade are compared, the Department will adjust the normal value to account for the difference in level of trade if two conditions are met. First, there must be differences between the actual selling functions performed by the seller at the level of trade of the U.S. sale and the level of trade of the normal value sale. Second, the difference must affect price comparability as evidenced by a pattern of consistent price differences between sales at the different levels of trade in the market in which normal value is determined.

In its questionnaire responses, Multiraya did not specifically identify levels of trade based on its selling activities by customer categories within each market. In order to independently confirm the absence of separate levels of trade within or between the U.S. and home markets, we examined Multiraya's questionnaire responses for indications that Multiraya's function as a seller differed among customer categories. Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, and the SAA at 827, in identifying levels of trade for directly observed (i.e., not constructed) export price and normal values sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price, before any adjustments. Where possible, we further examined whether each selling function was performed on a substantial portion of sales. (See *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, (61 FR 7303, 7348, February 27, 1996)) (“Proposed Regulations”).

Multiraya sold to a single customer in the U.S. market. In the home market, Multiraya sold only to one category of customer and performed the same selling functions between sales to the home market customers. Thus, our analysis of the questionnaire response leads us to conclude that sales within each market are not made at different levels of trade. Accordingly, we preliminarily find that no level of trade differences exist between any sales in either the home market or the U.S. market. Therefore, all price comparisons are at the same level of trade and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) is unwarranted.

Export Price

We calculated EP, in accordance with subsections 772 (a) and (c) of the Act,

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 (“CEP”) was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record.

We have preliminarily rejected petitioner's request that CEP be used because we do not find the record to indicate that the sole U.S. importer and Multiraya are affiliated parties. Section 771(33)(G) of the Act provides, *inter alia*, that parties will be considered affiliated when one controls the other. A person controls another person “if the person is legally or operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction over the other person.” The SAA further states that a company may be in a position to exercise restraint or direction through, among other things, “close supplier relationships in which the supplier or buyer becomes reliant upon the other.”

Pursuant to section 771(33) of the Act, we reviewed Multiraya's relationship with its U.S. importer and have determined, subject to verification, that petitioner's claim is unwarranted. The evidence indicates that there is no corporate or familial relationship between the two companies. Multiraya reported in its questionnaire response that it negotiated prices with the importer, that the importer is free to purchase MIDP from sources other than Multiraya (and has done so), and that Multiraya is free to sell to any customer in the United States. Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that Multiraya and the U.S. importer are not affiliated.

For Multiraya, we calculated EP based on packed, ex-works, FOB (“free on board”) port to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for foreign inland freight expenses, which include foreign brokerage and handling. In accordance with section 772(c)(1)(B), we added amounts for import duties imposed on imported materials and rebated upon export of the subject merchandise (“duty drawback”).

Multiraya reported that it did not borrow in U.S. dollars during the POI. In accordance with the Department's questionnaire instructions and practice (see, e.g., *Pasta from Italy*), Multiraya calculated its reported U.S. imputed credit expense using the average short-term interest rate (i.e., “prime rate”) in the United States during the POI, as published by the International Monetary Fund in *International Financial Statistics*, for purposes of making circumstance of sale adjustment for this expense.

Multiraya reported that it pays an excise tax on imported melamine powder—a material that Multiraya reports is not produced in Indonesia—and then receives a corporate income tax credit equal to the amount of the excise tax paid on the imported melamine powder content of the exported subject merchandise. As such, Multiraya claims that this tax credit constitutes a duty drawback under section 772(c)(1)(B). The information currently on the record supports Multiraya's claim and we have included this adjustment in our EP calculation. We will, however, examine this claim further at verification.

Normal Value

Cost of Production Analysis

As noted in the “Case History” section of this notice above, based on the petitioner's allegations, the Department found reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Multiraya made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise. As a result, the Department initiated an investigation to determine whether Multiraya made home market sales during the POI at prices below the COP 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 Multiraya's reported 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.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

We used the respondent's 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 selling expenses. We did not deduct indirect selling expenses from the home market price because these expenses were included in the G&A portion of COP.

C. Results of COP Test

In determining whether to disregard home-market sales made at prices below COP, we examine (1) whether, within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities and (2) whether such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. Where less than 20 percent (by quantity) of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales of that product. Where 20 percent (by quantity) or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POI were at prices less than the COP, we determine such sales to have been made in substantial quantities within an extended period; where we determine that such sales were also not made at prices that permit recovery of cost within a reasonable period, we disregard the below-cost sales.

In this case, we found that some products had no above-cost sales available for matching purposes. Accordingly, 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 Multiraya's cost of materials, fabrication, selling, general, and administrative expenses ("SG&A"), and profit, plus U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales database. 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. We calculated Multiraya's CV based on the methodology described above for the calculation of COP. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses.

Adjustments to Prices

We calculated NV based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for discounts and inland freight. In addition, where appropriate, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses, bank charges (U.S. market), and warranty expenses (home market).

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.

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 convert foreign currencies based on the dollar exchange rate in effect on the date of sale of the subject merchandise, except if it is established that a currency transaction on forward markets is directly linked to an export sale. When a company demonstrates that a sale on forward markets is directly linked to a particular export sale in order to minimize its exposure to exchange rate losses, the Department will use the rate of exchange in the forward currency sale agreement.

Section 773A(a) also directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation exists, we substitute the benchmark rate for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice. 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. (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 Indonesian rupiah 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
P. T. Mayer Crocodile	12.90
P. T. Multi Raya Indah Abadi	5.24
All others	5.24

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, in 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 November 13, 1996, and rebuttal briefs, no later than November 20, 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 November 26, 1996, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 1414 at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 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(d) of the Act.

Dated: August 14, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-21463 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-570-844]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 22, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Wojcik-Betancourt, Everett Kelly, David J. Goldberger, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0629, (202) 482-4194, or (202) 482-4136, 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

We preliminarily determine that melamine institutional dinnerware products ("MIDPs") 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 ("LTFV"), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation (61 FR 8039, March 1, 1996) the following events have occurred:

On March 22, 1996, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case (see ITC Investigation Nos. 731-TA-741, -742, and -743).

On March 8 and 29, 1996, we sent surveys to the PRC's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation ("MOFTEC") and to the China Chamber of Commerce of Metals, Minerals, and Chemicals ("China Chamber") requesting the identification of producers and exporters, and information on production and sales of MIDPs exported to the United States. In April we received responses from the PRC government identifying the following exporters as companies who sold the subject merchandise during the period of investigation ("POI").

Shenzhen Baon District Foreign Economic Development Corp.
Shenzhen Longang District Foreign Economic Service Corp.
Guandong Light Industrial Products Import & Export Corp. (hereinafter, "Guandong")
Xinjian Foreign Trade Corp. (hereinafter, "Xinjian FTC")
Shanghai Foreign Corp.
Sam Choan Plastic Co. Ltd. (hereinafter, "Sam Choan")
Nian Jing Koto Melamine Products Company Ltd.
Zhejiang Melamine Dinnerware Company Ltd.
Hui Zhou Ziao Cheng Plastic Products Co. Ltd.
Shang Hai Jia Da Plastic Products Co. Ltd.
Dongguan Wan Chao Melamine Products Co., Ltd.
Shin Lung Melamine Guangzhou Co., Ltd.
Dong Guan Hotai Plastic Products Company Ltd.
Ji Nan Fortune Long Melamine Products Co. Ltd.
Kunshan Ever Unison Melamine Products Co. Ltd.
Guang Dong Guan Living Products Co. Ltd.

Tar Hong Melamine Xiamen Co. Ltd. (hereinafter, "Tar Hong Xiamen")
Chen Hao (Xiamen) Plastic Industrial Co. Ltd. (hereinafter, "Chen Hao Xiamen"), and
Gin Harvest Melamine (Heyuan) Enterprises Co. Ltd. (hereinafter, Gin Harvest Heyuan).

On April 8, 1996, the Department received faxes from two of the identified companies, Guandong and Xinjian FTC, stating that they did not export the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI.

On April 15, 1996, the Department issued an antidumping questionnaire to the China Chamber and MOFTEC with instructions to forward the document to all producers/exporters of the subject merchandise and that these companies must respond by the due dates. We also sent courtesy copies of the antidumping duty questionnaire to all identified companies. 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 B does not normally apply in antidumping proceedings involving the PRC). Section D requests information on the factors of production of the subject merchandise.

On May 10, 1996, the Department requested that interested parties provide information for valuing the factors of production and for surrogate country selection. We received comments from the interested parties in June 1996.

On June 6, 1996, the Department postponed the preliminary determination of this investigation and the companion investigations from Indonesia and Taiwan until August 14, 1996, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(B) of the Act (61 FR 30219, June 14, 1996).

In May and June 1996, the five participating respondents—Chen Hao Xiamen, Sam Choan, Dongguan, Tar Hong Xiamen, and Gin Harvest—submitted questionnaire responses. We issued supplemental questionnaires to these companies on June 26, 1996, and we received responses in July 1996. We did not receive any information from the other thirteen identified companies.

On May 29, 1996, petitioner, the American Melamine Institutional Tableware Association ("AMITA"), requested that the Department consider whether the special rule for certain multinational corporations ("MNC") set forth in section 773(d) of the Act should be applied in this investigation. Petitioner suggested that this provision should be applied with respect to Chen