

demonstrates that the NZKMB is not strictly the exclusive exporter of kiwifruit from New Zealand. Sales of kiwifruit by any grower, reseller or other party, to the Australian market is permissible under New Zealand law. Also, New Zealand resellers of kiwifruit are permitted to export to other markets if they are licensed by the NZKMB. Thus export markets and export pricing are not subject to absolute control and manipulation by the NZKMB. Even if the NZKMB were in a position to manipulate export prices, there is no evidence on the record that the NZKMB acts on behalf of the New Zealand government to control prices in the home market. As a result, we find that petitioners have not presented evidence of "price control" sufficient to satisfy the "particular market situation" standard under the new law.

A finding of sales below cost of production does not, in and of itself, establish that a "particular market situation" exists. It is the Department's longstanding practice to first determine whether the home market is viable and then to determine whether sales are made below cost of production. In this review, we applied the below-cost test, as described in the preliminary results of review, and found that within an extended period of time, substantially more than 80 percent of the home market sales were sold at prices below the COP, which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Since a substantial number of sales were made below cost we relied on constructed value (CV). Since the remaining above-cost sale(s) in this review segment had no corresponding model matches, we also relied on CV where sale(s) were above-cost.

For these reasons, based on the evidence on the record, we find that the New Zealand market does not represent a "particular market situation" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(C)(iii). As a result, we reaffirm our preliminary determination on this issue.

Final Results of Review

As a result of comments received and programming errors corrected, we have revised our preliminary results.

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (Percent)
New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board	2.81

The Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between

U.S. price and NV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning the respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the review firm will be 2.81 percent; and (2) the cash deposit rate for merchandise exported by all other manufacturers and exporters will be the "all others" rate of 98.60 percent established in the less-than-fair-value investigation; in accordance with the Department practice. See *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F. Supp. 766 (1993), and *Federal Mogul Corporation*, 822 F. Supp. 782 (1993).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review. This notice serves as the final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 22, 1996.

Robert S. La Russa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-22412 Filed 8-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-570-506]

Porcelain on Steel Cookware From the People's Republic of China; 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 limits for antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits of the preliminary and final results of this antidumping duty administrative review of Porcelain on Steel Cookware from the People's Republic of China. The review covers the period December 1, 1994, through November 30, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 3, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judy Kornfeld, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3146.

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 completion of the preliminary results until January 21, 1997 and of the final results until 120 days after publication of the preliminary results of this review, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). (See Memorandum to the file from Jeffrey P. Bialos to Robert S. LaRussa.)

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

Dated: August 28, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-22414 Filed 8-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-570-825]

Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Sebacic Acid from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in response to requests from petitioner, Union Camp Corporation and three respondents: Tianjin Chemicals Import and Export Corporation (Tianjin), Guangdong Chemicals Import and Export Corporation (Guangdong) and Sinochem International Chemicals Company, Ltd. (SICC). This review covers four exporters of the subject merchandise, including the three respondent companies above and Sinochem Jiangsu Import and Export Corporation (Jiangsu). The period of review (POR) is July 13, 1994 through June 30, 1995.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV) during this period. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between United States price (USP) and NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 3, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Patience or Jean Kemp, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3793.

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). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC on July 14, 1994 (59 FR 35909). On July 3, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 34511) a notice

of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the PRC covering the period July 13, 1994 through June 30, 1995.

On July 26, 1995, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a), Union Camp requested that we conduct an administrative review of Tianjin, Guangdong, SICC, and Jiangsu. On July 28, 1996, Tianjin, Guangdong and SICC requested that we conduct an administrative review. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on September 15, 1995 (60 FR 47930). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this order are all grades of sebacic acid, a dicarboxylic acid with the formula $(CH_2)_8(COOH)_2$, which include but are not limited to CP Grade (500ppm maximum ash, 25 maximum APHA color), Purified Grade (1000ppm maximum ash, 50 maximum APHA color), and Nylon Grade (500ppm maximum ash, 70 maximum ICV color). The principal difference between the grades is the quantity of ash and color. Sebacic acid contains a minimum of 85 percent dibasic acids of which the predominant species is the C10 dibasic acid. Sebacic acid is sold generally as a free-flowing powder/flake.

Sebacic acid has numerous industrial uses, including the production of nylon 6/10 (a polymer used for paintbrush and toothbrush bristles and paper machine felts), plasticizers, esters, automotive coolants, polyamides, polyester castings and films, inks and adhesives, lubricants, and polyurethane castings and coatings.

Sebacic acid is currently classifiable under subheading 2917.13.00.00 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 proceeding remains dispositive.

This review covers the period July 13, 1994 through June 30, 1995, and four exporters of Chinese sebacic acid.

Verification

We conducted verifications of the sales and factor information provided by SICC and Tianjin Zhong He Chemical Plant (Zhong He) in Beijing and Tianjin, PRC. We conducted the verifications using standard verification procedures, including onsite inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and

financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports.

Separate Rates

1. Background and Summary of Findings

It is the Department's standard policy to assign all exporters of the merchandise subject to review in non-market-economy countries a single rate, unless an exporter can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports. To establish whether an exporter is sufficiently independent of government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes the exporter in light of the criteria established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) (Sparklers), as amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, May 2, 1994) (Silicon Carbide). Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of de jure absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. Evidence relevant to a de facto absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four factors, whether the respondent: (1) Sets its own export prices independent from the government and other exporters; (2) can retain the proceeds from its export sales; (3) has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts; and (4) has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. See *Silicon Carbide* at 22587; see also *Sparklers* at 20589.

In our final determination of sales at less than fair value, the Department determined that there was de jure and de facto absence of government control and determined that each company warranted a company-specific dumping margin. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 28053 (May 31, 1994) (Sebacic Acid). For this period of review, SICC, Tianjin, and Guangdong have responded to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates. We have found that the

evidence on the record is consistent with the final determination in the LTFV investigation and continues to demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to their exports, in accordance with the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*. For SICC, although we applied the PRC, country-wide rate to two sales reported by SICC, we have preliminarily determined that SICC is separate from government control and Jiangsu. During verification of SICC, we examined its business license and charter, government notices announcing its separation from the government, its tax registration certificate, company management election ballots, and financial statements. These documents showed no evidence of government control of SICC or of any affiliation between Jiangsu and SICC.

2. Separate Rate Determination for Non-responsive Company

For Jiangsu, which did not respond to the questionnaire, we preliminarily determine that this company does not merit a separate rate. Although Jiangsu met the Department's criteria for separate rates in the LTFV investigation, because it failed to respond in this review, we have no information to support continued application of a separate rate. Therefore, because the Department assigns a single rate to companies in a non-market economy unless an exporter can demonstrate absence of government control, we preliminarily determine that Jiangsu is subject to the country-wide rate for this case.

United States Price

For SICC, Tianjin, and Guangdong, the Department based USP on export price (EP), in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act. We made deductions from EP, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, brokerage and handling, and marine insurance. We valued these adjustments using surrogate data based on Indian internal freight costs and international shipping costs. We selected India as the surrogate country for the reasons explained in the "Normal Value" section of this notice.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine the normal value (NV) using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) The merchandise is exported from an NME country; and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

The Department has treated the PRC as an NME country in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is a NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Furthermore, available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home market prices, third country prices or CV under section 773(a) of the Act. Therefore, we treated the PRC as a NME country for purposes of this review and calculated NV by valuing the factors of production in a comparable market economy country which is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. In such cases, the factors include, but are not limited to: (1) Hours of labor required; (2) quantities of raw materials employed; (3) amounts of energy and other utilities consumed; and (4) representative capital cost, including depreciation.

In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act and section 353.52(b) of the Department's regulations, we determined that India is comparable to the PRC in terms of per capita gross national product (GNP), the growth rate in per capita GNP, and the national distribution of labor. (See Memorandum from Director, Office of Policy, to Division Director, Office of Antidumping Compliance, dated March 4, 1996.) The statute directs us to select a country that is comparable economically to the PRC. Based on the list of possible surrogate countries, we find that India is a comparable economy to the PRC.

The statute also requires that, to the extent possible, the Department use a surrogate country that is a significant producer of merchandise comparable to sebacic acid. The countries that we were able to confirm still produce sebacic acid, such as Japan and the United States, do not have economies comparable to the PRC. However, we found that India was a significant producer of comparable merchandise (e.g., oxalic acid) during the POR. Though sebacic acid and oxalic acid have different end uses, both are dicarboxylic acids. In addition, many of the inputs used to produce sebacic acid are also used to produce oxalic acid. Therefore, we find that India fulfills both requirements of the statute.

For purposes of calculating NV, we valued PRC factors of production, in accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act. In determining which surrogate value to use for valuing each factor of production, we selected, where

possible, the publicly available published value which was: (1) An average non-export value; (2) representative of a range of prices within the POR if submitted by an interested party, or most contemporaneous with the POR; (3) product-specific; and (4) tax-exclusive. We chose values with a preference for prices representative of the POR because these prices more closely reflect the prices paid for inputs in the surrogate during the POR. Where we could not obtain a POR-representative price for an input, we selected a value in accordance with the remaining criteria mentioned above and which was closest in time to the POR. In accordance with this section methodology, we valued the factors of production as follows:

For castor oil, the Department valued this material at the market rate as reported in *The Economic Times* (Bombay) for Calcutta, Delhi, Hyderabad, Kanpur, and Madras during the months of July, August, and November 1994. These values were reported by counsel for the respondents. The Department adjusted these values to account for freight costs between the supplier and the respondents' sebacic acid manufacturing facilities.

For caustic soda, the Department used the value reported in the publication *Indian Chemical Weekly*, using data from the months of October–December 1994, and January and April, 1995. These reported values were adjusted to include freight expense incurred from the suppliers to the respondents' sebacic acid manufacturing facilities.

For cresol, also referred to as orthol cresol, respondents reported the market value as indicated in *Chemical Weekly*. Respondents provided information concerning prices during the months of October and November, 1994. The Department reviewed pricing information for other months of the POR which indicated that the market prices reported by respondents is representative of the market price of the material for the entire POR.

The valuation of activated carbon, which is interchangeable with macropore resin, was based upon information found in the publication *India's Imports by Commodities-Countries* (Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India (IMF)). This pricing information reflects the average unit price for the period April–October, 1994. This average unit value was adjusted to account for inland freight expense.

The market value for sodium chloride (also referred to as sodium chlorite or vacuum salt) and zinc oxide was based upon the published market prices

reported in *Chemical Weekly*.

Respondents provided information concerning the market price of sodium chloride on December 27, 1994 and March 28, 1995, and of zinc oxide on March 28, 1995. The Department reviewed other dates throughout the POR and determined that the market prices published on these dates were representative of the prices for the entire POR.

For direct labor, we used 1994 data from *Investing, Licensing & Trading Conditions Abroad, India*, published in November 1994 by the Economist Intelligence Unit. We then adjusted the 1994 labor value to the POR to reflect inflation using wholesale price indices (WPI) of India as published in the *International Financial Statistics* by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

For factory overhead, we used information obtained from the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. From "Statement 1—Combined Income, Value of Production, Expenditure and Appropriation Accounts, Industry Group-wise" of that report for the Indian metals and chemicals industries, we summed those components which pertain to overhead expenses and divided them by the sum of those components pertaining to the cost of manufacturing to calculate an overhead rate of 10.74 percent.

For coal we used prices published in the *Gazette of India* for June 1994; for electricity we used information obtained from the *Current Energy Scene in India* for July 1995.

For selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we used information from the same source as was used for factory overhead. We summed the values which comprised the components of SG&A and divided that figure by the same cost of manufacturing figure used to determine factory overhead, to arrive at an SG&A rate of 17.99 percent.

For the calculation of profit, we used information from the same *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. We divided the reported before-tax profit by the sum of those components pertaining to the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A to calculate a profit rate of 5.71 percent.

For the value of export packing (plastic bags), the Department used the value of imports into India during April 1994–February 1995 and for April 1995, as obtained from the Indian Import Statistics, for HTS number 3923.21.

For foreign inland freight, the Department relied upon the trucking freight rates reported to the Department in an August 1993 embassy cable from India, pursuant to the less-than-fair-value investigation of certain helical spring lock washers from the PRC. This is the same information we used in the sebacic acid less-than-fair-value investigation. We adjusted these rates to the POR to reflect inflation.

For ocean freight, the Department used the information provided by respondents, which is based upon the common rates tariff filed by Nippon Yusen Kaisha with the Federal Maritime Commission for rates from China to New York.

To calculate the expense for marine insurance, the Department used information from a publicly summarized version of the questionnaire response for the investigation of sales of less than fair value of sulphur dyes from India. The marine insurance rate reported in the public version of the October 8, 1992 response was adjusted to reflect marine insurance charges during the POR.

To value fatty acid, we used publicly available published information from the *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India* (Monthly Statistics) and adjusted the value to account for inflation between the time period applicable to the value in question and the POR using wholesale price indices (WPI) published in International Financial Statistics (IFS) by the IMF. To value glycerine, we used a value for crude glycerine in the publication *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India* and adjusted the value to account for inflation between the time period applicable to the value in question and the POR using WPI published in IFS by the IMF. Consistent with the methodology employed in the final determination in the less-than-fair-value investigation, we have determined that fatty acid and glycerine are by-products. See *Sebacic Acid* at 28056.

Therefore, as by-products, we subtracted the sales revenue of fatty acid and glycerine from the production costs of sebacic acid. This treatment of by-products is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. (See *Cost Accounting: A Managerial Emphasis* (1991) at pages 539–544).

To value caproyl alcohol, we used publicly available published information from *Chemical Weekly*. Consistent with the methodology employed in the final determination in the less-than-fair-value investigation, we have determined that caproyl alcohol is a co-product. Therefore, we have allocated the factor inputs, based on the relative quantity of output of this product and sebacic acid. Additionally, we have used the production times necessary to complete each production stage of sebacic acid as a basis for allocating the amount of labor, energy usage, and factory overhead among the products. This treatment of co-products is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. (See *Cost Accounting: A Managerial Emphasis* (1991) at pages 528–533).

Margin Calculation

For SICC, at verification we found that certain sales reported as SICC sales were in fact sales by another respondent company, Jiangsu, (See Memorandum from Analyst to File: Verification of Sales Questionnaire Response of Sinochem International Chemicals Company, dated August 26, 1996.) Therefore, for these sales, we applied the rate applicable to Jiangsu's sales, 243.40 percent, and then weighted these sales into the overall calculation of SICC's margin. (See Memorandum from Edward Yang, Office Director for AD/CVD Enforcement to Joseph Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement: Appropriate Rate for Certain Sales Reported by Sinochem International Chemical Corporation, First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Sebacic Acid from the People's Republic of China, dated August 27).

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Tianjin Chemicals I/E Corp	7/13/94–6/30/95	35.42
Guangdong Chemicals I/E Corp	7/13/94–6/30/95	14.06
Sinochem International Chemicals Corp	7/13/94–6/30/95	70.55
Country-Wide Rate	7/13/94–6/30/95	243.40

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter.

Interested parties may submit written comments (case briefs) within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal comments (rebuttal briefs), which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, within 180 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates (SICC, Tianjin and Guangdong) will be the rates for those firms established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rates will be 243.40 percent; and (3) the cash deposit rates for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rates applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification of Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the

subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: August 26, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-22413 Filed 8-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 960726208-6208-01]

RIN 0693-XX21

Proposed Withdrawal of Thirty-two Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Publications

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The following Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Publications are proposed for withdrawal from the FIPS series:

- FIPS 1-2, Code for Information Interchange, Its Representations, Subsets, and Extension (ANSI X3.4-1986/R1992, X3.32-1990, X3.41-1990)
- FIPS 11-3, Guideline: American National Dictionary for Information Systems (ANSI X3.172-1990 & X3.172A-1992)
- FIPS 16-1, Bit Sequencing of Code for Information Interchange in Serial-By-Bit Data Transmission (ANSI X3.15-1976/R1983&R1990)
- FIPS 17-1, Character Structure and Character Parity Sense for Serial-By-Bit Data Communication in the Code for Information Interchange (ANSI X3.16-1976/R1983&R1990)
- FIPS 19-2, Catalog of Widely Used Code Sets
- FIPS 22-1, Synchronous Signaling Rates Between Data Terminal and Data Communication Equipment (ANSI X3.1-1976)
- FIPS 34, Guide for the Use of International System of Units (SI) in Federal Information Processing Standards Publications
- FIPS 49, Guideline on Computer Performance Management: An Introduction
- FIPS 57, Guidelines for the Measurement of Interactive Computer Service Response Time and Turnaround Time
- FIPS 58-1, Representations of Local Time of the Day for Information Interchange (ANSI X3.43-1986)
- FIPS 59, Representations of Universal Time, Local Time Differentials, and United States Time Zone References for Information Interchange (ANSI X3.51-1975)
- FIPS 68-2, BASIC (ANSI X3.113-1987)

- FIPS 70-1, Representation of Geographic Point Locations for Information Interchange (ANSI X3.61-1986)
- FIPS 75, Guideline on Constructing Benchmarks for ADP System Acquisitions
- FIPS 76, Guideline for Planning and Using a Data Dictionary System
- FIPS 77, Guideline for Planning and Management of Database Applications
- FIPS 86, Additional Controls for Use with American National Standard Code for Information Interchange (ANSI X3.64-1979/R1990)
- FIPS 88, Guideline on Integrity Assurance and Control in Database Administration
- FIPS 94, Guideline on Electrical Power for ADP Installations
- FIPS 96, Guideline for Developing and Implementing a Charging System for Data Processing Services
- FIPS 99, Guideline: A Framework for the Evaluation and Comparison of Software Development Tools
- FIPS 103, Codes for the Identification of Hydrologic Units in the United States and the Caribbean Outlying Areas (USGS/CIRCULAR #878-A & ANSI X3.145-1986)
- FIPS 104-1, ANS Codes for the Representation of Names of Countries, Dependencies, and Areas of Special Sovereignty for Information Interchange
- FIPS 109, Pascal (ANSI/IEEE 770X3.97-1983/R1990)
- FIPS 110, Guideline for Choosing a Data Management Approach
- FIPS 123, Specification for a Data Descriptive File for Information Interchange (DDF) (ANSI/ISO 8211-1985/R1992)
- FIPS 124, Guideline on Functional Specifications for Database Management Systems
- FIPS 126, Database Language NDL (ANSI X3.133-1986)
- FIPS 152, Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) (ISO 8879-1986)
- FIPS 156, Information Resource Dictionary System (IRDS) (ANSI X3.138-1988&X3.138A-1991)
- FIPS 157, Guideline for Quality Control of Image Scanners (ANSI/AIIM MS44-1988)
- FIPS 158-1, The User Interface Component of the Applications Portability Profile (MIT X Version 11, Release 5)

Many of these FIPS adopt voluntary industry standards for Federal government use, but the FIPS documents have not been updated to reference current or revised voluntary industry standards. In some cases, commercial products implementing the voluntary industry standards, such as the American National Code for Information Interchange, are widely available. In other cases, the industry specifications have not been implemented in commercial off-the-shelf products. As a result, it is no longer necessary for the government to mandate standards in these areas.

Others of these FIPS provide advisory guidance to Federal agencies with no requirements for compulsory and binding use. They explain and