

Rich Talent Trading Ltd./Smartcord Int'l Co. Ltd.
 Round-the-World (USA) Corp.
 Round-the-World International Trade & Trans. Service (Tianjin) Co., Ltd.
 Seven Seas Candle Ltd.
 Shandong H&T Corp.
 Shandong Native Produce International Trading Co., Ltd.
 Shanghai Arts and Crafts Company
 Shanghai Asian Development Int'l Tr
 Shanghai Broad Trading Co. Ltd.
 Shanghai Gift & Travel Products Import & Export Corp.
 Shanghai Gifts & Travel
 Shanghai Jerry Candle Co., Ltd.
 Shanghai New Star Im/Ex Co., Ltd.
 Shanghai Ornate Candle Art Co., Ltd.
 Shanghai Shen Hong Corp.
 Shanghai Sincere Gifts Designers & Manufacturers, Ltd.
 Shanghai Success Arts & Crafts Factory
 Shanghai Xietong Group O/B Asia 2 Trading Company
 Shanghai Zhen Hua c/o Shanghai Light Industrial Int'l Corp., Ltd.
 Silkroad Gifts
 Simon Int'l Ltd.
 Suzhou Ind'l Park Nam Kwong Imp & Exp Co. Ltd. (No. 339 East Baodai Road, Suzhou)
 Suzhou Ind'l Park Nam Kwong Imp & Exp Co. Ltd. (Zhongxing City, Conghuan Rd., Suzhou)
 T.H.I. (HK) Ltd.
 Taizhou Int'l Trade Corp.
 Taizhou Sungod Gifts Co., Ltd.
 THI (HK) Ltd.
 Thi Group Ltd. and THI (HK) Ltd.
 Tianjin Native Produce Import & Export Group Corp., Ltd.
 Tonglu Tiandi
 Universal Candle Co., Ltd.
 Weltach
 World Way International (Xiamen)
 World-Green (Shandong) Corp., Ltd.
 Xiamen Aider Import & Export Company
 Xiamen C&D Inc.
 Xietong (Group) Co., Ltd.
 Zhejiang Native Produce & Animal By-Products Import & Export Corp.
 Zhong Nam Industrial (International) Co., Ltd.
 Zhongnam Candle
 Zhongxing Shenyang Commercial Building (Group) Co., Ltd.
 [FR Doc. 04-5802 Filed 3-12-04; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-825]

Sebacic Acid from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results in Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Patrick Connolly at (202) 482-1779, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 22, 2003, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 50750 (Aug. 22, 2003). The period of review is July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003. The review covers two exporters of subject merchandise to the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department shall make a preliminary determination in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend the 245-day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period. On March 9, 2004, the Department issued a revised surrogate country selection memorandum to interested parties in this proceeding, in which: 1) Pakistan had been eliminated as an acceptable surrogate country selection; 2) Egypt and Morocco had been added as acceptable surrogate country selections; and 3) economic indicators had been updated for all countries. We requested comments from interested parties for consideration in the preliminary results by April 8, 2004. In order to allow sufficient time for interested parties to comment and provide surrogate value information based on the revised surrogate country selection memorandum, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we have fully extended the deadline by 120 days until July 30, 2004.

Dated: March 9, 2004.

Jeffrey May,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-5801 Filed 3-12-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-887]

Notice of Postponement of Final Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Notice of postponement of final determination of antidumping duty investigation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine Bertrand or Peter Mueller, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3207 and (202) 482-5811 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This investigation was initiated on July 14, 2003. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 42686 (July 18, 2003). The period of investigation ("POI") is October 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003. On January 27, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published the notice of preliminary determination. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China*, 69 FR 3887 (January 27, 2004).

Postponement of Final Determination

Section 735(a)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") provides that a final determination may be postponed until not later than 135 days after the date of the publication of the preliminary determination if, in the event of an affirmative determination, a request for such postponement is made by exporters who account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, or in the event of a negative preliminary determination, a request for such postponement is made

by petitioner. The Department's regulations, at 19 CFR 351.210(e)(2), require that requests by respondents for postponement of a final determination be accompanied by a request for extension of provisional measures from a four-month period to not more than six months. *See* 19 CFR 351.210(e)(2).

On February 27, 2004, the respondent Qingdao Wenkem (F.T.Z.) Trading Company Limited ("QWTC") requested a nine-week extension of the final determination and also requested an extension of the provisional measures. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.210(b), because (1) our preliminary determination is affirmative, (2) QWTC accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and (3) no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are extending the due date for the final determination until no later than 135 days after the publication of preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, the final determination is now due on June 10, 2004. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

This notice is published in accordance with section 735(a)(2) of the Act.

Dated: March 8, 2004.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-5799 Filed 3-12-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-894, A-570-895]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Tissue Paper Products and Certain Crepe Paper Products from the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Ferrier at (202) 482-2667, Rachel Kreissl at (202) 482-0409, and Nazak Nikakhtar at (202) 482-9079 of Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Initiation of Investigations The Petition

On February 17, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("Department") received an antidumping duty petition ("Petition") filed in proper form by Seaman Paper Company of Massachusetts, Inc. ("Seaman"); American Crepe Corporation ("American Crepe"); Eagle Tissue LLC ("Eagle"); Flower City Tissue Mills Co. ("Flower City"); Garlock Printing & Converting, Inc. ("Garlock"); Paper Service Ltd. ("Paper Service"); Putney Paper Co., Ltd. ("Putney"); and the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union AFL-CIO, CLC ("PACE") (collectively "Petitioners"). Seaman, Eagle, Flower City, Garlock, Paper Service, and Putney are domestic producers of certain tissue paper products. Seaman and American Crepe are domestic producers of certain crepe paper products. On February 18, 2004, February 20, 2004, and February 24, 2004, the Department asked Petitioners to clarify certain aspects of the Petition. On February 23, 2004, February 24, 2004, and February 27, 2004, Petitioners submitted information to supplement the Petition ("First Supplemental Response," "Second Supplemental Response," and "Third Supplemental Response," respectively). On February 27, 2004, the Department requested that Petitioners provide publicly ranged data for the quantity and value of imports (*see Memorandum to the File: Request for Publicly Ranged Data for Volume and Value of Imports of Tissue Paper and Crepe Paper From the Peoples Republic of China*, dated February 27, 2004). On March 3, 2004, Petitioners filed their response to the Department's request ("Fourth Supplemental Response"). In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), Petitioners allege that both imports of certain tissue paper products and certain crepe paper products 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, the respective U.S. industries.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed their Petition on behalf of each domestic industry because they are an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and Petitioners have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the investigations they are presently

seeking. *See Determination of Industry Support for the Petition* section below.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that the Department's industry support determination, which is to be made before the initiation of the investigation, be based on whether a minimum percentage of the relevant industry supports the petition. A petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) 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. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A), or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission ("ITC"), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law. *See USEC, Inc. v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2001), citing *Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1988).