amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain electronic educational devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 1, 2, 3 or 4 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,203,705 and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is—

Franklin Electronic Publishers, Inc., One Franklin Plaza, Burlington, NJ 08016–4907.

(b) The respondents are the following companies alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

LeapFrog Enterprises, Inc., 6401 Hollis Street, Emeryville, CA 94608–1071.

Jetta Company, Ltd., Jetta House, 19 On Kui Street, On Lok Tsuen, Fanling, N.T., Hong Kong.

(c) David O. Lloyd, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Room 401, Washington, DC 20436, who shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received no later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to that respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against that respondent.

Issued: August 6, 2002.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 02–20214 Filed 8–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Open Core Protocol International Partnership Association, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on July 8, 2002, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), OCP International Partnership Association, Inc. (''OCP–IP'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, 3rdeye Technology, Washington, DC; e-ASIC, San Jose, CA; Semiconductor Technology Academic Research Center (''STARC''), Yokohama, JAPAN; Qualis, Inc., Lake Oswego, OR; GeoLogic Design, LLP, Redwood City, CA; and Mentor Graphics, San Jose, CA have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and OCP–IP intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 10, 2002, OCP–IP filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 18, 2002 (67 FR 41483).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 02–20140 Filed 8–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Southwest Research Institute: Diesel Aftertreatment Sensitivity to Lubricants (DASL) and Non-Thermal Catalyst Deactivation (N–TCD)

Notice is hereby given that, on July 2, 2002, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4310 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Southwest Research Institute: Diesel Aftertreatment Sensitivity to Lubricants (DASL) and Non-Thermal Catalyst Deactivation (N–TCD) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the current identities of the parties are Caterpillar, Inc., Mossville, IL; Chevron Oronite Company LLC, Richmond, CA; Corning Incorporated, Corning, NY; Exxon Mobile Research and Engineering, Clinton, NJ; Infineum International Limited, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, UNITED KINGDOM; Lubrizol Corporation, Wickliffe, OH; and NGK-Locke, Inc., Southfield, MI. The nature and objectives of the venture are to investigate the potential for lubricating oils to degrade or poison emissions control systems for diesel and gasoline engines. The DASL portion of the investigation is a parametric study which is designed to expose various diesel emissions controls systems to oil combustion byproducts. The effects of the lubricating oil components, such as sulfur, phosphorus, zinc, calcium, and boron will be determined by measuring the deactivation of the emissions control systems as a consequence of oil exposure. The N–TCD portion of the investigation is a research/mechanistic study intended to explore the mechanisms of emissions control system deactivation as a result of oil exposure; for example, phosphorus poisoning of three-way catalysts.

Membership in this research group remains open, and the participants intend to file additional written

notification disclosing all changes in membership and planned activities.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 02–20141 Filed 8–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of July, 2002.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

None

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–41,525; Stanley Furniture Co., Inc., Stanleytown, VA

TA–W–41,018; Lucent Technologies, Inc., Lucent Worldwide Service, Installation Div., Eugene, OR

TA–W–40,802; Geotemps, Hurley, NM

TA–W–41,595; Greyhound Lines, Inc., Dallas, TX

TA–W–41,453; Fun-Tees, Inc., Distribution Center, Concord, NC

TA–W–41,562; Florsheim Distribution Center, Florsheim Group, Inc., Jefferson City, MO

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–41,554; International Utility Structures, Inc., Batesville, AR

TA–W–41,582; Garment Corp. of America, Miami Beach, FL

TA–W–41,494; Mantua Industries, Inc., Woodbury Heights, NJ

TA–W–41,557; Battery Pack of America, Toshiba Battery Co Ltd, Durham, NC

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name and location of each determination references the impact date for all workers of such determination.

TA–W–41,587; Saes Getters Corporation of America, Independence, OH: May 5, 2001.

TA–W–41,392; White Mountain Stitching Co., Littleton, NH: March 21, 2001.

TA–W–41,338; Cooper Wiring Devices, Division of Cooper Industries, Long Island City, NY: March 20, 2001.

TA–W–41,533; The Stanley Works, Stanley Tools Plant, New Britain, CT: January 19, 2002.

TA–W–39,104; Alexander Doll Company, Inc., New York, NY: April 9, 2000.

TA–W–41,344 & A; Vision-Ease Lens Azusa, Inc., Azusa, CA and Vision-Ease Lens, Inc., Azusa, CA: March 22, 2001.

TA–W–41,242; Chevron U.S.A. Production Co (CPDN), A Div. of Chevron U.S.A., Inc., Houston, TX and Operating in the Following Locations: A; CA, B; CO, C; LA, D; NM, E; OK, F; TX, G; WY: July 8, 2001.

TA–W–40,951; Albany International Corp., Geschmay Plant, Greenville, SC: January 28, 2001.

TA–W–41,085; BBI Enterprises, LP, Alpena, MI: February 14, 2001.

TA–W–41,298; Komar Manufacturing Co., Claysburg, PA: March 8, 2001.

TA–W–41,345; Fuchs Systems, Inc., Salisbury, NC: January 20, 2002.

TA–W–41,374; Curtis PMC, Division of Curtis Instruments, Inc., Livermore, CA: March 28, 2001

TA–W–41,526; Wabash Technologies, Automotive Business Unit, Huntington, IN: May 2, 2001

TA–W–41,565; Washington Garment Co., Inc., Washington, NC: April 29, 2001

TA–W–41,592; Logan Manufacturing Company, Inc., Chapmanville, WV: May 2, 2001

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchaper D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the months of July, 2002.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) That imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA–TAA–06270; Sovereign Adhesives, Inc., Ewing, NJ