www.ia.ita.doc.gov. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our verification and analysis of the comments received, we have changed our approach to the margin calculation for Panchmahal and Isibars. *See* the Decision Memo.

Final Results of the Review

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exists for the period February 1, 1999, through January 31, 2000:

CERTAIN FORGED STAINLESS STEEL FLANGES FROM INDIA

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Echjay	0
Isibars	6.76
Panchmahal	61.31
Patheja	210.00
Viraj	21.10

Where applicable we calculated import-specific duty assessment rates in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries, by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise.

In addition, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice for all shipments of stainless steel flanges from India entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) For the companies reviewed, the cash deposit rates will be the rates listed above, (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent segment of the proceeding in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 162.14 percent, the all others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only 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 351.305(a)(3). Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.214.

September 5, 2001.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—Issues in Decision Memorandum

Comments

Isibars: Petitioners object to Isibars' sales data revisions; Isibars objects to the use of constructed value instead of third country sales; Isibars objects to the Department's surrogate company choice; Isibars objects to the financial results period used for surrogate expense data; Isibars claims it did not get service of Echjay's published annual reports;

Panchmahal: Petitioners claim Panchmahal's misreported sales merit adverse facts available; Petitioners urge a more adverse approach to Constructed Value (moot); Petitioners urge a more adverse approach to Brokerage and Handling (moot); Panchmahal objects to the expense ratios from a surrogate company (moot);

Viraj: Petitioners claim Viraj improperly reported duty drawback; Petitioners claim fixed overhead was understated; Petitioners claim net interest expense was understated; Viraj asks that prices and costs be calculated per-piece, not per-kilogram; Viraj argues that the DIFMER Test and Per-Kilogram Costs distort results; Viraj objects to comparisons of rough to finished flanges; Viraj objects to the comparison of ASTM to DIN standard merchandise; Viraj objects to the use of its reported weights instead of its standard weights.

[FR Doc. 01–23330 Filed 9–18–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Cancellation of Partially Closed Meeting of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership National Advisory Board Scheduled For September 20, 2001

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting Cancellation.

SUMMARY: The partially closed meeting of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership National Advisory Board, originally scheduled for September 20, 2001 at the National Institute of Standards and Technology is hereby canceled.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Linda Acierto, Senior Policy Advisor, Manufacturing Extension Partnership, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–4800, telephone 301–975–5033 or e-mail *linda.acierto@nist.gov*.

Dated: September 14, 2001.

Michael R. Rubin,

Acting Chief Counsel for Technology.

[FR Doc. 01–23444 Filed 9–18–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice is being republished to proved an additional thirty (30) day comment period. The original notice was published on September 11, 2001 (66 FR 47176). Changes to Page 2 of the DLA Form 1822 have been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget. The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information