

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Department) announces the availability of its guidelines for the proper consideration of small entities in agency rulemaking pursuant to Executive Order 13272. The purpose of these guidelines is to establish procedures and policies to promote compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA). These guidelines ensure that the Department properly considers the potential impacts of its rulemakings on small business, small governmental jurisdictions, and small organizations during the rulemaking process.

**ADDRESSES:** To obtain a copy of the Department's guidelines, please send a written request to Daniel Cohen, Chief Counsel for Regulation, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Ave., Suite 5876, Washington, DC 20230, or visit the following Web site: <http://www.ogc.doc.gov/ogc/legreg/regulati.htm>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, please contact Tricia Choe, Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation at (202) 482-4265.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On August 13, 2002, the President signed Executive Order 13272 entitled Proper Consideration of Small Entities in Agency Rulemaking. Executive Order 13272 requires federal agencies to issue policies and procedures to ensure that the potential impacts of agency rules in small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions are properly considered during the rulemaking process consistent with the statutory mandates of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA). *See* 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The intent of the Order is to ensure that agencies work closely with the Office of Advocacy at the Small Business Administration to address small business issues as early as possible in the regulatory process, particularly as they relate to disproportionate regulatory burden.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Order, the Department of Commerce prepared guidelines that establish procedures and policies ensuring compliance with the RFA. These guidelines ensure that the Department properly considers the potential impacts of rules on small business, small governmental jurisdictions, and small organizations during the rulemaking process. Specifically, the document provides guidance concerning the formulation of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis and final regulatory

flexibility analysis, the certification process, and the SBA review process.

On November 13, 2002, the Department submitted a draft of the guidelines to SBA for review and comment. After reviewing the guidelines, SBA requested that the Department make minor editorial revisions and include the Department's procedure for notifying SBA of proposed rules that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Department addressed all of SBA's comments. The Department now makes available to the public its guidelines. To obtain a copy of the guidelines, please see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

Dated: February 13, 2003.

**Theodore W. Kassinger,**  
General Counsel, Department of Commerce.  
[FR Doc. 03-4032 Filed 2-19-03; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 3510-BW-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-201-809]

#### **Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico: Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On November 12, 2002, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the remand determination of the Department of Commerce (the Department) in the 1997-98 administrative review for Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. (AHMSA) arising from the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Mexico. *See Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. v. United States of America, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation*, Consol. Ct. No. 01-00018, Slip Op. 02-136 (CIT November 12, 2002) (the November 12, 2002 Court order). As there is now a final court decision, we are amending the amended final results of the review in this matter. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these amended final results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 20, 2003.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Thomas Killiam or Michael Heaney, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street N.W. and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5222 or (202) 482-4475, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On August 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on steel plate from Mexico (58 FR 44165). On February 18, 2000, the Department published the final results of the 1997-1998 administrative review. *See Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 8338, February 18, 2000. The Department published three successive sets of amended results, on November 2, 2000 (65 FR 65830), December 12, 2000 (65 FR 77566), and January 24, 2001 (66 FR 7619).

Following the January 24, 2001 amended results, the foreign producer, AHMSA, contested certain aspects of the Department's final and amended final results at the CIT. The Department requested a voluntary remand, and on April 15, 2002, the CIT remanded the amended final results to the Department. On June 28, 2002, the Department issued its remand redetermination. *See Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Order in Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. v. United States, et. al.*, Court No. 01-00018, June 28, 2002. *See also* Memorandum to the File from T. Killiam, Case Analyst, "Analysis of Programming Revisions in the Final Remand Results of Review of Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Mexico A-201-809", June 28, 2002; and Memorandum to Neal Halper, Director, Office of Accounting, from Peter S. Scholl, Senior Accountant, "Final Remand Redetermination - Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Mexico," June 28, 2002. In the remand determination, the Department used historical and inflation-adjusted information previously placed on the record by AHMSA to calculate a revised financial expense rate, and applied this revised rate to AHMSA's historical cost of manufacturing.

On November 12, 2002, the CIT sustained the Department's remand results.

**Amendment to Final Results**

The time period for appealing the CIT's decision sustaining the Department's remand results has expired and no party has appealed this decision. Therefore, pursuant to section 516 A(c) of the Tariff Act, (19 U.S.C. 1516a(c)), we are amending our final results of review for the period August 1, 1997 through July 1, 1998, to reflect the findings in the remand results.

The revised weighted-average margin for AHMSA is as follows:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
AHMSA .....	0.07 ( <i>de minimis</i> )

The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties all entries of AHMSA's subject merchandise during the POR, as provided in 19 C.F.R. 351.106(c)(2). The above amended rate will not affect AHMSA's cash deposit rates currently in effect, which continue to be based on the margins found to exist in the most recently completed review.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)).

Dated: February 11, 2003.

**Faryar Shirzad,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03-4131 Filed 2-19-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration**

[A-588-861]

**Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Polyvinyl Alcohol from Japan**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value.

**SUMMARY:** We preliminarily determine that polyvinyl alcohol from Japan is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Interested parties are invited to comment on this preliminary determination. We will make our final determination not later than 75 days

after the date of this preliminary determination.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 20, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mike Strollo or Gregory E. Kalbaugh, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0629 or (202) 482-3693, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Preliminary Determination**

We preliminarily determine that polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) from Japan is being sold, or is likely to be sold, in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (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 (*Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Polyvinyl Alcohol from Germany, Japan, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Singapore*, 67 FR 61591 (Oct. 1, 2002)) (*Initiation Notice*), the following events have occurred:

On September 30, 2002, we received scope comments from Celanese Ltd. and E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. (collectively, the petitioners), in which the petitioners requested that we revise the scope to exclude PVA used as, or in the manufacture of, excipients.

On October 11, 2002, the petitioners and two Japanese producers, Kuraray Co., Ltd. (Kuraray) and Marubeni Specialty Chemicals, Inc. (Marubeni), submitted comments on the model-matching criteria to be used by the Department. On October 15, 2002, Marubeni submitted an amendment to its model-matching comments.

On October 21, 2002, we received requests to exclude certain additional products from the scope of this investigation from Kuraray and two importers of PVA (*i.e.*, Oxyvinyls, LP and Ricoh Electronics, Inc.).

Also on October 21, 2002, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that imports of PVA from Japan are materially injuring the United States industry. *See* ITC Investigation Nos. 731-TA-1014-1018 (Publication No. 3553, *Polyvinyl Alcohol from Germany, Japan, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Singapore*, 67 FR 65597 (Oct. 25, 2002)).

On October 22, 2002, we issued antidumping questionnaires to Denki Kagaku Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha (Denki Kagaku), Japan VAM & POVAL Co., Ltd. (Japan VAM & POVAL), Kuraray, and the Nippon Synthetic Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. (Nippon Gohsei), the producers/exporters accounting for all known exports of subject merchandise from Japan during the period of investigation (POI). For further discussion, see the memorandum to Louis Apple, Director, Office 2, from the Team entitled "Antidumping Duty Investigation of Polyvinyl Alcohol from Japan - Selection of Respondents," dated October 22, 2002.

On November 19, 2002 and November 25, 2002, respectively, Kuraray and Nippon Gohsei submitted responses to Section A of the Department's questionnaire. Both Japan VAM & POVAL and Denki Kagaku failed to respond to the Department's questionnaire. For further discussion, see the "Facts Available (FA)" section of this notice.

On December 5, 2002, Kuraray notified the Department that it would no longer participate in this investigation, and it requested that the Department remove all of its business proprietary information from the record of this proceeding. On December 11, 2002, the Department destroyed Kuraray's business proprietary information and notified Kuraray of this action. For further discussion, see the "Facts Available (FA)" section of this notice.

On December 13, 2002, the petitioners and Nippon Gohsei submitted additional model-matching comments.

On December 23, 2002, the petitioners agreed to the exclusion requests made on October 21, 2002. On January 9, 2003, Kuraray requested that the Department modify the scope language in the petitioners' December 23, 2002, submission to avoid unnecessary restrictions on imports of certain of the products covered by that submission which are not manufactured in the United States. On January 22, 2003, the petitioners agreed to the majority of Kuraray's proposed revisions. Accordingly, certain exclusions have now been incorporated into the scope. For further discussion, see the "Scope Comments" section below.

On January 27, 2003, Japan VAM & POVAL requested that the Department revise the scope to exclude certain additional copolymers. Also on January 27, 2003, Nippon Gohsei requested that the Department modify the scope language in the petitioners' December 23, 2002, submission to avoid unnecessary restrictions on imports of the remaining copolymers covered by