

	Period to be reviewed
Antidumping Duty Proceedings	
Malaysia: Extruded Rubber Thread A-557-805	10/1/00-9/30/01
Filati Lastex Elastofibre Sdn. Bhd. Heveafil Sdn. Bhd.	
The People's Republic of China:	
Helical Spring Lock Washers ¹ A-570-822	10/1/00-9/30/01
Hangzhou Spring Washer Plant (aka Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd.).	
Barium Chloride ² A-570-007	10/1/00-9/30/01
China National Chemicals Import and Export Corp.	
Zhang Jia Ba	
Tangshan	
Tianjin Chemical	
Red Star	
Linshu	
Ermeishang	
Hengnan	
Buohai	
Kunghan	
Xinji	
Countervailing Duty Proceedings	
None.	
Suspension Agreements	
Russia: Uranium A-821-802	10/1/00-9/30/01

¹ If one of the above-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

² If one of the above-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of barium chloride from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: November 15, 2001.

Holly A. Kuga,
Senior Office Director for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-29144 Filed 11-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India: Rescission of New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Rescission of new shipper review.

SUMMARY: On March 28, 2001, the Department initiated a new shipper review of certain forged stainless steel flanges from India for Metal Forgings Pvt. Ltd. (Metal Forgings). Pursuant to section 351.214(f)(2)(ii) of the Department's regulations, we find that an expansion of the normal review period to include the entry of the subject merchandise would be likely to prevent the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations, and therefore we are rescinding this new shipper review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 21, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam or Mike Heaney, Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone:

202-482-5222 and 202-482-4475, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Background

On March 28, 2001, the Department initiated a new shipper review of certain forged stainless steel flanges from India, for the period February 1, 2000 through January 31, 2001 manufactured or exported by Metal Forgings. *See Certain Stainless Steel Flanges from India*, 66 FR 16905. Metal Forgings' responses to our original and supplemental questionnaires showed that its merchandise was not loaded for export until April 26, 2001, and therefore could not have entered the United States until, at the earliest, sometime in the fourth month after the conclusion of the period of review (POR).

Rescission of Review

Under section 351.214(f)(2)(ii) of the Department's regulations, when the sale of the subject merchandise occurs

within the POR, but the entry occurs after the normal POR, the POR may be extended unless it would be likely to prevent the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations. The regulations do not provide a definitive date by which the entry must occur, but the preamble to the Department's regulations state that both the entry and the sale should occur during the POR, and that only under "appropriate" circumstances should the POR be extended when the entry is made after the POR. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27319 (May 19, 1997).

The Department has in many cases extended the POR by 30 days in order to capture entries of POR sales, when the 30-day extension is not likely to pose significant obstacles to completing a new shipper review within the time limits established by the Department's regulations. However, the shipment in this case was made over 30 days after the sale, and an extension of the POR to include the entry would pose significant obstacles to the timely completion of this new shipper review. *See* "Memorandum to Richard Weible, Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges (Flanges) from India, Subject: Rescission of New Shipper Review," dated August 9, 2001. Accordingly, we are rescinding the new shipper review of Metal Forgings for the period February 1, 2000 through January 31, 2001.

We note that the respondent may renew its request for a new shipper review, pursuant to the deadlines provided by section 351.214(d) of the Department's regulations. If Metal Forgings renews its request and if the review request and the reported transaction conform to requirements, we will conduct a new shipper review per section 351.214(g)(1)(i), and the POR will include both the sale and the entry.

This notice 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 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation. This determination is issued in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(4)(2) and section 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 13, 2001.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 01-29147 Filed 11-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-357-812]

Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Honey From Argentina

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

ACTION: Notice of amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 21, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Melissa Blackledge, Charles Rast, or Donna Kinsella, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, at (202) 482-3518, (202) 482-1324, or (202) 482-0194, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations: 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 Tariff Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Amendment to the Final Determination

On September 26, 2001, the Department determined that honey from Argentina is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 735(a) of the Tariff Act. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Honey From Argentina*, 66 FR 50611 (October 4, 2001) (*Final Determination*). On October 9, 2001, respondent Asociacion Cooperativas Argentinas (ACA) timely filed an allegation that the Department had made several ministerial errors in its final determination. ACA requested that we correct the errors and publish a notice of amended final determination in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(e). In addition, on October

15, 2001, petitioners filed comments in rebuttal of ACA's alleged errors.

ACA's submission alleges the following errors:

- The Department mistakenly omitted in its calculation of ACA's G&A expenses total invoiced economic activity, which should have been used as the G&A denominator instead of ACA's cost of goods sold;
- The Department inadvertently failed to include in its G&A expense ratio denominator the costs associated with services provided by ACA, which are part of its cost of sales;
- The Department failed to include other income earned by ACA's administrative departments ("Organos de Direccion y Asesoramiento", "Organos de Ejecucion General", and "Administracion Descentralizada") in the calculation of the numerator used in the G&A expense ratio;
- The Department inadvertently included income taxes in the calculation of the numerator used to derive the G&A expense ratio; and
- Finally, the Department inadvertently erred in calculating an interest expense ratio based on gross rather than net financing costs because the Department failed to deduct interest revenue from the financing costs. *See* Letter, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, October 9, 2001 *passim*.

In their rebuttal submission, petitioners claim all errors alleged by the respondent are not ministerial errors. Regarding alleged errors in the calculation of the G&A expense ratio, petitioners assert the Department, according to normal practice, calculated the G&A expense ratio by dividing the company-wide G&A expenses by the company-wide total cost of goods sold per respondent's audited financial statement. Petitioners also contend the costs of services provided by ACA were most likely the costs associated with inter-company transactions omitted from the financial statement. Petitioners further contend there is no evidence on the record that the income items identified by the respondent were earned solely by the departments incurring G&A expenses, and no evidence that the expenses associated with the income items were not included in another part of the financial statement. Regarding interest income, petitioners claim there is no evidence that the amount of interest income ACA proposes should be included as interest income was indeed earned from short-term investments of working capital. *See* Letter, Collier Shannon Scott, October 15, 2001.

The Department's regulations define a ministerial error as one involving