

publication of the *Antidumping Duty Order*. Because the preliminary determination was published on May 3, 2001, and the *Antidumping Duty Order* was published on November 29, 2001, the Department will issue instructions to Customs and Border Protection (Customs) to terminate suspension of liquidation of all entries of subject merchandise made between October 30, 2001, and November 28, 2001, inclusive, without regard to antidumping duties (*i.e.*, release all bonds and refund all cash deposits). In addition, in accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, the Department will also instruct Customs to resume collection, effective November 29, 2001, of a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins published in the *Final Determination*. Effective November 29, 2001, Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The "All Others" rate applies to all exporters of subject hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands not specifically listed. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Producer/manufacturer/ exporter	Cash deposit rate (percent)
Corus Staal BV	2.59
All Others	2.59

This notice constitutes the amended antidumping duty order with respect to certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from the Netherlands. Interested parties may contact the Department's Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Commerce building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This amended order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: December 16, 2003.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E3-00616 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-351-806]

Silicon Metal From Brazil: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of an antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On August 22, 2003, in response to a request made by the petitioners¹, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation of an antidumping duty administrative review of silicon metal from Brazil, for the period of review (POR) July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. Because the petitioners have withdrawn their request for review, and there were no other requests for review for this time period, the Department is rescinding this review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213 (d)(1).

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 23, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maisha Cryor, telephone: (202) 482-5831, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 2, 2003, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil, covering the POR July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 68 FR 39511 (July 2, 2003). On August 22, 2003, pursuant to a request made by the petitioners, the Department initiated an administrative review of Companhia Ferroligas Minas Gerais-Minasligas (Minasligas) and Companhia Brasileira Carbureto de Calcio (CBCC), both of which are subject to the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil for the POR July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part* 68 FR 50750, 50751 (August 22, 2003). On November 19, 2003, the

petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review of Minasligas.

Rescission of Review

19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) provides that a party that requests an administrative review may withdraw the request within 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested administrative review. Since the notice of initiation of this administrative review was published on August 22, 2003, and the petitioners, the party requesting this administrative review, withdrew their request for review within 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation, the Department is rescinding the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil for the period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Further, we are rescinding the review with respect to CBCC because, since the initiation of this current review, the Department has revoked the order in part, with respect to CBCC, effective for entries made on or after July 1, 2002. *See Silicon Metal from Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation of Order in Part* 68 FR 57670, 57671 (October 6, 2003).

This notice is in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: December 18, 2003.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E3-00617 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

Pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether an instrument of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instrument shown below is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington,

¹ The petitioners are Elkem Metals Company and Globe Metallurgical Inc.

DC 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Suite 4100W, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 03-054. **Applicant:** Frostburg State University, Department of Biology, 101 Braddock Road, Compton Science Center, Frostburg, MD 21532. **Instrument:** Electron Microscope, Model JEM-1011. **Manufacturer:** JEOL Ltd., Japan. **Intended Use:** The instrument is intended to be used for science-related educational purposes in the course BIO 436/536, Electron Microscopy for Biologists. **Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:** December 10, 2003.

Gerald A. Zerdy,

Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 03-31595 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 121203C]

Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS); Certification of New VMS Unit for Use in Northeast Fisheries

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of VMS unit certification.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces the approval and certification of the Boatracs FMCT/G (Fisheries Mobile Communications Transceiver/Global Positioning System (GPS) based) VMS unit for use in all fisheries in the northeastern United States in which VMS units are required.

DATES: This new FMCT/G VMS unit can be used effective December 23, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Northeast Office for Law Enforcement, VMS Program, telephone 978-281-9213.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulations at 50 CFR 648.9 set forth VMS requirements for fisheries in the northeastern United States that require the use of VMS for fishery monitoring and/or reporting. Specifically, § 648.9(b) lists minimum VMS performance criteria that a VMS unit must meet in order to be certified for use.

The Administrator, Northeast Region, NMFS, has reviewed all components of the FMCT/G and other information provided by the vendor and has

certified the following unit for use in all Northeast fisheries in which VMS units are required: Boatracs FMCT/G, available from Boatracs, 1935 Cordell Court, El Cajon, CA 92020-0911, Telephone: (619) 438-6000, 1-800-336-8722.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: December 16, 2003.

Bruce C. Morehead,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 03-31613 Filed 12-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 071703A]

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Exempted Fishing Permit

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Disapproval of an exempted fishing permit (EFP).

SUMMARY: NMFS announces that it has disapproved the request for an exempted fishing permit (EFP) from Florida Offshore Aquaculture, Inc., of Madeira Beach, FL. The EFP would have authorized a 24-month feasibility study for net cage culture of cobia, mahi-mahi, greater amberjack, Florida pompano, red snapper and cubera snapper at a site approximately 33 statute miles (53 km) WSW. of Johns Pass, FL.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Eldridge, 727-570-5305; fax: 727-570-5583; e-mail: peter.eldridge@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The EFP was requested under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), and regulations at 50 CFR 600.745(b), concerning scientific research activity, exempted fishing permits, and exempted educational activity.

Florida Offshore Aquaculture, Inc., requested an EFP to determine the feasibility of raising fish in the exclusive economic zone approximately 33 miles (53 km) WSW. of Johns Pass, FL. Initially, the project intended to raise juvenile cobia in four cages during the

first year. The applicant intended to expand the project to eight cages with cobia, mahi-mahi, greater amberjack, Florida pompano, red snapper and cubera snapper. The applicant stated that disease-free fingerlings would be obtained from the Aquaculture Center of the Florida Keys (59300 Overseas Highway, Marathon, FL, phone (305) 743-6135) and the Marine Science Institute of the University of Texas (750 Channel View Drive, Port Aransas, TX, phone (361) 749-6795). Further, the applicant stated that the brood stock and their spawn would be genetically tagged using the satellite DNA method.

On July 30, 2003, NMFS published in the **Federal Register** a notice of receipt of an application for an exempted fishing permit with a request for comments on the EFP (68 FR 44745). During the public comment period, 340 individuals opposed the granting of the EFP. In addition, one shrimp firm opposed the EFP because it would disrupt their operations. Six environmental organizations opposed granting the EFP and stated that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) rather than an Environmental Assessment (EA) should be prepared for this project. In July 2003, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) expressed concerns about the EA and requested that the EA be revised to reflect their concerns. The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services supported the permit application.

Consistent with the requirements of 50 CFR 600.745(b)(3)(i), NMFS provided copies of the EFP application and information to the State of Florida, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council), the U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard), and Region 4 of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) along with information on the EFP's effects on target species.

The Council considered the EFP request at its September 2003 meeting, and strongly recommended that the EFP for Florida Offshore Aquaculture, Inc. be denied. The Coast Guard and the EPA did not respond to the NMFS request for comments. On October 27, 2003, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection commented that the revised EA lacked adequate information pertaining to the environmental effects of caged aquaculture operations in warm waters, particularly the Gulf of Mexico, and the potential for short- and long-term environmental impacts due to expansion of the facility. Also, they stated that the precedent setting nature of the proposed action warrants a