

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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: October 31, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-27857 Filed 11-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-485-803]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Romania; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Rescission of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On October 1, 2001, in response to a request made by Sidex S.A. (Sidex), the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation of antidumping duty administrative review of cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania, for the period August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 66 FR 49924 (October 1, 2001). Because Sidex has timely withdrawn the only request for review, the Department is rescinding this review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 6, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker or Robert James, Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2924 and (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff 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 August 19, 1993 the Department published the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania*, 58 FR 44167 (August 19, 1993). On August 1, 2001, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order for the period August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 66 FR 39729 (August 1, 2001). On August 31, 2001, Sidex, a producer of the subject merchandise, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review for the period August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001. There were no other requests for review. On October 1, 2001, the Department published a notice of initiation of antidumping duty administrative review of cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i). *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 66 FR 49924 (October 1, 2001). On October 10, 2001, Sidex withdrew its request for review.

Rescission of Review

The Department's regulations provide that the Department will rescind an administrative review "if a party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review." *See* 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Sidex's withdrawal of their request for review was within the 90-day time limit. As a result of the withdrawal of the request for review and because the Department received no other requests for review, the Department is rescinding the administrative review for the period August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001, and will issue appropriate assessment instructions to the U.S. Customs Service.

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 and published in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4) and sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: October 30, 2001.

Edward C. Yang,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 01-27858 Filed 11-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-557-805]

Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the petitioner, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. This review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States (Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd., Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./Filmax Sdn. Bhd., Inc., and Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd.). This is the eighth period of review, covering October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the normal value by each of the three companies subject to this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who wish to submit comments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument: (1) a statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 6, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irina Itkin or Elizabeth Eastwood, 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) 482-0656 or (202) 482-3874, respectively.

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 amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 20, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia (65 FR 63057).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on October 27, 2000, the petitioner, North American Rubber Thread, requested an administrative review of the antidumping order covering the period October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, for the following producers and exporters of extruded rubber thread: Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd. (Filati), Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./Filmax Sdn. Bhd. (Heveafil), and Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd. (Rubberflex).

On November 22, 2000, the Department initiated an administrative review for Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex (65 FR 71299). The Department also issued questionnaires to each of these companies in November.

In March 2001, we received responses from Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex.

In May and June 2001, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex. We received responses to these supplemental questionnaires in July and August 2001.

In August 2001, we conducted verification of Filati's U.S. branch, Filati Lastex Elastofibre (Filati USA).

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this review is extruded rubber thread. Extruded rubber thread is defined as vulcanized rubber thread obtained by extrusion of stable or concentrated natural rubber latex of any cross sectional shape, measuring from

0.18 mm, which is 0.007 inch or 140 gauge, to 1.42 mm, which is 0.056 inch or 18 gauge, in diameter. Extruded rubber thread is currently classifiable under subheading 4007.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000.

Normal Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia to the United States were made at less than normal value (NV), we compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the NV for all three respondents, as specified in the "Export Price and Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice, below. We also compared the export price (EP) to the NV for Rubberflex, as specified in those sections.

When making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the "Scope of the Review" section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade (*i.e.*, sales within the contemporaneous window which passed the cost test), we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in sections B and C of our antidumping questionnaire, or constructed value (CV), as appropriate.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as EP or CEP. The NV level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A) and profit. For EP, the U.S. level of trade is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from the exporter to the importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different level of trade than EP or CEP

sales, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different level of trade and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we make a level of trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731 (Nov. 19, 1997).

Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex claimed that they made home market sales at only one level of trade (*i.e.*, sales to original equipment manufacturers). Because each of these respondents performed the same selling activities for sales to all customers in the home market, we determined that all home market sales by each of these companies were at the same level of trade.

The respondents made CEP sales during the POR. In order to determine whether NV was established at a level of trade which constituted a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP for these companies, we compared the selling functions performed for home market sales with those performed with respect to the CEP transaction, which excludes economic activities occurring in the United States. We found that all of the respondents performed essentially the same selling functions in their sales offices in Malaysia for both home market and U.S. sales. Therefore, the respondents' sales in Malaysia were not at a more advanced stage of marketing and distribution than the constructed U.S. level of trade, which represents a F.O.B. foreign port price after the deduction of expenses associated with U.S. selling activities. Because we find that no difference in level of trade exists between markets, we have not granted a CEP offset to Filati, Heveafil, or Rubberflex.

In addition, Rubberflex made EP sales during the POR. We compared the selling functions performed for its home market and EP transactions in order to determine whether a level of trade adjustment is warranted. We found that

Rubberflex performed essentially the same selling functions for its U.S. and home market sales and that, therefore, no level of trade adjustment is warranted for it.

For further discussion, see the *Concurrence Memorandum* dated October 31, 2001.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For Filati and Heveafil, we based the U.S. price on CEP where sales to the unaffiliated purchaser took place after importation into the United States, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act. We also based U.S. price on CEP for Filati and Heveafil where the merchandise was shipped directly to certain unaffiliated customers because we found that title passed from the U.S. affiliates of the respondents to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer after importation by the U.S. affiliate into the United States.

For Rubberflex, we based the U.S. price on EP, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, when the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation, and we based the U.S. price on CEP where sales to the unaffiliated purchaser took place after importation into the United States, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act.

A. Filati

We calculated CEP based on the starting price to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we added an amount for uncollected import duties in Malaysia. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for discounts.¹ In addition, where appropriate, we made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. warehousing expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made additional deductions from CEP, where appropriate, for commissions, credit expenses, and U.S. indirect selling expenses, including U.S. inventory carrying costs, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act. For those U.S. sales for which Filati did not report a date of payment, we have used the signature date of these preliminary results (*i.e.*, October 31, 2001) as the

date of payment and calculated credit expenses accordingly.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Filati and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

B. Heveafil

We calculated CEP based on the starting price to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we added an amount for uncollected import duties in Malaysia. We made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. warehousing expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. We disallowed the revenue earned on the sale of a building as an offset to warehousing expenses and recalculated warehousing expenses accordingly.

We made additional deductions to CEP, where appropriate, for credit expenses and U.S. indirect selling expenses, including U.S. inventory carrying costs, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act. We disallowed the full amount of revenue earned on the sale of a building as an offset to indirect selling expenses. Rather, we recalculated these expenses to allow an offset only in the amount of the gain on the building.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Heveafil and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

C. Rubberflex

We based EP or CEP, as appropriate, on the starting price to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, and U.S. inland freight in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. In addition, we made deductions from the

starting price for Malaysian export taxes in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(B) of the Act.

We made additional deductions to CEP, where appropriate, for credit expenses and U.S. indirect selling expenses, including U.S. inventory carrying costs and U.S. warehousing expenses related to returned merchandise, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act. For those U.S. sales for which Rubberflex did not report a date of payment, we have used the signature date of these preliminary results (*i.e.*, October 31, 2001) as the date of payment and calculated credit expenses accordingly.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Rubberflex and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the volume of each respondent's home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that each respondent had a viable home market during the POR. Consequently, we based NV on home market sales.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex had made home market sales at prices below their costs of production (COPs) in this review because the Department had disregarded sales below the COP for these companies in the most recent administrative review. *See Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 6140, 6143 (Feb. 8, 2000). As a result, the Department initiated an investigation to determine whether the respondents made home market sales during the POR at prices below their respective COPs.

We calculated the COP based on the sum of each respondent's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for SG&A

¹ We reclassified credits related to quality problems from rebates to discounts because the customer paid Filati the invoice value less the credit amount.

and packing costs, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act.

We compared the COP figures to home market prices of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to home market prices, less any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, and packing costs.

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made: (1) in substantial quantities within an extended period of time; and (2) at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. *See* section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices below the COP, we found that sales of that model were made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time (as defined in section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act), in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act. In such cases, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, we disregarded the below-cost sales. Where all sales of a specific product were at prices below the COP, we disregarded all sales of that product.

We found that, for certain models of extruded rubber thread, more than 20 percent of each respondent's home market sales within an extended period of time were at prices less than COP. Further, the prices did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. We therefore disregarded the below-cost sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. For those U.S. sales of extruded rubber thread for which there were no comparable home market sales in the ordinary course of trade, we compared EP or CEP, as appropriate, to CV, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of each respondent's cost of

materials, fabrication, SG&A, profit, and U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by each respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country.

Company-specific calculations are discussed below.

A. Filati

Where NV was based on home market sales, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. For all price-to-price comparisons, we made deductions from the starting price for rebates, where appropriate. We also made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we also made deductions for home market credit expenses and bank charges. For those home market sales for which Filati did not report a date of payment, we have used the signature date of these preliminary results (*i.e.*, October 31, 2001) as the date of payment and calculated credit expenses accordingly. Where applicable, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.410(e), we offset any commission paid on a U.S. sale by reducing the NV by the amount of home market indirect selling expenses, up to the amount of the U.S. commission.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

For CV-to-CEP comparisons, we made an adjustment, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) and 773(a)(8) of the Act. Where applicable, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.410(e), we offset any commission paid on a U.S. sale by reducing the NV by the amount of home market indirect selling expenses, up to the amount of the U.S. commission.

B. Heveafil

In all instances, NV for Heveafil was based on home market sales. Accordingly, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions for foreign inland freight and foreign inland insurance, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii)

of the Act, we also made deductions for home market credit expenses.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

C. Rubberflex

In all instances, NV for Rubberflex was based on home market sales. Accordingly, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. For all price-to-price comparisons, we made deductions from the starting price for discounts,² where appropriate. We also made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight expenses, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Rubberflex failed to report foreign inland freight expenses on certain sales delivered using its own trucks. Because Rubberflex failed to provide the requested information, pursuant to section 776(a)(2)(B) of the Act, as facts available, we have used the lowest third party inland freight expense reported in the home market for the freight expense on these transactions.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments for differences in credit expenses.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Section 773A of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business

² We reclassified credits related to quality problems from rebates to discounts because the customer paid Rubberflex the invoice value less the credit amount.

days. When we determine a fluctuation to have existed, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd.	18.66
Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./Filmax Sdn. Bhd.	0.83
Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd.	0.00

The Department will disclose to parties the calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may request a hearing within 30 days of the publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the date rebuttal briefs are filed. Interested parties may submit case briefs not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such case briefs, within 120 days of the publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We calculate importer-specific assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those sales, where available. Where the entered value is not available, we calculate a quantity-based assessment rate. These rates will be assessed uniformly on all entries of particular importers made during the POR. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties all entries for any importer for whom the assessment rate is *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.50 percent of entered value). The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia entered, or withdrawn

from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex will be the rates established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106, the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.16 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties. This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 31, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-27856 Filed 11-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-806]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping New Shipper Review: Natural Bristle Paintbrushes and Brush Heads From the People's Republic of China

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 6, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sally Gannon Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0162.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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 Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), the Department received a timely request from petitioner, Paint Applicator Division of the American Brush Manufacturers Association (Paint Applicator Division), that we conduct an administrative review of the sales of Hebei Founder Import & Export Company (Founder) and Hunan Provincial Native Products Import & Export Corp. (Hunan). On March 22, 2001, the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paintbrushes and paintbrush heads for the period of review (POR) of February 1, 2000 through January 31, 2001 for Founder and Hunan. On September 6, 2001, the Department rescinded the administrative review with respect to Founder because it did not sell, ship, or enter the subject merchandise during the POR. See *Natural Bristle Paintbrushes and Brush Heads from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 66 FR 47450 (September 12, 2001).

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of a review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results within the statutory time limit of 245 days from the date on which the review was initiated. The Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review for Hunan within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the