

Hyosung, producers of the subject merchandise, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their respective sales for the period June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002. There were no other requests for review. On July 24, 2002, the Department published a notice of initiation of antidumping duty administrative review of polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip from Korea, 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*, 67 FR 48435 (July 24, 2002). On July 29, 2002, Hyosung 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). Hyosung's withdrawal of its request for review was within the 90-day time limit. Therefore, the Department is rescinding this review as to Hyosung in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Because the Department received no other requests for review, the Department is rescinding the administrative review for the period June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002, 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 notice 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: August 30, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-22999 Filed 9-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-485-805]

Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Romania: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Postponement of Final Results

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by S.C. Silcotub S.A. (Silcotub), a producer/exporter of subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain small diameter carbon and alloy seamless standard, line and pressure pipe (seamless pipe) from Romania. The period of review (POR) is February 4, 2000, through July 31, 2001.

We preliminarily find that sales have not been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties on the subject merchandise exported by Silcotub and entered during the POR.

The Department also is now conducting an inquiry into Romania's status as a nonmarket economy country under section 771(18)(C)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 10, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magd Zalok, Tisha Loeper-Viti, or Martin Claessens, Group II, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4162, (202) 482-07425, or (202) 482-5451, respectively.

For further information regarding the analysis of Romania's nonmarket economy country status under the antidumping and countervailing duty laws, contact George Smolik or Lawrence Norton at (202) 482-1843 and (202) 482-1579, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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 of Commerce (the Department) regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (2001).

Case History

On August 10, 2000, the Department published an antidumping duty order on certain small diameter carbon and alloy seamless standard, line and pressure pipe from Romania. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Romania*, 65 FR 48963 (August 10, 2000) (*Amended Final Determination*). On August 1, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request administrative review of antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding or suspended investigation. *See Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation*, 66 FR 39729 (August 1, 2001). On August 30, 2001, Silcotub requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on seamless pipe from Romania. On October 1, 2001, the Department initiated the current administrative review. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 66 FR 49924 (October 1, 2001). Since the initiation of this administrative review, the following events have occurred:

On October 18, 2001, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to Silcotub. We received the questionnaire responses from Silcotub on November 15 and December 7, 2001. We issued supplemental questionnaires on December 13, 2001, January 10 and April 5, 2002, to which we received responses on January 10, January 31, and April 19, 2002, respectively.

On May 8, 2002, the Department extended the time limit for completion of these preliminary results until no later than May 24, 2002. *See Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Romania: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 30874 (May 8, 2002).

On May 28, 2002, the Department determined that additional time was necessary to consider the proper surrogate valuation of the factors of production and also to consider a request from the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, submitted to the

Department on May 10, 2002, to revoke Romania's nonmarket economy status. As such, it was not possible for the Department to complete the preliminary analysis in this review by May 24, 2002. Therefore, the Department fully extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than September 3, 2002. See *Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Romania: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 36856 (May 28, 2002).

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are seamless carbon and alloy (other than stainless) steel standard, line, and pressure pipes and redraw hollows produced, or equivalent, to the ASTM A-53, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-333, ASTM A-334, ASTM A-335, ASTM A-589, ASTM A-795, and the API 5L specifications and meeting the physical parameters described below, regardless of application. The scope of the order also includes all products used in standard, line, or pressure pipe applications and meeting the physical parameters described below, regardless of specification. Specifically included within the scope of the order is seamless pipes and redraw hollows, less than or equal to 4.5 inches (114.3 mm) in outside diameter, regardless of wall-thickness, manufacturing process (hot finished or cold-drawn), end finish (plain end, beveled end, upset end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or surface finish.

The seamless pipes subject to the order is currently classifiable under the subheadings 7304.10.10.20, 7304.10.50.20, 7304.31.30.00, 7304.31.60.50, 7304.39.00.16, 7304.39.00.20, 7304.39.00.24, 7304.39.00.28, 7304.39.00.32, 7304.51.50.05, 7304.51.50.60, 7304.59.60.00, 7304.59.80.10, 7304.59.80.15, 7304.59.80.20, and 7304.59.80.25 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

Specifications, Characteristics, and Uses: Seamless pressure pipes are intended for the conveyance of water, steam, petrochemicals, chemicals, oil products, natural gas and other liquids and gasses in industrial piping systems. They may carry these substances at elevated pressures and temperatures and may be subject to the application of external heat. Seamless carbon steel pressure pipe meeting the ASTM A-106 standard may be used in temperatures of up to 1000 degrees Fahrenheit, at various ASME code stress levels. Alloy pipes made to ASTM A-335 standard

must be used if temperatures and stress levels exceed those allowed for ASTM A-106. Seamless pressure pipes sold in the United States are commonly produced to the ASTM A-106 standard.

Seamless standard pipes are most commonly produced to the ASTM A-53 specification and generally are not intended for high temperature service. They are intended for the low temperature and pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air and other liquids and gasses in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses. Standard pipes (depending on type and code) may carry liquids at elevated temperatures but must not exceed relevant ASME code requirements. If exceptionally low temperature uses or conditions are anticipated, standard pipe may be manufactured to ASTM A-333 or ASTM A-334 specifications.

Seamless line pipes are intended for the conveyance of oil and natural gas or other fluids in pipe lines. Seamless line pipes are produced to the API 5L specification.

Seamless water well pipe (ASTM A-589) and seamless galvanized pipe for fire protection uses (ASTM A-795) are used for the conveyance of water.

Seamless pipes are commonly produced and certified to meet ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53, API 5L-B, and API 5L-X42 specifications. To avoid maintaining separate production runs and separate inventories, manufacturers typically triple or quadruple certify the pipes by meeting the metallurgical requirements and performing the required tests pursuant to the respective specifications. Since distributors sell the vast majority of this product, they can thereby maintain a single inventory to service all customers.

The primary application of ASTM A-106 pressure pipes and triple or quadruple certified pipes is in pressure piping systems by refineries, petrochemical plants, and chemical plants. Other applications are in power generation plants (electrical-fossil fuel or nuclear), and in some oil field uses (on shore and off shore) such as for separator lines, gathering lines and metering runs. A minor application of this product is for use as oil and gas distribution lines for commercial applications. These applications constitute the majority of the market for the subject seamless pipes. However, ASTM A-106 pipes may be used in some boiler applications.

Redraw hollows are any unfinished pipe or "hollow profiles" of carbon or alloy steel transformed by hot rolling or cold drawing/hydrostatic testing or

other methods to enable the material to be sold under ASTM A-53, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-333, ASTM A-334, ASTM A-335, ASTM A-589, ASTM A-795, and API 5L specifications.

The scope of the order includes all seamless pipe meeting the physical parameters described above and produced to one of the specifications listed above, regardless of application, with the exception of the specific exclusions discussed below, and whether or not also certified to a non-covered specification. Standard, line, and pressure applications and the above-listed specifications are defining characteristics of the scope of the order. Therefore, seamless pipes meeting the physical description above, but not produced to the ASTM A-53, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-333, ASTM A-334, ASTM A-335, ASTM A-589, ASTM A-795, and API 5L specifications shall be covered if used in a standard, line, or pressure application, with the exception of the specific exclusions discussed below.

For example, there are certain other ASTM specifications of pipe which, because of overlapping characteristics, could potentially be used in ASTM A-106 applications. These specifications generally include ASTM A-161, ASTM A-192, ASTM A-210, ASTM A-252, ASTM A-501, ASTM A-523, ASTM A-524, and ASTM A-618. When such pipes are used in a standard, line, or pressure pipe application, with the exception of the specific exclusions discussed below, such products are covered by the scope of the order.

Specifically excluded from the scope of the order is boiler tubing and mechanical tubing, if such products are not produced to ASTM A-53, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-333, ASTM A-334, ASTM A-335, ASTM A-589, ASTM A-795, and API 5L specifications and are not used in standard, line, or pressure pipe applications. In addition, finished and unfinished OCTG are excluded from the scope of the order, if covered by the scope of another antidumping duty order from the same country. If not covered by such an OCTG order, finished and unfinished OCTG are included in this scope when used in standard, line or pressure applications.

With regard to the excluded products listed above, the Department will not instruct Customs to require end-use certification until such time as petitioner or other interested parties provide to the Department a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that the products are being used in a covered application. If such information is provided, we will require end-use certification only for the product(s) (or

specification(s)) for which evidence is provided that such products are being used in covered applications as described above. For example, if, based on evidence provided by petitioner, the Department finds a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that seamless pipe produced to the A-161 specification is being used in a standard, line or pressure application, we will require end-use certifications for imports of that specification. Normally we will require only the importer of record to certify to the end use of the imported merchandise. If it later proves necessary for adequate implementation, we may also require producers who export such products to the United States to provide such certification on invoices accompanying shipments to the United States.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the merchandise subject to this scope is dispositive.

Nonmarket Economy Status

As indicated above, on May 10, 2002, the Department received a letter from the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs requesting a review of the status of Romania as a nonmarket economy (NME) country, either as a free-standing investigation or in the context of this administrative review. In response to this request, the Department is conducting an inquiry into Romania's status as an NME country in the context of the instant review. See section 771(18)(C)(ii) of the Act.

The Department has treated Romania as a NME country in all past antidumping duty investigations and administrative reviews. See, e.g., *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Romania*, 65 FR 39125 (June 23, 2000); and *Notice of Final Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Romania*, 66 FR 49625 (September 28, 2001). A designation as an NME country remains in effect until it is revoked by the Department. See section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act.

As part of its review of Romania's NME status, the Department invites public comment with respect to Romania on the factors listed in section 771(18)(B) of the Act, which the Department must take into account in making a market economy/NME determination: (i) The extent to which the currency of the foreign country is convertible into the currency of other countries; (ii) the extent to which wage

rates in the foreign country are determined by free bargaining between labor and management; (iii) the extent to which joint ventures or other investments by firms of other foreign countries are permitted in the foreign country; (iv) the extent of government ownership or control of the means of production; (v) the extent of government control over allocation of resources and over price and output decisions of enterprises; and (vi) such other factors as the administering authority considers appropriate.

The deadline for submission of comments regarding Romania's NME status will be 45 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. All comments should be filed at the Department's Central Records Unit (CRU), located at the address listed below. Rebuttal comments may be submitted up to 30 days after the date the initial comments are due. Each person submitting comments should include his or her name and address, and give reasons for any recommendation. To facilitate their consideration by the Department, comments should be submitted in the following format: (1) Begin each comment on a separate page; (2) concisely state the issue identified and discussed in the comment and include any supporting documentation in exhibits or appendices; (3) provide a brief summary of the comment (a maximum of 3 sentences) and label this section "Summary of Comment;" (4) provide an index or table of contents; and (5) include the case number A-485-805 in the top right hand corner of the submission. To simplify the processing and distribution of comments, the Department requires the submission of documents in electronic form accompanied by an original and six copies in paper form. We require that documents filed in electronic form be on DOS formatted 3.5 inch diskettes and prepared in either WordPerfect 9 format or a format that the WordPerfect program can convert and import into WordPerfect 9. Please submit comments in separate files on the diskette.

Comments received on diskette will be made available to the public on the Internet at Import Administration's Website, <http://ia.ita.doc.gov>. Paper copies will be available for reading and photocopying in the CRU, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20230. Any questions concerning file formatting, document conversion, access on the Internet, or other file requirements should be addressed to Andrew Lee

Beller, Import Administration Webmaster, (202) 482-0866.

After reviewing all comments and rebuttal comments, the Department will determine if a public hearing on the NME country issue is warranted, if one is requested in the initial or rebuttal comments on this issue, and, if so, the Department will announce a place and time for that hearing.

Separate Rates

It is the Department's standard policy to assign all exporters of subject merchandise subject to review in an NME country a single rate unless an exporter can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports. To establish whether an exporter is sufficiently independent of government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes the exporter in light of the criteria established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers From the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified in *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide From the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this test, exporters in NME countries are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control over exports, both in law (*de jure*) and in fact (*de facto*).

Absence of De Jure Control

Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) Any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) Any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. See *Sparklers*, 56 FR at 20589.

Absence of De Facto Control

A *de facto* analysis of absence of government control over exports is based on four factors—whether the respondent: (1) Sets its own export prices independently of the government and other exporters; (2) retains the proceeds from its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; (3) has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and (4) has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. See *Silicon Carbide*, 59

FR at 22587; *see also Sparklers*, 56 FR at 20589.

We have determined, according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*, that evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports by Silcotub. Silcotub is a private joint stock commercial company organized under the Romanian Commercial Companies Law, Law No. 31/1990, as amended. Silcotub is limited only by its articles of incorporation and bylaws. Specifically, the information on the record shows that Silcotub is autonomous in selecting its management, negotiating and signing contracts, setting its own export prices and retaining its own profits. For a complete discussion of the Department's analysis regarding Silcotub's entitlement to a separate rate, *see the* September 3, 2002, memorandum, Assignment of Separate Rates for S.C. Silcotub S.A., which is on file in the Central Record Unit (CRU), Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For certain sales made by Silcotub to the United States, we used constructed export price (CEP) in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act because the first sale to an unaffiliated purchaser occurred after importation of the merchandise into the United States. For Silcotub's remaining sales to the United States, we used export price (EP), in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and because the CEP methodology was not indicated by other circumstances.

We calculated EP based on the C&F prices to unaffiliated purchasers, as appropriate. In accordance with section 772(c) of the Act, we deducted amounts, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, and international freight. We valued the deductions for foreign inland freight and brokerage and handling using surrogate data based on Egyptian values. (The selection of the surrogate country and surrogate values is explained in the "Normal Value" section of this notice, below.) Since ocean freight for U.S. sales was provided by an unaffiliated carrier from a market economy country and was paid for in a market economy currency, we valued ocean freight using the actual charges from the market economy country.

We calculated CEP based on the packed, ex-warehouse or delivered prices from Silcotub's U.S. subsidiary to unaffiliated customers. In accordance with section 772(c) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for CEP for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, international freight, marine insurance, customs duties, U.S. brokerage and handling, and other U.S. transportation expenses such as wharfage, stevedoring, and surveying. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made further deductions for the following selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States: credit expenses, direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, bank charges), and indirect selling expenses (including inventory carrying costs). In accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we have deducted from the starting price an amount for profit.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine the NV using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) The merchandise is exported from an NME country; and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value (CV) under section 773(a) of the Act.

The Department has treated Romania as an NME country in all previous antidumping cases. Furthermore, available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home market prices, third country prices, or CV under section 773(a) of the Act. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. As discussed in the "Nonmarket Economy Status" section above, since Romania's designation as a NME country remains in effect until it is revoked by the Department, we treated Romania as an NME country for purposes of this review and calculated NV by valuing the factors of production in a surrogate country.

Surrogate Country

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act requires the Department to value the NME producer's factors of production, to the extent possible, in one or more market economy countries that: (1) Are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the NME, and (2) are significant producers of comparable merchandise. We chose Egypt as the surrogate country on the basis of the

criteria set out in 19 CFR 351.408(b). For a further discussion of our surrogate selection, *see the* September 3, 2002, memorandum Selection of Surrogate Country. (This memorandum is on file in the Department's CRU.)

Factors of Production

We used publicly available information from Egypt to value the various factors of production. Because some of the Egyptian import data were not contemporaneous with the POR, we inflated the data, expressed in U.S. dollars, to the POR using the U.S. producer price index published by the International Monetary Fund.

In accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, we valued Silcotub's reported factors of production by multiplying them by publicly available Egyptian values. In selecting the surrogate values, we considered the quality, specificity, and contemporaneity of the data. As appropriate, we adjusted input prices to make them delivered prices. We added to Egyptian surrogate values a surrogate freight cost using the reported distance from the supplier to the factory because this distance was shorter than the distance from the nearest seaport to the factory. This adjustment is in accordance with the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's decision in *Sigma Corp. v. United States*, 117 F.3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

We valued material inputs and packing material (*i.e.*, where applicable, steel billet, plastic caps, and ink) by Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) number, using imports statistics from the *Egyptian Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics, National Information Center*. Where a material input was purchased in a market economy currency from a market economy supplier (*i.e.*, lacquer, strap, clips, and tags), we valued the input at the actual purchase price in accordance with section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations. We note that, while lacquer was purchased from both NME and market economy suppliers, respondent argued that the price paid to the market economy supplier should not be used to value the factor. We disagree and have used the actual price Silcotub paid for lacquer, in a market economy currency, to a market economy supplier. This methodology is consistent with section 351.408(c)(1) of the Department's regulations in that the Department will normally value the factor using the price paid to the market economy supplier, where a portion of a factor is purchased from a market economy and a NME supplier. We valued labor using the method described in 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3) of the

Department's regulations. For a complete analysis of surrogate values, see the September 3, 2002, memorandum, Factors of Production Valuation for Preliminary Results, (Valuation Memorandum) on file in the CRU.

To value electricity, we used the 2001 electricity rates for Egypt reported on the website of the International Trade Administration of the Department under "Trade Information Center." See <http://www.web.ita.doc.gov/ticwebsite/newweb.nsf/>. We based the value of natural gas on 1998 Egyptian prices reported in Egyptian Ministerial Decree number 1435/1997, adjusted for inflation.

We based our calculation of factory overhead and selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, as well as profit, on 1998/99 financial statements of El-Naser Steel Pipes & Fittings Co., an Egyptian producer of products comparable to the subject merchandise.

To value truck freight rates, we used a 1999 rate (adjusted for inflation) provided by a trucking company located in Egypt. For rail transportation, we valued rail rates using information used in *Titanium Sponge From the Republic of Kazakhstan: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 66169 (November 24, 1999), which were initially obtained from a 1999 letter from the Egyptian International House.

For brokerage and handling, we used a 1999 rate (adjusted for inflation) provided by a trucking and shipping company located in Alexandria, Egypt. For further details, see Valuation Memorandum.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with Section 773(A)(a) of the Act. For currency conversions involving the Egyptian pound, we used exchange rates published by the International Monetary Fund in *International Financial Statistics*. For all other conversions, we used daily exchange rates published by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists for the period February 4, 2000, through July 31, 2001.

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Silcotub	0.04

Within five days of the date of publication of this notice, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224, the Department will disclose its calculations. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 42 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Issues raised in hearings will be limited to those raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this review are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument with an electronic version included. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to provide the Department copies of the public versions on diskette.

Postponement of the Final Results

The Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit because of the need to evaluate Romania's NME status. Therefore, the Department is fully extending the due date for the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any written briefs or hearing. Accordingly, the final results will be issued no later than 180 days after the date of publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department will determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated an exporter/importer (or customer)-specific assessment rate for merchandise subject to this review. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to the Customs Service within 15 days of publication of the final results of

review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of review, we will direct the Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties on the merchandise subject to review pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2). For the final results, if any importer-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct Customs to assess duties accordingly. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of seamless pipe from Romania entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) For Silcotub, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be zero if Silcotub's rate in the final results of review continues to be less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or the LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 13.06 percent, the "Romania-Wide" rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Amended Final Determination*, 65 FR 48963.

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

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 issued and published in accordance

with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 3, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-22995 Filed 9-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-451-801]

Notice of Initiation of Inquiry Into the Status of Lithuania as a Non-Market Economy Country for Purposes of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Under a Changed Circumstances Review of the Solid Urea Order Against Lithuania

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation and request for comments.

DATES: September 10, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George Smolik, Office of Policy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1843.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is initiating an inquiry into the status of Lithuania as a non-market economy country for purposes of the antidumping and countervailing duty laws under a changed circumstances review of the solid urea order against Lithuania.

The Applicable Statute

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's ("Department") regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2002).

Background

On May 15, 2002, the Department received a letter from the Embassy of Lithuania requesting a review of Lithuania's status as a non-market economy ("NME") country. On June 5, 2002, the Government of Lithuania submitted a document supporting its request for market economy status. On August 20, 2002, the Department

received a letter from the Embassy of Lithuania requesting that the Department review this issue under a changed circumstances review of the solid urea order against Lithuania. In response to this latter request, the Department is initiating an inquiry into Lithuania's status as an NME in the context of a changed circumstances review of the solid urea order against Lithuania pursuant to sections 751(b) and 771(18)(C)(ii) of the Act.

The Department has treated Lithuania as a NME country in all past antidumping duty investigations and administrative reviews. *See, e.g., Urea From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 52 FR 19557 (May 26, 1987); and, *Solid Urea from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Transfer of the Antidumping Duty Order on Solid Urea From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Baltic States and Opportunity to Comment*, 57 FR 28828 (June 29, 1992). A designation as a NME remains in effect until it is revoked by the Department. *See* section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act.

Opportunity for Public Comment

As part of this inquiry to determine whether to revoke Lithuania's NME status, the Department is interested in receiving public comment with respect to Lithuania on the factors listed in section 771(18)(B) of the Act, which the Department must take into account in making a market/non-market economy determination: (i) The extent to which the currency of the foreign country is convertible into the currency of other countries; (ii) the extent to which wage rates in the foreign country are determined by free bargaining between labor and management; (iii) the extent to which joint ventures or other investments by firms of other foreign countries are permitted in the foreign country; (iv) the extent of government ownership or control of the means of production; (v) the extent of government control over allocation of resources and over price and output decisions of enterprises; and, (vi) such other factors as the administering authority considers appropriate.

Comments—Deadline, Format, and Number of Copies

The deadline for submission of comments will be 45 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. All comments should be filed at the Department of Commerce Central Records Unit located at the address listed below. Rebuttal

comments may be submitted up to 30 days after the date initial comments are due. Each person submitting comments should include his or her name and address, and give reasons for any recommendation. To facilitate their consideration by the Department, comments should be submitted in the following format: (1) Begin each comment on a separate page; (2) concisely state the issue identified and discussed in the comment and include any supporting documentation in exhibits or appendices; (3) provide a brief summary of the comment (a maximum of 3 sentences) and label this section "summary of comment;" (4) provide an index or table of contents; and (5) include the case number A-451-801 in the top right hand corner of the submission. To simplify the processing and distribution of comments, the Department requires the submission of documents in electronic form accompanied by an original and six copies in paper form. We require that documents filed in electronic form be on DOS formatted 3.5" diskettes and prepared in either WordPerfect 9 format or a format that the WordPerfect program can convert and import into Word Perfect 9. Please submit comments in separate files on the diskette. Comments received on diskette will be made available to the public on the Internet at Import Administration's Web site, <http://ia.ita.doc.gov>. Paper copies will be available for reading and photocopying in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20230. Any questions concerning file formatting, document conversion, access on the Internet, or other file requirements should be addressed to Andrew Lee Beller, Import Administration Webmaster, (202) 482-0866.

Hearing

After reviewing all comments and rebuttal comments, the Department will determine if a public hearing on the NME country issue is warranted, if one is requested in the initial or rebuttal comments on this issue, and, if so, will announce a place and time for that hearing.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(b) and 771(18)(C)(ii).

Dated: August 30, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-22998 Filed 9-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P