AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC; telephone (202) 482–1385 or 482–0159, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Due to the complexity of issues involved in these cases, it is not practicable to complete these reviews within the original time limit. The Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results from May 3, 2001 until August 31, 2001, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. See memorandum to Joseph A. Spetrini from Edward Yang regarding the extension of the case deadline. The time limit for the final results would remain at 120 days after the preliminary results are issued. This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. Sec. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: January 18, 2001.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 01–2511 Filed 1–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–812]

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above (''DRAMs'') From the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paige Rivas at (202) 482–0651, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office IV, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On July 7, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on DRAMs from Korea, covering the period May 1, 1999, through April 30, 2000 (65 FR 131).

The antidumping dumping duty order for DRAMs from Korea was revoked, pursuant to the sunset procedures established by statute, effective January 1, 2000. *See Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (''DRAMs'') of One Megabit and Above From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Full Sunset Review and Revocation of Order,* 65 FR 1471366 (October 5, 2000). However, we are conducting this review to cover sales of the subject merchandise made in the United States by Hyundai and LG during the 8-month period from May 1, 1999, until the effective date of the revocation, December 31, 1999. The preliminary results are currently due no later than January 30, 2001.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than May 30, 2001. *See* Decision Memorandum from Thomas Futtner to Holly A. Kuga, dated January 10, 2001, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the main Commerce building. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: January 22, 2001.

Melissa G. Skinner,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–2528 Filed 1–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A–475–818, A–489–805)

Certain Pasta From Italy and Turkey: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Lai Robinson at (202) 482–3797, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to issue the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and the final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within that time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary results to a maximum of 365 days and for the final results to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary results) from the date of the publication of the preliminary results.

Background

On September 6, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain pasta from Italy and Turkey, covering the period July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000 (65 FR 53980). The preliminary results are currently due no later than April 2, 2001.

Extension of Preliminary Results of Reviews

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of

these reviews within the original time limits. Therefore, we are extending the time limits for completion of the preliminary results until no later than June 21, 2001. *See* Decision Memorandum from Melissa Skinner to Holly A. Kuga, dated January 16, 2001, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, B–099 of the main Commerce Building. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after the publication of the notice of preliminary results of these reviews.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: January 22, 2001.

Melissa Skinner,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–2517 Filed 1–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–821, C–560–813, C–791–810, C–549–818]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From India, Indonesia, South Africa, and Thailand: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Determinations in Countervailing Duty Investigations

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary determinations in countervailing duty investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit of the preliminary determinations in the countervailing duty (''CVD'') investigations of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from India, Indonesia, South Africa, and Thailand from February 7, 2001 until no later than March 26, 2001. This extension is made pursuant to section 703(c)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Greynolds (India), at (202) 482–6071; Stephanie Moore (Indonesia), at (202) 482–3692; Sally Gannon (South Africa), at (202) 482–0162; and Dana Mermelstein (Thailand), at (202) 482–1391, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 Act'') by 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 (2000).

Extension of Due Date for Preliminary Determinations

On December 4, 2000, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated the CVD investigations of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from India, Indonesia, South Africa, and Thailand. *See Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Argentina, India, Indonesia, South Africa, and Thailand,* 65 FR 77580 (December 12, 2000). Currently, the preliminary determinations are due no later than February 7, 2001. However, pursuant to section 703(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we have determined that these investigations are ''extraordinarily complicated'' and are therefore extending the due date for the preliminary determinations by 45 days to no later than March 26, 2001.

Under section 703(c)(1)(B), the Department can extend the period for reaching a preliminary determination until not later than the 130th day after the date on which the administering authority initiates an investigation if:

(B) the administering authority concludes that the parties concerned are cooperating and determines that

(i) the case is extraordinarily complicated by reason of

(I) the number and complexity of the alleged countervailable subsidy practices;

(II) the novelty of the issues presented;

(III) the need to determine the extent to which particular countervailable subsidies are used by individual manufacturers, producers, and exporters; or

(IV) the number of firms whose activities must be investigated; and

(ii) additional time is necessary to make the preliminary determination. Regarding the first requirement, we find that in each case all concerned parties are cooperating. Regarding the second requirement, we find that each of these four cases is extraordinarily complicated for the following reasons.

India

The Indian CVD investigation is extraordinarily complicated because of the number of firms whose activities must be investigated and the need to determine the extent to which particular countervailable subsidies are used by individual manufacturers, producers, and exporters in India. There are five producers which exported subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation. In order to determine the extent to which alleged countervailable subsidies are used, a large amount of information must be analyzed by the Department for these five companies. Given the time constraints of this investigation, we consider the information to be analyzed for these five companies to be voluminous.

Indonesia

The Indonesian CVD investigation is extraordinarily complicated because of the novelty of the issue presented and the need to determine the extent to which particular countervailable subsidies are used by the producer of the subject merchandise and its subsidiary. Certain of the alleged subsidies, including equity infusions, were provided by the Government of Indonesia to a company affiliated with the producer of the subject merchandise, rather than to the producer itself. Thus, this case presents an unusual set of facts which requires additional attention and analysis with respect to determining whether such alleged subsidies provided a countervailable benefit to the producer of the subject merchandise.

South Africa

The South African investigation is extraordinarily complicated because a number of the alleged programs are complex or novel. For example, the Department must analyze complicated equity financing issues, involving extensive and complex financial analysis, as well as novel tax issues, including advanced depreciation. In addition, the Department is examining whether one of the companies was ''creditworthy'' when the government provided equity and loans to the company (*i.e.,* whether a private investor would have provided the types of financing that the government provided) which demands that the Department analyze significant amounts of information.

Thailand

The Thai CVD investigation is extraordinarily complicated because of the number and complexity of the