

a governmental authority; (2) whether the respondent has authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; (3) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether the respondent retains the proceeds of its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses. *See Silicon Carbide and Furfuryl Alcohol.*

LABEC asserted the following: (1) It establishes its own export prices; (2) it negotiates contracts without guidance from any governmental entities or organizations; (3) it makes its own personnel decisions; and (4) it retains the proceeds of its export sales, uses profits according to its business needs, and has the authority to sell its assets and to obtain loans. Additionally, statements contained in LABEC's September 29, 2000, submission indicate that the company does not coordinate its prices with other exporters.

The Department conducted verification of LABEC's separate rate claim and found no evidence at verification of government involvement in LABEC's business operations. Specifically, Department officials examined sales documents that showed that LABEC negotiated its contracts and set its own sales prices with its customers. In addition, the Department reviewed sales payments, bank statements and accounting documentation that demonstrated that LABEC received payment from its U.S. customers via bank wire transfer, which was deposited into its own bank account without government intervention. Finally, the Department examined internal company memoranda, such as appointment notices and election results, which demonstrated that LABEC selected its own management. *See* Department verification report on LABEC at pages 3 through 6. This information, taken in its entirety, supports a finding that there is an absence of *de facto* governmental control of LABEC's export functions. Consequently, we have determined that LABEC has met the criteria for the application of a separate rate.

Final Results of the Review

We also verified data contained in LABEC's September 29, 2000, submission and February 16, 2001, supplemental submission as it pertained to the claim that LABEC is the successor-in-interest to LABEF.

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Act and in order to determine

whether LABEC is the successor-in-interest to LABEF, we examined several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. *See, e.g., Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992) ("*Brass from Canada*"). While no single factor or combination of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of a successor-in-interest relationship, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if the new company's resulting operation is not materially dissimilar to that of its predecessor. *See, e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994); *Brass from Canada*, and *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 50880 (September 23, 1998). Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the former company, the Department will accord the new company the same antidumping treatment as its predecessor.

Based on our verification findings, we determine that LABEC is the successor-in-interest to LABEF. Specifically, LABEF has demonstrated through registration and ownership documentation examined at verification that it changed its name to LABEC as a result of decisions made by LABEF's original owners. Moreover, LABEF has demonstrated through production and accounting records examined at verification that changing its name to LABEC has resulted in no significant changes in either production facilities, supplier relationships, customer base, or management. *See* Department verification report on LABEC at pages 7 through 10.

Thus, we determine that LABEC is the successor-in-interest to LABEF for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability, and should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to brake rotors as the former LABEF.

We will instruct the Customs Service to suspend shipments of subject merchandise made by LABEC at LABEF's cash deposit rate (*i.e.*, zero percent). The shipments of subject merchandise to be suspended are those which are entered, or withdrawn from

warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this changed-circumstances review.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: July 9, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-17857 Filed 7-16-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A-583-835

Postponement of Final Determination for Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Taiwan

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

ACTION: Notice of postponement of final antidumping duty determination of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Taiwan.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is postponing the final determination in the antidumping duty investigation of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from the Taiwan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 17, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Tran at 202-482-1121, Mike Heaney at 202-482-4475, or Robert James at 202-482-0649, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

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

Postponement of Final Determination and Extension of Provisional Measures

On May 3, 2001, the Department published the affirmative preliminary determination for the investigation of

certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Taiwan. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Taiwan*, 66 FR 22204 (May 3, 2001). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f)(2) of the Department's regulations, we determined that respondents China Steel Corporation (China Steel) and Yieh Loong Enterprise Co., Ltd. (Yieh Loong) are affiliated companies and should be collapsed for purposes of an antidumping analysis. *See Memorandum to Joseph A. Spetrini, "Affiliation Issue regarding China Steel * * * and Yieh Loong * * *,"* dated April 19, 2001 (Affiliation Memorandum). The collapsed entity is hereafter referred to as China Steel.

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2) of the Tariff Act and § 351.210(b)(2)(ii) of the Department's regulations, on April 30, 2001, respondent China Steel requested the Department extend the final determination for the full sixty days as permitted by the statute and regulations. China Steel also agreed to the extension of provisional measures (*i.e.*, suspension of liquidation) from a four-month period to a period not to exceed six months, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.210(e)(2).

Section 735(a)(2) of the Tariff Act provides that a final determination may be postponed until not later than 135 days after the date of the publication of the preliminary determination if, in the event of an affirmative determination, a request for such postponement is made by exporters who account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, or in the event of a negative preliminary determination, a request for such postponement is made by petitioner. The Department's regulations, at 19 CFR 351.210(e)(2), require that requests by respondents for postponement of a final determination be accompanied by a request for extension of provisional measures from a four-month period to not more than six months.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.210(b)(2)(ii), because (1) our preliminary determination is affirmative, (2) the respondent requesting a postponement accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and (3) no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are granting China Steel's request and are postponing the final determination to no later than 135 days after the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

This notice of postponement is published pursuant to 19 CFR 351.210(b)(2).

Dated: July 6, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-17856 Filed 7-16-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review.

SUMMARY: The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs ("OETCA"), International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, has received an application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review ("Certificate"). This notice summarizes the proposed amendment and requests comments relevant to whether the Certificate should be issued.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Vanessa M. Bachman, Acting Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482-5131 (this is not a toll-free number) or E-mail at oitca@ita.doc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. An Export Trade Certificate of Review protects the holder and the members identified in the Certificate from state and federal government antitrust actions and from private treble damage antitrust actions for the export conduct specified in the Certificate and carried out in compliance with its terms and conditions. Section 302(b)(1) of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 and 15 CFR 325.6(a) require the Secretary to publish a notice in the **Federal Register** identifying the applicant and summarizing its proposed export conduct.

Request for Public Comments

Interested parties may submit written comments relevant to the determination whether an amended Certificate should be issued. If the comments include any privileged or confidential business information, it must be clearly marked and a nonconfidential version of the comments (identified as such) should be included. Any comments not marked privileged or confidential business

information will be deemed to be nonconfidential. An original and five (5) copies, plus two (2) copies of the nonconfidential version, should be submitted no later than 20 days after the date of this notice to: Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, Room 1104H, Washington, D.C. 20230. Information submitted by any person is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). However, nonconfidential versions of the comments will be made available to the applicant if necessary for determining whether or not to issue the Certificate. Comments should refer to this application as "Export Trade Certificate of Review, application number 84-12A12."

Northwest Fruit Exporters' ("NFE") original Certificate was issued on June 11, 1984 (49 FR 24581, June 14, 1984) and previously amended on May 2, 1988 (53 FR 16306, May 6, 1988); September 21, 1988 (53 FR 37628, September 27, 1988); September 20, 1989 (54 FR 39454, September 26, 1989); November 19, 1992 (57 FR 55510, November 25, 1992); August 16, 1994 (59 FR 43093, August 22, 1994); November 4, 1996 (61 FR 57850, November 8, 1996); October 22, 1997 (62 FR 55783, October 28, 1997); November 2, 1998 (63 FR 60304, November 9, 1998); October 20, 1999 (64 FR 57438, October 25, 1999); and October 16, 2000 (65 FR 63567, October 24, 2000). A summary of the application for an amendment follows.

Summary of the Application

Applicant: Northwest Fruit Exporters
105 South 18th Street, Suite 227,
Yakima, Washington 98901-2149,

Contact: James R. Archer, Manager,
Telephone: (509) 576-8004

Application No.: 84-12A12.

Date Deemed Submitted: July 9, 2001.

Proposed Amendment: Northwest Fruit Exporters seeks to amend its Certificate to:

1. Add each of the following companies as a new "Member" of the Certificate within the meaning of § 325.2(1) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(1)): Bertha's Marketing, Inc., Wenatchee, Washington; Crane & Crane, Inc., Brewster, Washington; Garrett Ranches Packing, Wilder, Idaho; Sun Fresh International, LLC, Wenatchee, Washington; and Valicoff Fruit Company, Wapato, Washington;

2. Delete the following companies as "Members" of the Certificate: Beebe Orchard Company, Chelan, Washington; Cashmere Fruit Exchange, Cashmere, Washington; Custom Fruit Packers,