because it is a market–economy country that is at a comparable level of economic development to the NME and is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. Based on the information provided by the petitioners, we believe that the petitioners' use of Egypt as a surrogate country is appropriate for purposes of initiation of this investigation. *See Initiation Checklist*.

In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act, the petitioners valued factors of production, where possible, on reasonably available, public surrogate country data. To value certain raw materials, the petitioners used import statistics from Egypt, as reported in the United Nations Statistical Division Commodity Trade Database System (''UNCTS'') for 1999, excluding those values from countries previously determined by the Department to be NME countries. For inputs valued in Egyptian pounds and not contemporaneous with the period of investigation (''POI'') (*i.e.*, July – December 2001), we used information from the wholesale price indices (''WPI'') in Egypt as published in the International Financial Statistics (''IFS''), December 2001, to determine the inflation adjustment. The surrogate values calculated by the petitioners for raw materials were recently used in the antidumping duty investigation of silicomanganese from Kazakhstan, with the exception of electrode paste, charcoal and wood chips. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Siliconmanganese from Kazakhstan*, (''*Silicomanganese from Kazakhstan*'') 66 FR 56639 (November 9, 2001) and *Initiation Checklist*.

Labor was valued using the regression–based wage rate for Russia provided by the Department, which is available on the Import Administration's website, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3). Petitioners valued electricity using the same Egyptian surrogate value used in *Silicomanganese from Kazakhstan*.

Factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A), interest, and profit were derived from the 1999–2000 financial statements of Sinai Manganese Company (''Sinai''), an Egyptian ferro–manganese alloys producer.

We made adjustments to NV for electrode paste, charcoal, wood chips, and the surrogate ratios. For further information, see the *Initiation Checklist*.

Based on comparisons of EP to NV, calculated in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, the estimated recalculated dumping margin for silicon metal from Russia is 97.17 percent.

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of silicon metal from Russia are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petition alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured and is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV. The petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is evident in (1) declines in production, (2) declines in shipments, and (3) declines in prices (4) capacity utilization, and (5) employment.

The Department assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and determined that these allegations are supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation (*see* Attachments to *Initiation Checklist*, Re: Material Injury).

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

Based upon our examination of the petition on silicon metal imports from Russia, we find that the petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of silicon metal from Russia are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the government representatives of Russia. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to each exporter named in the petition, as appropriate.

International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, no later than April 22, 2002, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of silicon metal from Russia are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in this investigation being terminated; otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 27, 2002

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–8069 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–813]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review: Stainless Steel Butt–Weld Pipe Fittings from Korea

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 3, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker at (202) 482–2924 or Robert James at (202) 482–0649; Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Office Eight, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The 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 Tariff Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce (the Department) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 2001).

Background

On February 23, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on stainless steel butt–weld pipe fittings from Korea. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Butt–Weld Pipe Fittings from Korea*, 58 FR 11029 (February 23, 1993). On August 31, 2001, TK Corporation, a

producer and exporter of the subject merchandise during the period of review (POR), requested that the Department conduct an antidumping duty new shipper review of the antidumping duty order. On October 5, 2001, the Department initiated the requested review. *See Stainless Steel Butt–Weld Pipe Fittings from Korea: Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review*, 66 FR 51017 (October 5, 2001).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act, the Department shall issue preliminary results in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The Tariff Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend that 245–day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period.

In the course of this proceeding the Department has determined, through consultation with the U.S. Customs Service, that there is an issue as to whether TK Corporation's U.S. sales fall within the period of investigation. Due to the need to analyze this question, it is not practicable to complete this review by the current deadline of March 27, 2002.

Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results by 120 days, until no later than July 25, 2002. The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: March 27, 2002

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 02–8070 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

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

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Suite 4100W, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building, 1099 14th Street, NW, Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 02–007. *Applicant:* National Institutes of Health, NIAMS/LSBR, 6 Center Drive, Building 6, Room B2–34, Bethesda, MD 20892–2717. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope, Model Tecnai 30 He. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, The Netherlands. *Intended Use:* The instrument is intended to be used to collect state-of-the-art cryo-electron microscopy for a variety of projects aimed at determining the structures of macromolecular complexes at high spatial resolution. Two immediate projects are Capsid Assembly of Hepatitis B Virus and Maturation of Bacteriophage Capsids. *Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* March 5, 2002.

Gerald A. Zerdy,

Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 02–8074 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Vermont; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Suite 4100W, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 02–001. *Applicant:* University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405. *Instrument:* Upgrade for X-ray based Motion Analysis System. *Manufacturer:* RSA BioMedical Innovations AB, Sweden. *Intended Use:* See notice at 67 FR 8939, February 27, 2002.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* This is a compatible accessory for an existing instrument purchased for the use of the applicant.

The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum dated February 1, 2002, that the accessory is pertinent to the intended uses and that it knows of no comparable domestic accessory.

We know of no domestic accessory which can be readily adapted to the existing instrument.

Gerald A. Zerdy,

Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 02–8073 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–815]

Pure and Alloy Magnesium From Canada: Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Countervailing Duty Review

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation of new shipper countervailing duty review.

SUMMARY: On February 28, 2002, the Department of Commerce received a request to conduct a new shipper review of the countervailing duty orders on pure and alloy magnesium from Canada. In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.214(d), we are initiating this new shipper review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 3, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or Craig Matney, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3464 or (202) 482–1778, 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. In addition, all references to the Department of Commerce's (''the Department's'') regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 2001).