{Commission} shall be deemed to have made an affirmative determination.'' By analogy, the Department finds that, where the Commission is evenly divided between a finding of material injury and a finding of threat of material injury, it is reasonable to treat the finding as an affirmative finding of material injury. As a result, the Department has determined there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect importers of CRS from Australia, China, India, Korea, the Netherlands, and Russia knew or should have known there was likely to be material injury by reason of these dumped imports.

Massive Imports

In determining whether there are ''massive imports'' over a ''relatively short period,'' pursuant to section 733(e)(1)(B) of the Act, the Department normally compares the import volumes of the subject merchandise for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of the petition (*i.e.*, the ''base period'') to a comparable period of at least three months following the filing of the petition (*i.e.*, the ''comparison period''). However, as stated in section 351.206(i) of the Department's regulations, ''if the Secretary finds importers, or exporters or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely, then the Secretary may consider a time period of not less than three months from that earlier time.'' Imports normally will be considered massive when imports during the comparison period have increased by 15 percent or more compared to imports during the base period.

For the reasons set forth in the Critical Circumstances Memoranda, we find sufficient bases exist for finding importers, or exporters or producers, knew or should have known antidumping cases were pending on CRS from Australia, China, India, Korea, the Netherlands, and Russia by May 2001 at the latest. Accordingly, we determined December 2000 through May 2001 should serve as the ''base period,'' while June 2001 through November 2001 should serve as the ''comparison period,'' in determining whether or not imports have been massive over a relatively short period.

According to 19 C.F.R. 351.206(i), the comparison period normally should be at least three months; however, if we determine that importers, exporters or producers had reason to believe that a proceeding was likely, then the Department may consider a longer period. In this case, we have chosen a period of six months as the period for comparison in preliminarily determining whether imports of the subject merchandise have been massive for several reasons. First, at this time we have shipment data covering the six-month period for all exporters being examined for this purpose. We do not believe it is appropriate to use different periods for different exporters. Second, we believe that choosing a six-month period in general properly reflects the ''relatively short period'' commanded by the statute for determining whether imports have been massive. *See* Section 733(e)(1)(B) of the Act. Finally, we are concerned that selecting a longer period for comparison might, in some cases, hamper our ability to fulfill our obligation under the statute to determine whether a genuine surge in imports has occurred *shortly* after exporters knew or should have known about the likelihood of an antidumping petition. However, we welcome comments about the use of a six-month period both in this case and in general.

Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 351.206(h), we found imports of CRS increased by more than 15 percent for CRS from Australia, China, India, Korea, the Netherlands, and Russia in the comparison period; accordingly, we find that imports have been massive for each of the named countries. With respect to Korea, we noted that the import statistics from Korea indicated that imports from Korea increased 97.12 percent. The imports for one of the respondents, Pohang Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (''POSCO''), increased by well over 15 percent as well. However, imports for the other respondent, Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd. (''Dongbu''), increased by less than 15 percent. Accordingly, we find imports were massive for POSCO and all other producers/exporters, except for Dongbu.

In summary, we find there is a history of dumping and material injury by reason of dumped imports of CRS from Korea, the Netherlands, and Russia. We also find there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect importers knew or should have known exporters were selling CRS from Australia, China and India at LTFV and had knowledge of the likelihood of material injury with respect to such imports of CRS. We further find there have been massive imports of CRS over a relatively short period from Australia, China, India, Korea (with the exception of Dongbu), the Netherlands, and Russia.

CONCLUSION

Given the analysis summarized above, and described in more detail in the Critical Circumstances Memoranda, we preliminarily determine critical circumstances exist for imports of CRS from Australia, China, India, Korea (with the exception of Dongbu), the Netherlands, and Russia.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(e)(2) of the Act, if the Department issues affirmative preliminary determinations of sales at LTFV in the investigations with respect to imports of CRS, the Department, at that time, will direct the U.S. Customs Service (''Customs'') to suspend liquidation of all entries of Australia, China, India, Korea (with the exception of Dongbu), the Netherlands, and Russia that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after 90 days prior to the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of our preliminary determinations in these investigations. Customs shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated preliminary dumping margins reflected in the preliminary determinations published in the **Federal Register**. The suspension of liquidation to be issued after our preliminary determinations will remain in effect until further notice.

Final Critical Circumstances Determinations

We will make final determinations concerning critical circumstances for all countries named in Petitioners' allegations when we make our final dumping determinations in these investigations, which will be 75 days (unless extended) after issuance of the preliminary dumping determinations.

Commission Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we will notify the Commission of our determinations.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 10, 2002

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–9509 Filed 4–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–504]

Petroleum Wax Candles From the People's Republic of China (PRC): Notice of Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 18, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley at (202) 482–0666 or Brett L. Royce at (202) 482–4106, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), as amended. 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 28, 1986, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the PRC (51 FR 30686). On August 1, 2001, the Department published an opportunity to request an administrative review of the order (66 FR 39729). On August 31, 2001, the Department received a request from Dongguan Fay Candle Co., Ltd. to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the PRC. On October 1, 2001, the Department published a notice of initiation of this administrative review covering the period of August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001 (66 FR 49924).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department shall make a preliminary determination 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 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.

Due to the complexities involved with this particular case, including the extensive number of products, the possible inclusion in reported sales of both in-scope and out-of-scope candles, and the fact that the respondent has not been reviewed before, we find that it is not practicable to issue preliminary results of review by the current deadline of May 3, 2002. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results by 120 days.

This extension results in the due date for the preliminary results falling on August 31, 2002, which is a Saturday. Therefore, the preliminary results will be due on the next business day, which is September 3, 2002, since September 2, 2002 is an official holiday. The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

Dated: April 12, 2002

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 02–9508 Filed 4–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–504]

Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of the Antidumping New Shipper Review

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

DATES: April 18, 2002.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the final determination of the new shipper review on petroleum wax candles from the People's Republic of China. This review covers the period August 1, 2000 through January 31, 2001. The extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, ''the Act'').

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Javier Barrientos, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–2243.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute And Regulations:

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Extension Of Time Limit Of Final Results:

Under section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of a new shipper review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 90 days after issuance of the preliminary determination. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit due to certain complex issues relating to Shanghai New Star Import/Export Co., Ltd. and Peak Candle's sales valuation, surrogate values and factors of production.

Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Act (90 days after the date the preliminary determination is issued), in accordance with Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit for the final determination an additional 45 days, to no later than May 30, 2002.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and section 351.214(i)(2) of the Department's Regulations.

Dated: April 12, 2002

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 02–9510 Filed 4–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 020328074–2074–01]

RIN 0693–ZA48

Announcement of Availability of Funds for a Competition and Announcement of a Public Meeting—Advanced Technology Program (ATP)

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Technology Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Technology Administration's National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) announces that it will hold a single fiscal year 2002 Advanced Technology Program (ATP) competition and announces a public meeting (Proposers' Conference) for all interested parties. This single competition will continue ATP's practice of being open to all technology areas. All fiscal year 2002 proposals received may be distributed to technology-specific source evaluation boards in areas such as advanced materials, biotechnology, electronics, information technology, etc. This notice