

the central government of the PRC. Golden Tide submitted documentation establishing: (i) the date on which its NFAJC was first shipped to the USA; (ii) the volume of that shipment and subsequent shipments; and (iii) the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR

351.214, we are initiating a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on NFAJC from the PRC. We intend to issue the preliminary results of this review not later than 180 days from the date of publication of this notice. We intend to issue final results of this review no later than 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued. See 19 CFR 351.214(i). All

provisions of 19 CFR 351.214 will apply to Golden Tide throughout the duration of this new shipper review. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(B), the standard period of review in a new shipper review initiated in the month immediately following the semiannual anniversary month will be the six-month period immediately preceding the semi-annual anniversary month.

Antidumping Duty Proceeding	Period to be Reviewed
People's Republic of China: Non-Frozen Apple Juice Concentrate, A-570-855: Yantai Golden Tide Fruits & Vegetable Food Co., Ltd.	06/01/02 through 11/30/02

Concurrent with publication of this notice, and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(e), we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the subject merchandise exported by the company listed above, until the completion of the review. As Golden Tide has certified that it both produced and exported the subject merchandise exported to the United States during the relevant period of review, we will apply the bonding option under 19 CFR 351.107(b)(1)(i) only to subject merchandise for which it is both the producer and exporter.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: January 24, 2003.

Susan Kuhbach,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-2195 Filed 1-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-879, A-580-850]

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Polyvinyl Alcohol from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea

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

SUMMARY: SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is postponing the preliminary determinations in the antidumping duty investigations of

polyvinyl alcohol from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea from February 12, 2003, until no later than March 14, 2003. These postponements are made pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 30, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elizabeth Eastwood (People's Republic of China) or Irina Itkin (Republic of Korea) at (202) 482-3874 or (202) 482-0656, respectively, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Postponement of Due Date for Preliminary Determination

On October 1, 2002, the Department initiated antidumping duty investigations of imports of polyvinyl alcohol from the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the Republic of Korea (Korea). See 67 FR 61591 (Oct. 1, 2002). The notice of initiation stated that we would issue our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of initiation. See *Id.* Currently, the preliminary determinations in this investigation are due on February 12, 2003.

On January 21, 2003, the petitioners made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e) for a 30-day postponement for the PRC and Korea, pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The petitioners stated that a postponement of these preliminary determinations is necessary in order to permit more complete and effective investigations and more accurate preliminary determinations.

Under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act, if the petitioner makes a timely request for an extension of the period within which the preliminary determination must be made under subsection (b)(1),

then the Department may postpone making the preliminary determination under subsection (b)(1) until not later than the 190th day after the date on which the administering authority initiated the investigation. Therefore, in accordance with the petitioners' requests for postponement, the Department is postponing the preliminary determinations in these investigations until March 14, 2003, which is 170 days from the date on which the Department initiated these investigations.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f).

Dated: January 23, 2003.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-2102 Filed 1-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-816]

Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 30, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lilit Astvatsatrian, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office IX, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6412.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this administrative review is certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("SSBWPF") whether finished or unfinished, under 14 inches inside diameter. Certain SSBWPF are used to connect pipe sections in piping systems where conditions require welded connections. The subject merchandise is used where one or more of the following conditions is a factor in designing the piping system: (1) Corrosion of the piping system will occur if material other than stainless steel is used; (2) contamination of the material in the system by the system itself must be prevented; (3) high temperatures are present; (4) extreme low temperatures are present; and (5) high pressures are contained within the system.

Pipe fittings come in a variety of shapes, with the following five shapes the most basic: "elbows", "tees", "reducers", "stub-ends", and "caps." The edges of finished pipe fittings are beveled. Threaded, grooved, and bolted fittings are excluded from this review. The pipe fittings subject to this review are classifiable under subheading 7307.23.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS").

Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the review is dispositive. Pipe fittings manufactured to American Society of Testing and Materials specification A774 are included in the scope of this order.

On April 12, 2001, during this administrative review, the Department received a scope ruling request, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(c), from Allegheny Bradford Corporation d/b/a Top Line Process Equipment Company (\geq Top Line \geq), for a scope ruling on whether the stainless steel butt-weld tube fittings it plans to import are covered by the antidumping duty order on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. On November 15, 2001, the Department issued its preliminary scope ruling. See *Memorandum from Edward C. Yang, Director, Enforcement, Group III, Office 9, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III: Preliminary Scope Ruling on the Antidumping Duty Order on Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings: Allegheny Bradford Corporation d/b/a Top Line Process Equipment ("Preliminary Scope Ruling")*, dated November 15, 2001, which is on file at the U.S. Department of Commerce, in the Central Records

Unit, in room B-099. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our *Preliminary Scope Ruling*. Top Line and petitioners filed briefs on November 21, 2001. On November 26, 2001, Top Line and petitioners filed rebuttal briefs. On December 10, 2001, the Department issued its final scope ruling that Top Line's stainless steel butt-weld tube fittings are within the scope of the Order. See *Memorandum from Edward C. Yang, Director, Enforcement, Group III, Office 9, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III: Final Scope Ruling on the Antidumping Duty Order on Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings: Allegheny Bradford Corporation d/b/a Top Line Process Equipment*, dated December 10, 2001, which is also on file at the U.S. Department of Commerce, in the Central Records Unit, in room B-099.

Amendment of the Final Results

On December 17, 2002, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") issued its final results for stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan for the June 1, 2000 through May 31, 2001, period of review. See *Notice of Final Results and Final Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From France: Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan ("Final Results")*, 67 FR 78417 (December 24, 2002).

In accordance with 19 C.F.R. §351.224(c), on December 20, 2002, the petitioners in this administrative review requested that the Department extend the deadline to file ministerial errors regarding the *Final Results* from December 20, 2002 to December 27, 2002. On December 20, 2002, the Department extended the deadline to file any ministerial error allegations on the *Final Results* from December 20, 2002 to December 27, 2002. Subsequently, on December 27, 2002, the petitioners timely filed an allegation pursuant to 19 CFR §351.224(c) that the Department made six ministerial errors in the **FINAL RESULTS**. Ta Chen Stainless Steel Pipe Co., ("Ta Chen"), the only respondent covered by the review, did not submit any ministerial error allegations or rebuttal comments in reply to petitioners' ministerial error allegations.

Allegation 1: Improper Revision to General and Administrative Expense ("G&A") Ratio

The petitioners state that in the final results the Department erred in the method of applying the revised general and administrative expenses ("G&A") to

the total cost of manufacture when adding certain bonus payments to the reported G&A. According to the petitioners, the Department erroneously applied the revised G&A ratio to the reported G&A, instead of applying the revised G&A to the reported total cost of manufacture. The petitioners note that the same error of not applying the revised G&A to the total cost of manufacture was also made in the Margin Calculation Program.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners and have revised both the Model Match and Margin Calculation programs to apply the revised G&A correctly. See Analysis Memo.

Allegation 2: Improper Use of Fiscal Year for U.S. Indirect Selling Expense Calculation

The petitioners argue that in the final results the Department erroneously did not rely on 2001 financial statements of Ta Chen International ("TCI") for the calculation of the U.S. indirect selling expense. The petitioners further argue that the Department has erred in its decision by finding that TCI had not been given the opportunity to adjust its 2001 financial data because record evidence shows that the relevant adjusted information was in fact on the record. Thus, the petitioners state that the Department should revise its final results by using TCI's adjusted 2001 indirect selling expense percentage of the gross unit price.

Department's Position: With regard to this allegation, we disagree that a change to the calculation would represent a ministerial error correction. At the outset, we note that petitioners are correct that this information is on the record. However, we note that reliance on that erroneous observation is only one of the two bases of our decision in the final results. The second basis of the Department's decision was that TCI's year 2000 data overlaps a longer portion of the POR than the year 2001 data. This fact is unchallenged by the petitioners. Therefore, petitioners' request that the Department overturn its decision to use the year 2000 TCI data is not ministerial in nature, but rather involves a methodological change. A ministerial error is defined under 19 CFR 351.224(f) as "an error in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other similar type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial." Accordingly, we have not made the requested change.

Allegation 3: Improper Use of Short-term Borrowing Rate for U.S. Credit Expense Calculation

The petitioners argue that in the final results, the Department incorrectly based the U.S. credit expenses for certain “indent” sales on Ta Chen Taiwan’s short-term borrowing rate, instead of its U.S. subsidiary TCI’s short-term borrowing rate. The petitioners conclude the Department should revise U.S. credit expenses based TCI’s short-term interest rate as opposed to that of Ta Chen.

Department’s Position: We agree with the petitioners that the Department inadvertently used Ta Chen’s short-term borrowing rate for calculation of imputed credit expense for the U.S. sales at issue, instead of correctly using TCI’s short-term borrowing rate. We have corrected this error. See Analysis Memo.

Allegation 4: Improper Application of Average Margin to Unreported Sales

Petitioners note that in the preliminary results, the Department decided to impose partial facts available on two sets of Ta Chen’s U.S. sales and assigned Ta Chen’s average positive margin to those sales. The petitioners further note that in the final results, the Department changed from using the average positive margin to the average margin on the basis that use of the average positive margin was implicitly an unintended adverse margin.

However, petitioners argue that using the average margin produces an incorrect result. See, *Memorandum For The File from Lilit Astvatsatrian through James Doyle*, dated January 20, 2003, for identification of the precise nature of the alleged incorrect result. Moreover, petitioners assert that the average positive margin is not adverse as the highest dumping margin calculated

would have been the proper adverse facts available margin. As a result of these considerations, petitioners conclude that the Department should apply the average positive margin to the two sets of Ta Chen’s U.S. sales at issue.

Department’s Position: We disagree with petitioners’ assertion that the use of the average margin represents a ministerial error and accordingly will not adjust the final results. The final results computer program correctly calculated and applied the average margin to these sales, which was precisely the Department’s intent as expressed in the final results. While the petitioners may disagree with the use of the calculated average margin, such disagreement regarding the figure does not represent identification of a ministerial error as described in 19 CFR 351.224(f).

Allegation 5: Omission of Negative Data Test in the Model Match Program

The petitioners maintain that in its Margin Calculation Program, the Department conducted a “negative data test” to find and remove a negative reported price or quantity from the calculation. Petitioners also note that the Department did not conduct a similar negative data test in the Model Match Program. Petitioners conclude that conducting the test in one program and not the other results in the incorrect use of different databases between the two programs.

Department’s Position: We disagree with petitioners. As an initial matter, we note that petitioners did not comment on this standard Department calculation practice after the preliminary results, which was the correct time to raise this methodological consideration. Finally, as this is a methodological issue, it cannot be understood to be a ministerial error.

Allegation 6: Improper Admission of CEP Offset

Petitioners allege that the Department, in granting Ta Chen a CEP offset, failed: (1) to analyze the proper levels of trade for determining whether a CEP offset should be granted, and (2) to confirm the type and extent of the selling expenses offered by Ta Chen to the U.S. and home markets in the submitted record. Petitioners argue that after a proper analysis, the Department should find that the U.S. level of trade is at a higher level (or at a minimum, an equal level) of trade than home market sales and deny Ta Chen’s request for a CEP offset and then correct the final results accordingly.

Department’s Position: We disagree with the petitioners. Rather than requesting the Department to correct an unintentional error such as these listed at 19 CFR 351.224 (f), the petitioners are requesting the Department to review its analysis and subsequently reverse its decision at the final results. Accordingly, we cannot agree this represents a ministerial error.

We are amending the *Final Results* to reflect the correction of the above-cited two ministerial errors. All changes made to the model match and margin program can be found in the analysis memorandum. See *Memorandum to the File from Lilit Astvatsatrian, Case Analyst to James C. Doyle, Program Manager, Final Analysis for Ta Chen Stainless Steel Pipe Co. for the Amended Final Results of the Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan for the period June 1, 2000 through May 31, 2001*, dated January 20, 2003.

The revised weighted-average dumping margin is as follows:

Producer/Manufacturer/Exporter	Final Weighted-Average Margin (percent)	Amended Final Weighted Average Margin (percent)
Ta Chen	2.38	2.41

The Department will determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates. With respect to the constructed export price sales, we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer. We will direct Customs to assess any resulting *non-de minimis* percentage margins against the

entered Customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer’s entries during the review period. We will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to the Customs Service within 15 days of publication of these amended final results of review.

We will also direct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all appropriate entries in accordance with the procedures discussed in the Final Results and at the rates amended by this determination. The amended deposit

requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and CFR 351.210(c).

Dated: January 23, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-2103 Filed 1-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Proposed Collection; Comment Requested

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness).

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) announces the following proposed reinstatement of a public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received March 31, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) (Program Integration) Legal Policy, ATTN: Lt Col Patrick Lindemann, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-4000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the above address or call at (703) 697-3387.

Title, Associated Form, and OMB Control Number: Application for Correction of Military Record Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552, DD Form 149, OMB Control Number 0704-0003.

Needs and Uses: This information collection requirement is necessary for all Service personnel (current and

former servicemembers) to apply to their respective Boards for Correction of Military Records (BCMR) for a correction of their military records under Title 10, United States Code Section 1552. The BCMRs of the Services are the highest administration boards and appellate review authorities in the Services for the resolution of military personnel disputes. The Service Secretaries, acting through the BCMRs, are empowered with broad powers and are duty bound to correct records if an error or injustice exists. The range of issues includes, but is not limited to, awards, clemency petitions (of court-martial sentences), disabilities, evaluation reports, home of record, memoranda of reprimands, promotions, retirements, separations, survivor benefit plans, and titling decisions by law enforcement authorities.

Information collection is needed to provide current and former servicemembers with a method through which to request correction of a military record, and to provide the Services with the basic data needed to process the request.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 14,000.

Number of Respondents: 28,000.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Average Burden Per Response: 30 minutes.

Frequency: On Occasion.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Information Collection

The respondents for this information collection are current and former servicemembers requesting correction to their military records. The servicemember submits to the respective Board for Correction of Military Records (BCMR) a DD Form 149, "application for Correction of Military Record Under the provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code Section 1552." The information from the DD Form 149 is used by the respective Service Boards for Correction of Military Records in processing the applicant's request authorized under Title 10 U.S.C. 1552. The DD Form 149 was devised to standardize applications to the BCMRs. This information is used to identify and secure the appropriate official military and medical records from the appropriate records storage facilities. Information on the form is used by the BCMRs to identify the issues and arguments raised by applicants, identify any counsel representing applicants, and determine if the applicants filed their petitions within the three-year statute of limitations established by Congress.

Dated: January 22, 2003.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03-2160 Filed 1-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense will submit to OMB for emergency processing, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by February 10, 2003.

Title, Applicable Form, and OMB Number: Application for Department of Defense Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities; SD Form 816 and SD Form 816C; OMB Number 0704—[To be Determined].

Type of Request: New Collection; Emergency processing requested with a shortened public comment period of ten days. An approval date by February 28, 2003, has been requested.

Number of Respondents: 50.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 50.

Average Burden Per Response: 8 hours.

Annual Burden Hours: 400.

Needs and Uses: Department of Defense funds are authorized for local educational agencies (LEAs) that educate military dependent students with severe disabilities and meet certain criteria. Eligible LEAs are determined by their responses to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) from information they submitted on children with disabilities, when they completed the Impact Program form for the Department of Education. This new application will be requested of LEAs who educate military dependent students with disabilities, who have been deemed eligible for the U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid program, to determine if they meet the criteria to receive additional funds from the Department of Defense due to high special education costs of the military dependents with severe disabilities that they serve.

Affected Public: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.