Economic Mission (February 10, 2003). On February 14, 2003, we received a rebuttal brief from domestic interested parties Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation. *See* Rebuttal Brief from Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation (February 14, 2003).

**Scope of Review:**

The products covered by the sunset review of the suspended antidumping duty investigation on certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Ukraine include hot-rolled iron and non-alloy steel universal mill plates (i.e., flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm but not exceeding 1250 mm and of a thickness of not less than 4 mm, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain iron and non-alloy steel flat-rolled products not in coils, of rectangular shape, hot-rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 mm or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness. Included as subject merchandise in this review are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been ''worked after rolling'') for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. This merchandise is currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTS'') under item numbers 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, 7208.51.0030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this sunset review is dispositive. Specifically excluded from subject merchandise within the scope of this sunset review is grade X-70 steel plate.

**Analysis of Comments Received:**

All issues raised by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (''Decision Memorandum'') from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Acting Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, dated May 1, 2003, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail were the suspended antidumping duty investigation to be terminated. Parties may find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn*, under the heading ''May 2003.'' The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

**Final Results of Review:**

We determine that termination of the suspended antidumping duty investigation on CTL plate from Ukraine would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

| Manufacturer/producer/exporter | Weighted-average margin percentage |
|---|---|
| Azovstal | 81.43 |
| Ilyich | 155.00 |
| Ukraine-wide | 237.91 |

This sunset review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 1, 2003.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03–11355 Filed 5–6–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A-201–827]**

### Certain Large Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Mexico: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 7, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Young or George McMahon at (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1167, respectively, 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 of Commerce (the Department) to issue the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order or 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 August 6, 2002, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** the notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on certain large diameter carbon and alloy seamless standard, line, and pressure pipe (''SLP'') from Mexico, for the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002 (67 FR 50856). On August 30, 2002, we

received a request from petitioner[1] to review Tubos de Acero de Mexico, S.A. (''TAMSA''). On September 25, 2002, we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review with respect to TAMSA. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part and Deferral of Administrative Reviews*, 67 FR 60210 (September 25, 2002). On October 25, 2002, we received a request from petitioner to determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed during the period of review by respondent TAMSA. TAMSA submitted a November 1, 2002 letter certifying that neither TAMSA, nor its U.S. affiliate, Siderca Corporation, directly or indirectly, exported or sold for consumption in the United States any subject merchandise during the period of review (''POR''). The preliminary results were originally due on May 5, 2003.

**Extension of Preliminary Results of Review**

After analyzing Customs information for the period of review, we preliminarily find that TAMSA is a non-shipper. Therefore, we have issued a memorandum in which we have expressed our intent to rescind this review. *See* Memorandum from Eric Greynolds to Melissa G. Skinner, regarding the *Second Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Large Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Mexico*, dated April 30, 2003.

To afford interested parties time to comment on the Department's intent to rescind this review, and because it would be impracticable to issue a preliminary determination prior to receiving those comments, we are postponing the preliminary determination by 60 days, until July 7, 2003, in accordance with 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. *See* Decision Memorandum from Melissa Skinner to Holly A. Kuga, dated May 1, 2003, 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 this review.

Dated: May 1, 2003.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03–11354 Filed 5–6–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S**

[1] The petitioner is United States Steel Corporation.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

**[C-122–839]**

## Final Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Reviews: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Reviews.

**SUMMARY:** On August 14, 2002, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of 18 expedited reviews of the countervailing duty order on certain softwood lumber products from Canada for the period April 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001. *See Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Expedited Reviews: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada*, 67 FR 52945 (August 14, 2002) (*Preliminary Results*). On November 5, 2002, the Department published its final results for 13 of these 18 expedited reviews. *See Final Results and Partial Recission of Countervailing Duty Expedited Reviews: Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada* (67 FR 67388; November 5, 2002) (*Final Results*). Based on our analysis of additional information and verification of the questionnaire responses, we have made changes to the estimated net subsidy rates determined in the *Preliminary Results* for an additional three companies in their expedited reviews. Therefore, these final results for these three expedited reviews differ from the preliminary results. For information on estimated net subsidies, please see the ''Final Results of Reviews'' section of this notice. In accordance with these final results of reviews, we will instruct the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (BCBP) to refund all collected cash deposits and waive future cash deposits requirements for each reviewed company as detailed in the ''Final Results of Reviews'' section of this notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 7, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gayle Longest, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3338.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On May 22, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its amended final affirmative countervailing duty determination and countervailing duty order on certain softwood lumber products (subject merchandise) from Canada (67 FR 36070), as amended (67 FR 37775; May 30, 2002). On July 17, 2002, the Department published a Notice of Initiation of Expedited Reviews which covered 73 companies that filed complete and timely review applications. (*See Notice of Initiation of Expedited Reviews of the Countervailing Duty Order: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada*, (67 FR 46955; July 17, 2002) (*Notice of Initiation*).)

As explained in the *Notice of Initiation*, we segregated the 73 applicants into two groups. Group 1 consists of 45 companies that obtain the majority of their wood (over 50 percent of their inputs) from the United States, the Maritime Provinces, Canadian private lands, and Canadian companies excluded from the order, as well as companies that source less than a majority of their wood from these sources and do not have tenure. Group 2 includes 28 companies that source less than a majority of their wood from these sources and have acquired Crown timber through their own tenure contracts.

In our review of the applications in Group 1, we noted that, in order to conduct our analysis, we required only minimal supplemental data for 24 of the 45 companies. The other Group 1 companies required additional information and more extensive analysis. Rather than delaying the process to provide all Group 1 companies the opportunity to submit the necessary information, we issued a short questionnaire to the 24 companies requiring only minimal information and set a short deadline for the response. Of the 24 companies, 18 were able to supply the information by the deadline. We completed our preliminary analysis of those 18 companies, using the Group 1 methodology (see ''Methodology'' section below). *See Preliminary Results*.

On September 6, 2002, petitioners filed comments to the *Preliminary Results*. Two companies subsequently requested an analysis of whether they benefited from subsidies bestowed on their inputs: Les Bois d'Oeuvre Beaudoin & Gauthier Inc. and Meunier Lumber Company Ltd. Three other companies, Interbois Inc. (Interbois), Les Moulures Jacomau 2000, Inc. (Jacomau), and Richard Lutes Cedar, Inc. (RLC), were verified subsequent to the