

determination at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Individuals who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time. Requests for a public hearing should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and, (3) to the extent practicable, an identification of the arguments to be raised at the hearing.

In addition, six copies of the business proprietary version and six copies of the non-proprietary version of the case briefs must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than 50 days from the date of publication of the preliminary determination. As part of the case brief, parties are encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. Six copies of the business proprietary version and six copies of the non-proprietary version of the rebuttal briefs must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than 5 days from the date of filing of the case briefs. An interested party may make an affirmative oral presentation only on arguments included in that party's case or rebuttal briefs. Written arguments should be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309 and will be considered if received within the time limits specified above.

This determination is published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: June 30, 2003.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-17216 Filed 7-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-351-806]

Notice of Decision of the Court of International Trade: Silicon Metal From Brazil

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

ACTION: Notice of Decision of the Court of International Trade.

SUMMARY: On June 27, 2003, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the Department of Commerce's results of redetermination on remand of the final results of the sixth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil. *See American Silicon Technologies, et al. v. United States*, Slip Op. 99-03-00149 (CIT June 27, 2003) (*American Silicon Decision*). Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), the Department is notifying the public that *American Silicon Decision* and the CIT's earlier opinion in this case, discussed below, were "not in harmony" with the Department's original results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 8, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Maisha Cryor, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5831.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 9, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of the final results of the sixth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil. *See Silicon Metal From Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 6305 (February 9, 1999) (*Final Results*). Subsequent to the Department's *Final Results*, the respondent filed a lawsuit with the CIT challenging these results. Thereafter, the CIT issued an Order and Opinion dated July 17, 2000, in *American Silicon Technologies, et al. v. United States*, 110 F. Supp. 2d 992, 1003-1004 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2000) (*American Silicon I*), remanding three issues to the Department. Pursuant to *American Silicon I*, the Department filed its remand results on January 29, 2001. The CIT reviewed the Department's redetermination on remand and issued an Order and Opinion dated October 17, 2002, in *American Silicon Technologies, et al. v. United States*, No. 99-03-00149, Slip Op. 02-123 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2002) (*American Silicon II*), remanding one issue to the Department. Pursuant to *American Silicon II*, the Department filed its remand results on January 22,

2003. The respondent challenged the Department's redetermination on remand. On June 27, 2003, the CIT affirmed the Department's final results of redetermination in *American Silicon Decision*.

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e), the Department must publish notice of a decision of the CIT which is "not in harmony" with the Department's results. The CIT's decision in *American Silicon Decision* was not in harmony with the Department's final antidumping duty results of review. Therefore, publication of this notice fulfills the obligation imposed upon the Department by the decision in *Timken*. In addition, this notice will serve to continue the suspension of liquidation. If this decision is not appealed, or if appealed, if it is upheld, the Department will publish amended final antidumping duty results.

Dated: July 2, 2003.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Grant Aldonas, Under Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-17376 Filed 7-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-816]

Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent to Rescind in Part

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

ACTION: Preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and notice of intent to rescind in part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from respondent Ta Chen Stainless Pipe Co., Ltd. ("Ta Chen") and from Markovitz Enterprises, Inc. (Flowline Division), Shaw Alloy Piping Products Inc., Gerlin, Inc., and Taylor Forge Stainless, Inc., collectively ("petitioners"), the Department of Commerce ("Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. Specifically, the petitioners requested that the Department conduct the administrative review for Ta Chen, Liang Feng Stainless Steel Fitting Co., Ltd. ("Liang

Feng”), and Tru-Flow Industrial Co., Ltd. (“Tru-Flow”). This review covers Ta Chen, a manufacturer and exporter of the subject merchandise and Liang Feng and Tru-Flow, manufacturers of the subject merchandise. The period of review (“POR”) is June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002. With regard to Ta Chen, we preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value (“NV”). With regard to Liang Feng and Tru-Flow, we are giving notice that we intend to rescind this review based on record evidence that there were no entries into the United States of subject merchandise during the POR. For a full discussion of the intent to rescind with respect to Liang Feng and Tru-Flow, see the “Notice of Intent To Rescind in Part” section of this notice.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (“Customs”) to assess antidumping duties. The preliminary results are listed below in the section titled “Preliminary Results of Review.”

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 8, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jon Freed or Robert Bolling, Enforcement Group III—Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3818 and (202) 482–3434, respectively.

Background

On June 16, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. See *Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe and Tube Fittings from Taiwan*, 58 FR 33250 (June 16, 1993). On June 5, 2002, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan for the period June 1, 2001, through May 31, 2002. See *Notice of Opportunity To Request Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation*, 67 FR 38640 (June 5, 2002). On June 25, 2002, petitioners requested an antidumping duty administrative review for the following companies: Ta Chen, Liang Feng, and Tru-Flow for the period June 1, 2001, through May 31, 2002. On June 28, 2002, Ta Chen requested an administrative review of its sales to the

United States during the POR. On July 24, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review for the period June 1, 2001, through May 31, 2002. See *Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation In Part*, 67 FR 48435 (July 24, 2002).

On August 15, 2002, the Department issued its antidumping questionnaire to Ta Chen, Liang Feng and Tru-Flow. On August 30, 2002, Liang Feng and Tru-Flow reported that they had no sales, entries or shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. On September 12, 2002, Ta Chen reported that it made sales of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR in its response to Section A of the Department’s questionnaire. On October 4, 2002, Ta Chen submitted its response to Sections B, C, and D of the Department’s questionnaire. On January 7, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a supplemental questionnaire to Section A of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on January 28, 2003. On January 22, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a supplemental questionnaire to Section B of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on February 12, 2003. On February 3, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a supplemental questionnaire to Section C of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on February 25, 2003. On February 21, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a second supplemental questionnaire to Sections B, C, and D of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on March 26, 2003. On March 3, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a second supplemental questionnaire to Section D of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on March 26, 2003. On March 11, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen additional questions to its March 3, 2003 supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, and C of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on March 26, 2003. On April 7, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a third supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on April 24, 2003. On April 11, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen additional questions to its April 7, 2003 supplemental questionnaire to Section A of the Department’s questionnaire, for

which Ta Chen submitted its response on April 24, 2003. On May 12, 2003, Ta Chen provided unrequested Section C and D databases. On May 21, 2003, the Department issued a letter to Ta Chen asking Ta Chen to explain the revisions to the Section C and D databases that it submitted on May 12, 2003. Ta Chen submitted its response to the May 21, 2003 letter on June 4, 2003. On May 23, 2003, the Department issued to Ta Chen a fourth supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department’s questionnaire, for which Ta Chen submitted its response on June 4, 2003.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for conducting an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 245 days. On March 3, 2003, the Department extended the time limit for these preliminary results 92 days to June 2, 2003 in accordance with the Act. See *Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 9977 (March 3, 2003). On May 22, 2003, the Department extended the time limit an additional 28 days to June 30, 2003 for the preliminary results of this administrative review. See *Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 27988 (May 22, 2003).

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”).

Notice of Intent To Rescind Review in Part

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department may rescind an administrative review, in whole or with respect to a particular exporter or producer, if the Secretary concludes that, during the period covered by the review, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise. The Department explained this practice in the preamble to the Department’s regulations. See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties* 62 FR 27296, 27317 (May 19, 1997) (“Preamble”); see also *Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Taiwan: Notice of Preliminary Results and Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 5789, 5790 (February 7, 2002) and *Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Taiwan: Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 66 FR 18610 (April 10, 2001).

Both Liang Feng and Tru Flow submitted a letter on the record stating that they had no sales of subject merchandise during the POR. *See* Letter dated August 30, 2002. To confirm their statements, on September 23, 2002, the Department conducted a Customs inquiry and the record from that inquiry indicates that there were no entries of subject merchandise during the POR. *See* the June 19, 2003 Memorandum to the File.

Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department preliminarily intends to rescind this review as to Liang Feng and Tru Flow. The Department may take additional steps to confirm that these companies had no sales, shipments or entries of subject merchandise to the United States.

Scope of the Review

The products subject to this administrative review are certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings, whether finished or unfinished, under 14 inches inside diameter. Certain welded stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("pipe fittings") 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 this review is dispositive. Pipe fittings manufactured to American Society of Testing and Materials specification A774 are included in the scope of this order.

Period of Review

The POR for this administrative review is June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002.

Product Comparison

For the purpose of determining appropriate product comparisons to pipe fittings sold in the United States, we considered all pipe fittings covered by the scope of review section above, which were sold by Ta Chen in the home market during the POR, to be "foreign like products" in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the physical characteristics reported by Ta Chen as follows (listed in order of preference): specification, seam, grade, size and schedule.

Since some of Ta Chen's sales were actually produced by other unaffiliated Taiwanese manufacturers, the Department has incorporated that information into the product comparison methodology. Petitioners have argued that the unaffiliated producers should be treated as exporters of subject merchandise to the U.S. *See* Petitioner's comments December 12, 2002, at 26-27. The record shows that Ta Chen both purchased from, and entered into tolling arrangements with, unaffiliated Taiwanese manufacturers of subject merchandise, and the record does not indicate that either manufacturer had knowledge that the subject merchandise would be sold into the United States market. *See* Ta Chen's September 12, 2002 Section A questionnaire response at 2; *see also* Ta Chen's January 28, 2002 Section A supplemental questionnaire response at 1-12. According to Ta Chen's September 12, 2002 Section A response, for subcontracted and resold fittings, Ta Chen labels itself as the producer. We have preliminarily determined that Ta Chen is the sole exporter, and that it is not appropriate to exclude sales of subject merchandise produced by unaffiliated manufacturers from Ta Chen's U.S. sales database.

However, section 771(16)(A) of the Act defines "foreign like product" to be "[t]he subject merchandise and other merchandise which is identical in physical characteristics with, and was produced in the same country by the same person as, that merchandise." Thus, consistent with the Department's past practice, for products that Ta Chen has identified with certainty that it purchased from a particular unaffiliated producer and resold in the U.S. market, we have restricted the matching of products to identical or similar products purchased by Ta Chen from the same

unaffiliated producer and resold in the home market.

Date of Sale

The Department's regulations state that the Department will normally use the date of invoice, as recorded in the exporter's or producer's records kept in the ordinary course of business, as the date of sale. *See* 19 CFR 351.401(i). If Commerce can establish "a different date [that] better reflects the date on which the exporter or producer establishes the material terms of sale," Commerce may choose a different date. *Id.*

In the present review, Ta Chen claimed that invoice date should be used as the date of sale in both the home market and U.S. market. *See* Ta Chen's Sections B and C responses dated October 4, 2002. Moreover, Ta Chen did not indicate any industry practice which would warrant the use of a date other than invoice date in determining date of sale.

Accordingly, as we have no information demonstrating that another date is more appropriate, we preliminarily based date of sale on invoice date recorded in the ordinary course of business by the involved sellers and resellers of the subject merchandise in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(i).

Affiliation

The petitioners assert that Ta Chen was affiliated with its home market customer and vendor, PFP Taiwan ("PFP") during the POR. At the Department's request, Ta Chen submitted information regarding PFP's corporate structure, ownership, and relationship with Ta Chen. The evidence currently on the record indicates that (1) the president of Ta Chen, Robert Shieh, and the head operating manager of PFP, Roger Tsai are distant relatives in that Roger Tsai is the brother of Robert Shieh's older brother's wife; (2) PFP leases office space out of Ta Chen's Taipei sales office, and pays Ta Chen appropriate consideration for the office space; and (3) Roger Tsai and his family members owned stock in Ta Chen as of June 2002 although their collective percentage of Ta Chen ownership is substantially below 5 percent. *See* Ta Chen's April 24, 2003 submission at pages 1-2, 17, and Exhibit 1; *see also* Ta Chen's May 12, 2003 submission at pages 2-3. Despite these connections, the evidence on the record at this time does not show that Robert Shieh, president of Ta Chen, has the ability to exercise control over PFP, or that Roger Tsai, head operating manager of PFP, has the ability to

exercise control over Ta Chen. Therefore, the Department preliminarily determines that Ta Chen and PFP are not affiliated. However, the Department will continue to investigate whether Ta Chen and PFP are affiliated for purposes of this administrative review.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise by Ta Chen to the United States were made at prices below normal value ("NV"), we compared, where appropriate, the constructed export price ("CEP") to the NV, as described below. Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the CEPs of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weight-averaged NV of the foreign like product.

Export Price/Constructed Export Price

Section 772(a) of the Act defines export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States. * * *" Section 772(b) of the Act defines constructed export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter. * * *"

Consistent with recent past reviews, all of the sales at issue are being considered CEP sales because the sale to the first unaffiliated customer was made between Ta Chen International (CA) Corp. ("TCI"), located in the United States, and the unaffiliated customer in the United States. *See Analysis Memorandum for Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan: Preliminary Results of the 2001-2002 Administrative Review of Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan* (June 30, 2003) ("Analysis Memo"); *see also* Ta Chen's February 25, 2003 submission at pages 4-5. TCI takes title to the subject merchandise, invoices the U.S. customer, and receives payment from the U.S. customer. In addition, TCI handles all communication with the U.S. customer, incurs risk of non-payment, relays orders and price requests from the U.S. customer to Ta Chen, and pays for U.S. Custom duties, brokerage charges, U.S. antidumping duties, ocean freight and U.S. inland freight. *See* Ta Chen's

January 28, 2003 Section A Supplemental Questionnaire Response at pages 14-15.

Having determined such sales are CEP, pursuant to section 772(b) of the Act, we calculated the price of Ta Chen's sales based on CEP. We calculated CEP based on FOB or delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States and, where appropriate, we deducted discounts. In addition, in accordance with section 772(d)(1), the Department deducted commissions, direct selling expenses and indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs, which related to commercial activity in the United States. With respect to inventory carrying costs, we note that certain of Ta Chen's sales do not enter TCI's inventory prior to shipment to U.S. customers, but are shipped directly to the end user. Therefore, we removed the cost of goods sold for those sales used in the calculation of Ta Chen's reported inventory turnover ratio. We also made deductions for movement expenses, which include foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, ocean freight, containerization expense, harbor construction tax, marine insurance, U.S. inland freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, and U.S. Customs duties. Finally, where appropriate, in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act, we deducted CEP profit.

Normal Value

After testing home market viability, as discussed below, we calculated NV as noted in the "Price-to-CV Comparisons" and "Price-to-Price Comparisons" sections of this notice.

1. Home Market Viability

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is greater than or equal to five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared Ta Chen's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. In addition, Ta Chen stated that the home market is viable since sales to the home market are more than five percent by quantity of sales in the United States. *See* Ta Chen's September 12, 2002 Section A questionnaire response at page 3. Because Ta Chen's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the

subject merchandise, we preliminarily determine that the home market is viable. We, therefore, based NV on home market sales.

2. Cost of Production Analysis

Because we disregarded sales below the cost of production ("COP") in the most-recently completed segment of this proceeding,¹ we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales by Ta Chen in its home market were made at prices below the COP, pursuant to sections 773(b)(1) and 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we conducted a COP analysis of home market sales by Ta Chen.

A. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated a weight-averaged COP based on the sum of Ta Chen's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for general and administrative expenses ("G&A"), interest expenses, and packing costs. We relied on the COP data submitted by Ta Chen in its original and supplemental cost questionnaire responses. For these preliminary results, we did not make any adjustments to Ta Chen's submitted costs.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

We compared the weight-averaged COP for Ta Chen to home market sales of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act in order to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and were not at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to home market prices, less any movement charges, discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

C. Results of COP Test

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, when less than 20 percent of Ta Chen's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the

¹ See Notice of Final Results and Final Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan ("Final Results"), 67 FR 78417 (December 24, 2002).

below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities as defined by section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. When 20 percent or more of Ta Chen's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined that such sales have been made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) and 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. In such cases, because we use POR average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of this administrative review, we appropriately disregarded below-cost sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

D. Calculation of Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Ta Chen's cost of materials, fabrication, G&A (including interest expenses), U.S. packing costs, direct and indirect selling expenses, and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based selling expenses and G&A ("SG&A") and profits on the actual amounts incurred and realized by Ta Chen in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the actual weight-averaged home market direct and indirect selling expenses.

3. Price-to-Price Comparisons

For those product comparisons for which there were sales at prices above the COP, we based NV on prices to home market customers. Where appropriate, we deducted early payment discounts, credit expenses, and inland freight. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for home market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in CEP comparisons. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Additionally, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, where there were no usable contemporaneous matches to a U.S. sale observation, we based NV on

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade ("LOT") as the CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market, or when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732-61733 (November 19, 1997).

In reviewing a respondent's request for a LOT adjustment, we examine all types of selling functions and activities reported in respondent's questionnaire response on LOT. In analyzing differences in selling functions, we determine whether the levels of trade identified by the respondent are meaningful. See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties, Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27371 (May 19, 1997). In the present review, Ta Chen did not request a LOT adjustment, but did request a CEP offset.

Ta Chen reported one LOT in the home market based on two channels of distribution: Trading companies and end-users. We examined the reported selling functions and found that Ta Chen's selling functions to its home market customers, regardless of channel of distribution, include inventory maintenance, technical services, packing, after-sales services, freight and delivery arrangements, general selling functions, some research and development, and customer service. See Ta Chen's September 12, 2002 Section

A questionnaire response at page 7; see also Ta Chen's January 28, 2003 Section A supplemental questionnaire response at pages 15-16. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude that the selling functions for the reported channels of distribution are sufficiently similar to consider them as one LOT in the comparison market.

Because Ta Chen reported that all of its CEP sales are made through TCI, Ta Chen is claiming that there is only one LOT in the U.S. market for its constructed export price sales and we preliminarily agree with Ta Chen's assertion that its U.S. sales constitute a single LOT. We examined the reported selling functions and found that Ta Chen's selling functions for sales to TCI include order processing, payment of marine insurance and packing for shipment to the United States. TCI handles the remaining selling functions for U.S. sales, such as: Communicating with U.S. customers; handling customer orders; dealing with U.S. customs duties, brokerage, inland freight and U.S. warehousing; taking seller's risk; and, incurring inventory carrying costs on the water and ocean freight.

The Department compared Ta Chen's selling functions offered to its home market customers, trading companies and end users with Ta Chen's selling functions for U.S. sales offered to its wholly-owned subsidiary, TCI. Ta Chen's selling functions for sales to the U.S., namely, order processing, payment of marine insurance and packing for shipment, are less numerous and less advanced than Ta Chen's selling functions to its home market customers, which include inventory maintenance, technical services, packing, after-sales services, freight and delivery arrangements, general selling functions, some research and development, and customer service. Therefore, we preliminarily find that Ta Chen performed fewer selling functions for its U.S. sales than it did in the home market. Ta Chen requested a CEP offset due to differences in level of trade between its home market and U.S. sales (see Ta Chen's September 12, 2002 Section A questionnaire response). When, as here, the NV is established at a LOT that is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the LOT of the CEP transactions, the Department's practice is to adjust NV to account for this difference. However, we were unable to quantify the LOT adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Therefore, we applied a CEP offset to the NV-CEP comparisons, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, in accordance with Section 773A(a) of the Act.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for Ta Chen for the period June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002:

Producer/Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Ta Chen Stainless Pipe Co., Ltd	1.13

The Department will disclose calculations performed for these preliminary results to the parties within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. See 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Further, we would appreciate that parties submitting written comments also provide the Department with an additional copy of those comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment

Upon issuance of the final results of this review, the Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department has calculated an assessment rate applicable to all appropriate entries. We calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties

calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value, or entered quantity, as appropriate, of the examined sales for that importer. Upon completion of this review, where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct Customs to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer.

Cash Deposit

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for each of the reviewed companies will be the rate listed in the final results of review (except that if the rate for a particular product is *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent, no cash deposit will be required for that company); (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the "all others" rate of 51.01 percent, which is the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of the proprietary information disclosed under APO in

accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, that continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 30, 2003.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-17215 Filed 7-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, 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 August 7, 2003.

Title and OMB Number: Application for CHAMPUS-Provider Status: Corporate Services Provider; OMB Number 0720-0020.

Type of Request: Reinstatement.

Number of Respondents: 1,000.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 1,000.

Average Burden Per Response: 20 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 333.

Needs and Uses: The information collection will allow eligible providers to apply for Corporate Services Provider status under the TRICARE Program. The collected information will be used by TRICARE contractors to process claims and verify authorized provider status. The Application for TRICARE-Provider Status: Corporate Services Provider, will collect the necessary information to ensure that the conditions are met for authorization as a TRICARE corporate services provider: i.e., The provider (1) is a corporation or a foundation, but not a professional corporation or professional foundation; (2) provides services and related supplies of a type of rendered by TRICARE individual professional providers or diagnostic technical services; (3) is approved for Medicare