

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of September 2003.

**James J. Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.*

[FR Doc. 03-25629 Filed 10-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-U

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1303]

#### Approval for Expanded Manufacturing Authority (Addition of Medical Imaging Products, and Expansion of Production of Color Negative Photographic Film and Paper) Within Foreign-Trade Subzone 38C; Fuji Photo Film, Inc.; Greenwood, South Carolina

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

*Whereas*, the South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 38, has applied on behalf of Fuji Photo Film, Inc. (Fuji), to expand the scope of manufacturing authority under zone procedures within Subzone 38C, at the Fuji plant in Greenwood, South Carolina, to include additional finished products (medical imaging products, components, and related products), and to increase the overall level of production authorized under FTZ procedures of color negative photographic paper and film (FTZ Doc. 63-2002; filed 12-17-2002);

*Whereas*, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 79048-79049, 12-27-2002); and,

*Whereas*, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

*Now, therefore*, the Board hereby approves the request subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of September, 2003.

**James J. Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.*

[FR Doc. 03-25630 Filed 10-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-U

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-357-812]

#### Honey From Argentina: Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of rescission of antidumping duty new shipper review.

**SUMMARY:** On February 6, 2003, the Department published the initiation of a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order of honey from Argentina covering the period of May 11, 2001 to November 30, 2002. *See Honey From Argentina: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 6114 (February 6, 2003) (New Shipper Initiation). This review covers one exporter, Nutrin S.A. (Nutrin) of Argentina. For the reasons discussed below, we are rescinding this new shipper review in its entirety.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 9, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Angela Strom or Donna Kinsella at (202) 482-2704 and (202) 482-0194, respectively; AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 8, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Scope of the Review

The merchandise under review is honey from Argentina. For purposes of this review, the products covered are natural honey, artificial honey containing more than 50 percent natural honey by weight, preparations of natural honey containing more than 50 percent natural honey by weight, and flavored honey. The subject merchandise includes all grades and colors of honey whether in liquid, creamed, comb, cut comb, or chunk form, and whether packaged for retail or in bulk form.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under subheadings 0409.00.00, 1702.90.90, and 2106.90.99 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection purposes, the Department's written description of the merchandise under this order is dispositive.

## Background

On February 6, 2003, the Department published the initiation of a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order of honey from Argentina. This review involves one exporter, Nutrin S.A. of Argentina, and covers the period of May 11, 2001 through November 30, 2002. *See New Shipper Initiation*. On July 14, 2003, the Department extended the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results of this new shipper review until November 28, 2003. *See Honey From Argentina: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review* 68 FR 41557 (July 14, 2003).

On February 19, 2003, the Department issued Sections A through C of the Department's antidumping questionnaire to Nutrin. Nutrin responded on March 14, 2003 and April 7, 2003. Petitioners submitted comments on Nutrin's questionnaire responses on April 4, 2003 and May 2, 2003. On May 23, 2003, the Department issued its first supplemental questionnaire, and Nutrin submitted its supplemental questionnaire response on June 13, 2003. Petitioners again commented on Nutrin's responses on July 1, 2003, and August 4, 2003.

#### Analysis of New Shipper Review

On August 15, 2003, the Department issued a memorandum detailing our analysis of the *bona fides* of Nutrin's U.S. sale and our intent to rescind this review because we preliminarily determined that Nutrin's U.S. sale was not a bona fide transaction based on the totality of the circumstances of the sale. *See Memorandum from Angela Strom through Richard Weible to Barbara E. Tillman: New Shipper Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Honey from Argentina: Intent to Rescind*, dated August 21, 2003 (Nutrin Intent to Rescind Memo). In this memorandum, the Department preliminarily determined that the single U.S. sale made by Nutrin was not *bona fide* due to (1) the conflicting information contained in different copies of the sales invoice for Nutrin's U.S. sale; (2) Nutrin's failure to disclose other apparent changes in the terms of the U.S. sale; (3) conflicting information and insufficient documentation regarding the date on which the essential terms of sale and final destination of goods were established; (4) inconsistent invoicing practices regarding the U.S. sale and other like sales; (5) atypical payment terms and (6) highly unusual sales and shipping arrangements. The totality of the facts on the record lead the Department to