

published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty orders on INC from Germany, Korea, Japan, the PRC, and the UK. See 55 FR 28266–28271 (July 10, 1990).

On February 12, 2004, Wolff requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order on INC from Germany through a changed circumstances review. According to Wolff, revocation is warranted because there is no longer any producer of the domestic like product. Specifically, Wolff asserts that Green Tree Chemical Technologies, Inc. (Green Tree), the sole producer of the domestic like product, has ceased production and no longer maintains the capacity to produce INC. See Wolff's February 12, 2004, letter at Exhibits A and B.

On March 9, 2004, Valspar requested that the Department initiate a changed circumstances review and revoke the antidumping duty orders on INC from France, Germany, Korea, Japan, the PRC, and the UK. Valspar claims that in November 2003, without prior announcement, Green Tree closed its INC production facility. According to Valspar, the alleged cessation of production of the domestic like product by the sole U.S. producer inherently constitutes "lack of interest" by the domestic industry in the continuation of the antidumping duty orders. See Valspar's March 9, 2004, letter, Request for Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review Seeking Revocation of the Antidumping Duty Order on Industrial Nitrocellulose from France, at pages 1–2.

#### Scope of the Orders

The product covered by these orders are shipments of INC from France, Germany, Japan Korea, the PRC and the UK. INC is a dry, white, amorphous synthetic chemical with a nitrogen content between 10.8 and 12.2 percent and is produced from the reaction of cellulose with nitric acid. INC is used as a film-former in coatings, lacquers, furniture finishes, and printing inks. The scope of the orders does not include explosive grade nitrocellulose, which has a nitrogen content of greater than 12.2 percent. INC is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3912.20.00. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description above remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

#### Initiation of Changed Circumstances Reviews

Pursuant to sections 751(d) and 782(h)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended (the Act), the Department may revoke an antidumping or countervailing duty order based on a review under section 751(b) of the Act (*i.e.*, a changed circumstances review) if the Department determines that producers accounting for substantially all of the production of that domestic like product have expressed a lack of interest in the continuance of an order. Section 751(b)(1) of the Act requires that a changed circumstances review be conducted upon receipt of a request for a review which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review. The Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.222(g) provide that the Department may revoke an order (in whole or in part) if it determines that producers accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product to which the order (or the part of the order to be revoked) pertains have expressed a lack of interest in the order, in whole or in part, or if other changed circumstances sufficient to warrant revocation exist.

In this case, the Department finds that the information submitted provides sufficient evidence of changed circumstances to warrant a review. Given Wolff's and Valspar's assertions, we will consider whether there is interest in continuing the orders on the part of the U.S. industry.

Interested parties may submit comments which the Department will take into account in the preliminary results of these reviews. Parties who submit comments are requested to submit with the comments (i) a statement of the issues, and (ii) a brief summary of the arguments. The due date for filing any such comments is no later than 20 days after publication of this notice. Any rebuttals to those comments may be submitted not later than five days following submission of the comments. All written comments must be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303 and must be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f).

On February 19, 2004, the Department initiated, on similar grounds, a changed circumstances review of the antidumping order on INC from Brazil. See *Industrial Nitrocellulose From Brazil: Notice of Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review and Consideration of Revocation of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 69 FR 8626 (February 25, 2004). Because these seven orders are affected by the same circumstances pertaining to the domestic industry, the Department plans to publish in the **Federal Register** a combined notice of preliminary results

of changed circumstances reviews of the antidumping duty orders on INC from Brazil, France, Germany, Korea, Japan, the PRC, and the UK. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(I), the notice will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based and a description of any action proposed based on these results. The Department will also issue its final results of reviews within 270 days of February 19, 2004, the date of initiation of the changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on INC from Brazil, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), and will publish these results in the **Federal Register**.

While the changed circumstances reviews are underway, the current requirement for a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on all subject merchandise will continue to be in force, unless and until it is modified pursuant to the final results of the changed circumstances reviews.

This notice is in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216, 351.221(B)(i), and 351.222.

Dated: March 29, 2004.

**James J. Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 04–7644 Filed 4–4–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–533–824]

#### **Certain Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limit for the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip from India until July 30, 2004. This extension applies to the sole respondent in the case, Jindal Polyester Limited. The period of review is December 21, 2001, through June 30, 2003.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 5, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Drew Jackson or John Conniff, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4406 or (202) 482-1009, respectively.

### Background

On August 22, 2003, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip from India, covering the period December 21, 2001 through June 30, 2003. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 50750. The preliminary results of review are currently due no later than April 1, 2004.

### Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order or finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the 245-day time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and the time limit for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

### Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. See Decision Memorandum from Thomas F. Futtner, Acting Office Director to Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group II, dated concurrently with this notice, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the Department's main building. The Department is therefore extending the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results by 120 days. We intend to issue the preliminary results no later than July 30, 2004.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 22, 2004.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group II.*

[FR Doc. 04-7527 Filed 4-2-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-580-853]

### Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value: Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbon from the Republic of Korea

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 5, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Fred Baker, Mike Heaney, or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-2924, (202) 482-4475, or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Final Determination

We determine that wax and wax/resin thermal transfer ribbons (TTR) are not being, nor are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

#### Case History

The Department published the preliminary determination of sales at not less-than-fair-value on December 22, 2003. See *Notice of Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value: Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbons from the Republic of Korea*, 68 FR 71078 (December 22, 2003) (Preliminary Determination). Since then the following events have occurred.

On December 22, 2003 respondent Illinois Tool Works, Inc. (the only known producer/exporter of TTR from Korea to the United States (ITW)) submitted its response to the Department's November 28, 2003 supplemental questionnaire regarding the section E further manufacturing response of ITW's U.S. affiliate ITW

Thermal Films (ITWTF). Also on December 22, 2003 ITW submitted its response to the Department's sections A, B, and C supplemental questionnaire, issued on December 1, 2003.

On December 23, 2003 DigiPrint International, a U.S. importer of TTR slit in India, submitted comments on substantial transformation and country of origin. These comments were made part of the TTR from Korea investigation as an attachment to a memorandum to the file dated January 9, 2004. See memorandum from Cheryl Werner to the file dated January 9, 2004 on file in room B-099 of the Department of Commerce building.

On January 5, 2004 ITW submitted its response to the Department's December 18, 2003 section D supplemental questionnaire. Also on January 5, 2004 the Department issued another section E supplemental questionnaire.

On January 5, 2004 and January 16, 2004, International Imaging Materials, Inc. (petitioner) submitted comments regarding (1) its allegation that respondents in the three concurrent investigations of TTR (France, Japan, and South Korea) would attempt to circumvent the order by slitting jumbo rolls in third countries, and (2) its request that the Department therefore determine that slitting does not change the country of origin of TTR for antidumping purposes.

On January 6, 2004 petitioner submitted comments on the upcoming cost of production (COP) verification.

On January 9, 2004 Armor S.A. (the sole respondent in the antidumping investigation of TTR from France) submitted a response to petitioner's January 5, 2004 comments on country of origin.

On January 12, 2004 ITW submitted its response to the Department's January 5, 2004 section E supplemental questionnaire.

From January 12 through January 16, 2004 Department officials verified the cost of production response of ITW Specialty Films Co., Ltd. (ITWSFK) in Seoul, Korea. See February 5, 2004 cost verification report. This and all other memoranda cited herein are on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the Department of Commerce building.

From January 16 through January 19, 2004 Department officials verified the sales response of ITWSFK in Seoul, Korea. See February 17, 2004 sales verification report.

On January 20, 2004 petitioner met with Department officials to discuss their concerns about some of the information on the record. See Memorandum from Fred Baker to the File, dated January 22, 2004.