

business proprietary nature or for any other reason. The Department will return such comments and materials to the persons submitting the comments and will not consider them in development of any changes to its practice. All comments responding to this notice will be a matter of public record and will be available for public inspection and copying at Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room B-099, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. on business days. The Department requires that comments be submitted in written form. The Department recommends submission of comments in electronic form to accompany the required paper copies. Comments filed in electronic form should be submitted either by e-mail to the webmaster below, or on CD-ROM, as comments submitted on diskettes are likely to be damaged by postal radiation treatment.

Comments received in electronic form will be made available to the public in Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the Import Administration Web site at the following address: <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/>.

Any questions concerning file formatting, document conversion, access on the Internet, or other electronic filing issues should be addressed to Andrew Lee Beller, Import Administration Webmaster, at (202) 482-0866, e-mail address: [webmaster-support@ita.doc.gov](mailto:webmaster-support@ita.doc.gov).

Dated: April 27, 2004.

**James J. Jochum,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

## Appendix

(1) Is Section A of the NME questionnaire sufficiently detailed to allow the Department to make complete, accurate, and informed determinations regarding exporters' eligibility for separate rates? If not, what would you recommend that the Department change with respect to its section A questionnaire? For example, should the Department request further information pertaining to *de jure* control, or lack of control, by the NME entity?

(2) What new procedures or approaches should be followed at verification to ensure a rigorous examination of whether a respondent qualifies for a separate rate?

(3) Due to the number of possible section A respondents in many cases and the Department's resource constraints, should the Department establish a process whereby exporters seeking a separate rate must prepare a request and satisfy established requirements before the Department seeks additional information through the questionnaire process? What requirements would you recommend the Department establish?

(4) Should the Department institute an earlier deadline for parties filing section A submissions who are requesting only a separate rate (as opposed to a full review), in relation to the deadline for mandatory respondents? When should this deadline be?

(5) In light of the Department's limited resources, should the number of section A respondents be limited and, if so, upon what basis should the Department limit its examination? For example, should the Department limit the examination to a specific number of parties, base this decision upon a percentage of the number of overall respondents requesting separate rates treatment, or develop an entirely different test to limit its examination?

(6) Under current practice, the Department maintains three rate categories: country-wide, individually calculated, and the average of the non-zero, non-*de minimis*, non-adverse rates. Does the Department have the authority to eliminate entirely the rate category that is based on the average of the calculated non-zero, non-adverse, and non-*de minimis* margins? This rate category is currently applicable to section A respondents, as well as to non-investigated respondents providing full questionnaire responses. If the Department has authority, should it eliminate this category and upon what basis?

(7) Should the Department develop an additional rate category beyond country-wide, individually calculated, and the average of the non-zero, non-*de minimis*, non-adverse rates? This additional rate category could be assigned to cooperative firms denied a separate rate under options (5) or (6) above, as an alternative to assigning them the country-wide rate. How should the duty rate for this fourth rate category be calculated?

(8) Once a separate rate has been awarded, should the Department apply it only to merchandise from producers that supplied the exporter when the rate was granted? In that case, should merchandise from all other suppliers shipped through an exporter with a separate rate receive the country-wide rate, the average of the non-zero, non-*de minimis*, non-adverse reviewed respondents' margins, or another duty rate altogether?

(9) Should the Department extend its separate-rates analysis to exporter-producer combinations, *i.e.*, should the Department consider any government control exercised on an exporter through a producer?

(10) Please provide any additional views on any other matter pertaining to the Department's practice pertaining to separate rates.

[FR Doc. 04-9999 Filed 4-30-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-427-801, A-428-801, A-475-801, A-588-804, A-559-801, A-412-801]

### Antifriction Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limit for final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the final results of the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom. The final results of these reviews are now due August 9, 2004.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 3, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sochieta Moth, (202) 482-0168, or Richard Rimlinger, (202) 482-4477, AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

At the request of interested parties, the Department initiated administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom for the period May 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003. See, *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 39055, (July 1, 2003), and *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part and Deferral of Administrative Reviews*, 68 FR 44524, (July 29, 2003). On February 9, 2004, the Department published its preliminary findings. See *Antifriction Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Rescission of Administrative Reviews, Notice of Intent to Rescind Administrative Reviews, and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part*, 69 FR 5950, (February 9, 2004). The

final results of reviews were originally scheduled for June 8, 2040.

### Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to issue the final results of an antidumping duty annual review within 120 days of the date on which the preliminary results are published. If the Department concludes that it is not practicable to issue the results by the original deadline, it may extend the 120-day period to 180 days. Completion of the final results of these reviews within this 120-day period is not practicable because of the large number of respondents and the complexity of the issues raised in these reviews. Therefore, we are extending the time period for issuing the final results of the review by 60 days, until August 9, 2004.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and § 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: April 27, 2004.

**Jeffrey May,**

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 04-9997 Filed 4-30-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-830]

### Notice of the Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Revocation of the Antidumping Order: Coumarin from the People's Republic of China

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

**SUMMARY:** On January 26, 2004, the Department of Commerce published a notice of preliminary results of changed circumstances review and intent to revoke the antidumping duty order (69 FR 3543). We are now revoking this order effective February 1, 2003. The basis of the revocation is that Rhodia, Inc., which is the current name of Rhone-Poulenc, the petitioner in original investigation and the sole U.S. producer of coumarin, ceased production during 2002.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 3, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott Lindsay or Addilyn Chams-Eddine at (202) 482-0780 or (202) 482-0648, respectively; Office of AD/CVD Enforcement Group VII, Import

Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On February 9, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on coumarin from the PRC. See *Notice of Antidumping Order: Coumarin from the People's Republic of China*, 60 FR 7751. On June 23, 2003, Berjé Incorporated (Berjé), a U.S. importer of subject merchandise and an interested party in this proceeding, requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances review for the purpose of revoking the antidumping duty order on coumarin from the PRC. According to Berjé, Rhone-Poulenc Specialty Chemicals Company (Rhone-Poulenc), the petitioner, was the only domestic coumarin producer at the time of the original investigation. Berjé also indicated that since the original investigation, Rhone-Poulenc had changed its company name and now does business under the name Rhodia, Inc. (Rhodia) and that Rhodia remained the only producer of coumarin in the United States. Berjé informed the Department that Rhodia, in a press release dated November 28, 2001, announced its intent to cease production of coumarin in 2002. Berjé provided further information obtained from Rhodia indicating that Rhodia no longer produces coumarin in the United States.

Based on Berjé's June 23, 2003 submission, the Department initiated this changed circumstances review on July 31, 2003. See *Notice of Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review and Consideration of Revocation of the Antidumping Duty Order: Coumarin From the Peoples's Republic of China*, 68 FR 46579 (*Initiation*). On August 26, 2003, Rhodia submitted comments on the initiation of this changed circumstances review. Also on August 26, 2003, H. Reynaud & Fils USA Co. (H. Reynaud), an importer of the subject merchandise, submitted comments regarding the effective date of the revocation of the order. No other parties commented on our *Initiation*.

On January 26, 2004, we published *Coumarin From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Intent to Revoke the Antidumping Order*, 69 FR 3543 (*Preliminary Results*). In the *Preliminary Results* we announced our intent to revoke the antidumping order on Coumarin from the PRC, effective February 1, 2003. Both Berjé and H.

Reynaud submitted comments on the *Preliminary Results* on February 25, 2004. H. Reynaud submitted rebuttal comments on March 1, 2004. We have addressed the comments of the parties in the *Issues and Decision Memo*, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Commerce Building. In addition, a complete version of the *Issues and Decision Memo* can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov>. The paper copy and electronic version of the *Issues and Decision Memo* are identical in content.

#### Scope of the Antidumping Duty Order

The product covered by this order is coumarin. Coumarin is an aroma chemical with the chemical formula (C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>6</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) that is also known by other names, including 2H-1-benzopyran-2-one, 1, 2-benzopyrone, cis-o-coumaric acid lactone, coumarinic anhydride, 2-Oxo-1, 2-benzopyran, 5, 6-benzo-alpha-pyrone, ortho-hydroxyc innamic acid lactone, cis-ortho-coumaric acid anhydride, and tonka bean camphor.

All forms and variations of coumarin are included within the scope of the order, such as coumarin in crystal, flake, or powder form, and "crude" or unrefined coumarin (*i.e.*, prior to purification or crystallization). Excluded from the scope of this order are ethylcoumarins (C<sub>11</sub>H<sub>10</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) and methylcoumarins (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>8</sub>O<sub>2</sub>). Coumarin is classifiable under subheading 2932.21.0000 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 investigation is dispositive.

#### Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Revocation of the Antidumping Duty Order

In the *Preliminary Results*, we indicated our intent to revoke the antidumping order on coumarin from the PRC, effective February 1, 2003. We have considered the comments of the parties and we determine that February 1, 2003, is still the appropriate date on which to make the revocation of the antidumping order on coumarin effective. See *Issues and Decision Memo*.

#### Instructions to the Customs Service

In accordance with section 351.222 of the Department's regulations, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to terminate the suspension of liquidation and to liquidate, without regard to antidumping duties, all unliquidated entries of coumarin from the PRC,