

Government Agency: Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Mailroom Operation, At the following Locations:
GSA Washington, 18th and F Streets NW, Washington, DC
GSA Arlington, Crystal Mall #3, 1931 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia
GSA Regional Office Building, 7th and D Streets, SW, Washington, DC
NPA: Didlake, Inc., Manassas, Virginia
Government Agency: General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Deletions

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities.
2. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the services to the Government.
3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in connection with the services proposed for deletion from the Procurement List.

The following commodities are proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

Commodities

Skin Protectant, Plus
6505-01-474-7724
Skin Protectant Plus, Effective Prevention
6505-01-474-7707
6505-01-474-7343
Box, Storage, Magnetic Tape
8115-00-432-6729
8115-00-432-6730
Suspension Assembly, Liner, Helmet
8470-00-880-8814

Sheryl D. Kennerly,

Director, Information Management.

[FR Doc. 01-25704 Filed 10-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[I.D. 100901A]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Swordfish Import Certificate of Eligibility.

Form Number(s): None.

OMB Approval Number: 0648-0363.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 5,700.

Number of Respondents: 204.

Average Hours Per Response: 1 hour.

Needs and Uses: In order to support recommendations of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, imports of swordfish have to be accompanied by a certificate of eligibility for lawful entry into the customs territory of the United States. The objective is to ensure that all imports of Atlantic swordfish meet the same minimum size standards as apply to landings by U.S. vessels.

Affected Public: Business and other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker,
(202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3129, Department of Commerce, Room 6086, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at MClayton@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: October 4, 2001.

Madeleine Clayton,

Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-25718 Filed 10-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[I.D. 100901B]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Cooperative Charting Programs.
Form Number(s): NOAA Forms 77-4 and 77-5.

OMB Approval Number: 0648-0022.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 45,000.

Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Average Hours Per Response: 3 hours.

Needs and Uses: NOAA's National Ocean Service (NOS) produces the official nautical charts of the United States. Forms are provided to members of U.S. Power Squadrons and the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary to report observations of changes that require additions, corrections, or revisions to the nautical charts. The information provided is used by NOS cartographers to maintain and prepare new additions of nautical charts that are used nationwide by commercial and recreational navigators.

Affected Public: Individuals or households, not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker,
(202) 395-3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3129, Department of Commerce, Room 6086, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at MClayton@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: October 4, 2001.

Madeleine Clayton,

Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-25719 Filed 10-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-JT-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-122-822]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Canada; Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review in Accordance With North American Free Trade Agreement Panel Decision

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

ACTION: Notice of amended final results of Administrative Review in accordance with North American Free Trade Agreement Panel Decision on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat

Products from Canada. USA–CDA–98–1904–01.

SUMMARY: On August 24, 2001, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Panel affirmed the Department of Commerce's final remand results of the antidumping duty administrative review of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada. As there is now a final and conclusive NAFTA Panel decision in this action, we are amending our final results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 12, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mark Hoadley at (202) 482–0666 or Julio Fernandez at (202) 482–0190, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 7866, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations set forth at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

On March 16, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final results for the administrative review of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada for the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996. See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 12725 (March 16, 1998) (*Final Results*). One of the respondents in this review was Stelco Inc. (Stelco).

In the **Final Results**, with respect to Stelco's cost of producing the subject merchandise, the Department explained that, in accordance with its standard practice for valuing major inputs supplied by affiliated companies, it had valued coating services and painting services supplied by Baycoat Partnership (Baycoat) and Z-Line Company (Z-Line), respectively, pursuant to the major input rule and the transactions disregarded rule, at the highest of three valuations: The transfer price between the affiliated parties; the market price between unaffiliated parties (which, in this case, was

inapplicable, as there were no unaffiliated transactions to indicate market price); and the affiliated supplier's cost of producing the input. See **Final Results**, at 63 FR 18464.

In responding to the Department's questionnaire, Stelco only supplied Z-Line's "actual cost of the operation in a manner consistent with other Hilton Works operating units," and Baycoat's transfer price adjusted for profit remitted to Stelco. In the *Final Results*, the Department increased the reported cost of coating and painting by the weighted average difference between invoice (i.e. transfer price) values from the sample invoices of the respective services to Stelco, obtained at verification, and the values reported by Stelco. The Department determined that these transfer prices were above the affiliated supplier's cost of producing these inputs. Therefore, for the final results of review, the Department used the transfer prices to value such inputs when calculating Stelco's cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV). See *Final Results*.

With regard to the Department's calculation of imputed credit expenses, in the *Final Results* the Department applied the Federal Reserve rate in its calculations of Stelco's imputed credit expenses in the United States for each transaction during the period of review (POR). Furthermore, to calculate imputed credit expenses for sales in which payment was not received by the time Stelco submitted its response to the agency, the Department applied the date of its final results as the surrogate payment date.

On March 20, 2001, the NAFTA Panel remanded the above-referenced proceeding to the Department with instructions to: (1) Recalculate Stelco's costs of production, taking account of the year-end return of profits by Baycoat and Z-Line to Stelco; provide the Panel with the method by which the Department recalculates COP in light of such return of profits; and explain the Department's methodology in light of the statutory requirements and attendant legislation as interpreted by this Panel; (2) to reevaluate the application of section 773(f)(3) of the Act in light of the requirement that the Department adjust the transfer price in accordance with the recalculation set out under (1) immediately above; and (3) to correct any errors on the imputed credit expense and payment date issues, in light of Stelco's complaint. See *Article 1904 Panel Review Pursuant to the North American Free Trade Agreement: Panel Determination and Remand*, Stelco, Inc. v. United States Department of Commerce, USA–CDA–

98–1904–01 (March 20, 2001) (*Panel Decision*).

Pursuant to its receipt of the NAFTA Panel's remand instructions, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Stelco. On June 25, 2001, Stelco submitted its response to this questionnaire (*Supplemental Response*). On July 6, 2001, the Department issued its draft remand results and requested comments from interested parties. See *Draft Results of Redetermination: North American Free Trade Agreement*, Article 1904 Panel Review, USA–CDA–98–1904–01 (July 6, 2001) (*Draft Remand Results*). In the *Draft Remand Results*, we reconsidered our methodology in accordance with the *Panel Decision*. On July 11, 2001, respondent filed comments on the *Draft Remand Results*. No party filed rebuttal comments.

On July 20, 2001, the Department issued its final remand results, which are discussed in detail below. See *Final Remand Determination: North American Free Trade Agreement*, Article 1904 Panel Review, USA–CDA–98–1904–01 (July 20, 2001) (*Final Remand Results*).

Pursuant to the order of the Panel, the Department recalculated Stelco's COP by taking into account year-end return of profits to Stelco from Baycoat and Z-Line, as reported in Stelco's *Supplemental Response*. See *Final Remand Results*. The methodologies adopted for recalculating Stelco's COP, by accounting for profits returned to Baycoat and Z-Line, were used in light of the Panel's interpretation of the relevant statutory provisions and their legislative history, including those provisions set forth in subsections 773(f)(2) and (f)(3).

Specifically, the Panel found that the Department failed to reasonably comply with the requirement to establish that the amount, which in the instant case the Panel found to be the invoice prices less profits returned from Baycoat, "did not fairly reflect" the amount usually reflected in sales. The NAFTA Panel further found that even if the Department were entitled to rely on the invoice prices paid by Stelco, rather than the invoice price adjusted for profit remittances, the Department has not established that it has taken due account of all material factors in arriving at a reasonable calculation of costs.

In light of the Panel's statement that it has remanded the case for the Department to compare Baycoat's transfer price without profits to the COP, we interpreted the Panel's ruling to mean that, pursuant to the major input rule, the Department is to ensure that the value of the major inputs used

to calculate Stelco's COP are not below the cost of producing such inputs. In the *Final Remand Results*, we recalculated Stelco's COP for the subject merchandise based upon the adjusted transfer price. Where the Department found that the adjusted transfer price value was less than Baycoat and Z-Line's respective costs of producing such inputs, the Department used the COP for such inputs, pursuant to the major input rule.

We note that the NAFTA Panel's ruling does not establish binding precedent and that the Department believes its interpretation of these statutory rules is reasonable and consistent with the intent of Congress. We also note that, in future reviews, the Department intends to pursue an examination of market price more fully to ensure appropriate application of the test, consistent with subsections 773(f)(2) and (f)(3) of the Act.

The Department also reconsidered the calculation of Stelco's imputed credit expense in the United States during the POR and its choice of surrogate payment dates where payment was not remitted at the time of submission. In addition, we corrected a clerical error, as alleged by respondent in its comment on the *Draft Remand Results*. See *Final Remand Results*.

On August 24, 2001, the Panel affirmed the Department's *Final Remand Results*. As this case is now final and conclusive, we are amending the *Final Results* of review. As a result of our recalculations, based upon the changes set forth above, we have revised the dumping margin for respondent.

Amendment to Final Results of Review

Because no further appeals have been filed and there is now a final and conclusive decision in the *Panel Decision* proceeding, effective as of the publication date of this notice, we are amending the *Final Results*, and establishing the following revised weight-averaged dumping margin:

Company	Amended final results 1995–1996 (percent)
Stelco Ltd	0.00

Dated: October 5, 2001.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–25705 Filed 10–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A–580–812]

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On June 7, 2001, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors of one megabit or above (DRAMs) from the Republic of Korea. The merchandise covered by this order is DRAMs from the Republic of Korea. The review covers two manufacturers, Hyundai Electronics Industries Co., Ltd. and Hyundai Electronics America (collectively Hyundai), and LG Semicon Co., Ltd. and LG Semicon America (collectively LG), and six resellers of subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is May 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 12, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paige Rivas or Ron Trentham, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0651 or 482–6320, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1999).

Background

The antidumping duty order for DRAMs from Korea was revoked, pursuant to the sunset procedures established by statute, effective January 1, 2000. See *Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMs) of One Megabit and Above From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Full Sunset Review and Revocation of Order*, 65 FR 1471366 (October 5, 2000). Therefore, we are conducting this review of exports of the subject merchandise to the United States by Hyundai Electronics Industries Co., Ltd. and LG Semicon Co., Ltd. (LG) for the 8-month period from May 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999.

On June 7, 2001, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on DRAMs from Korea. See *Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not to Revoke Order in Part*, 66 FR 30688 (June 7, 2001) (*Preliminary Results*). As stated in the *Preliminary Results*, we are collapsing Hyundai and LG into one entity for the purposes of in this administrative review (collectively Hyundai). See *Preliminary Results*, 66 FR at 30690. We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. On July 9, 2001, we received case briefs from Micron Technology, Inc. (Micron), the petitioner, and Hyundai. On July 13, 2001, we received rebuttal briefs from Micron and Hyundai. The petitioner requested a public hearing on July 12, 2001, and a public hearing was held on July 17, 2001. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of DRAMs from Korea. Included in the scope are assembled and unassembled DRAMs. Assembled DRAMs include all package types. Unassembled DRAMs include processed wafers, uncut die, and cut die. Processed wafers produced in Korea, but packaged or assembled into memory modules in a third country, are included in the scope; wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea are not included in the scope.

The scope of this review includes memory modules. A memory module is a collection of DRAMs, the sole function of which is memory. Modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs),