

business practices in the areas of administrative fees, transportation allowances, counterparty risk management, operator delivery requirements, resolution of delivery imbalances, and gravity bank adjustments; and

- Providing greater specificity and certainty with regard to RIK contract language, especially with regard to provisions addressing the valuation of RIK oil for billing purposes.

Additionally, on November 13, 2001, President Bush announced an initiative to fill the remaining capacity of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) with crude oil originating from royalties taken in kind. Royalty oil volumes from offshore Gulf of Mexico Federal leases have largely been dedicated to this effort, although about 22 percent of the Federal oil share from these leases is still currently being purchased under RIK eligible refiner sales. The MMS is taking approximately 90 percent of its royalty oil share in kind from Federal offshore California leases. This oil is also purchased under eligible refiner sales.

Potential respondents should also note that the mere conduct of a Determination of Need in no way presupposes that there will or will not be subsequent eligible refiner RIK sales. A Determination of Need is a logical first step in identifying general marketplace conditions. However, any decision to conduct additional RIK sales will necessarily be predicated on the regulatory criteria of "access" and "equity"—*i.e.*, whether a significant number of refiners have limited or no access to the marketplace and/or have experienced difficulty in negotiating a fair price for feeder stocks.

Information Requested: To assist MMS in completing a Determination of Need, please respond in writing to the following questions:

- (1) Indicate your perspective as it relates to the domestic crude oil market: Small/Independent Refiner.

Large Refiner.
Oil Producer.
Oil Transporter.
Oil Marketer.
Other (please specify).

- (2) Describe your experience with the domestic crude oil market and your perception of the need for the eligible refiner program.

- (3) What is your perception of whether a benefit exists to conducting separate sales for onshore and offshore Federal lease crude?

- (4) Under the sets of criteria outlined above, are you an eligible refiner of offshore lease oil, onshore lease oil, or both?

If you answered yes to any of the categories in the previous question, please address the questions that follow. (If you have multiple refineries, please address questions 1 through 5 for each refinery).

- (1) For your immediate region or geographic area of operation, how would you characterize the general availability of crude oil?

- (2) Is your refinery operating at full or near-full capacity in both summer and winter? If not, why not?

- (3) What are the slate of refined products and their volumes from your refinery over each of the past 12 months?

- (4) What percentage of onshore versus offshore crude oil volumes are currently being run through your refinery?

- (5) What type of crude is desired to sustain your mix of refined products (*e.g.*, Wyoming Sweet, Wyoming Sour, Light Louisiana Sweet, etc.)?

- (6) Have you been denied access to crude oil supplies in the past 18 months? What was the basis for the denial? For example, was the denial attributable to unavailability of desired crude, a lack of access to the transportation pipeline, or other reasons? Please provide documentation supporting any claim of denial.

- (7) Do you use exchange agreements? Why?

- (8) Are the feeder stocks you purchase, priced above market values for your geographic area? In other words, do you pay a bonus or premium because of your status as a small and/or independent refiner? Please identify, by crude oil type, what you pay on the average per barrel of oil.

- (9) Have you previously participated in the Federal royalty oil program? If a prior program participant, why did you leave the program? How would you now benefit from receiving Federal royalty oil?

- (10) Do you currently provide refined products (heating oil, jet fuel, etc.) to a U.S. military base or Federal installation? If so, identify the recipient facility and how long you have been supplying refined products.

- (11) Do you anticipate any near term developments that would change your access to necessary supplies of crude oil at equitable prices?

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) requires us to inform you that this information is being collected by MMS under an approved information collection titled Royalty-in-Kind (RIK)—Eligible Refiners, Determination of Need, OMB Control Number 1010-0119. All correspondence, records, or information received in response to this Notice, and

specifically in response to the questions listed above, are subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). All information provided will be made public unless the respondent identifies which portions are proprietary. Please highlight the proprietary portions, including any supporting documentation, or mark the page(s) that contain proprietary data. Proprietary information is protected by the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1733), FOIA (5 U.S.C. 552 (b)(4)), the Indian Minerals Development Act of 1982 (25 U.S.C. 2103), and Department regulations (43 CFR 2). An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. Public reporting burden is estimated to be 4 hours per response. Comments on the accuracy of this burden estimate or suggestions on reducing this burden should be directed to the Information Collection Clearance Officer, MMS, MS-4230, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240.

Dated: July 15, 2003.

Lucy Querques Denett,

Associate Director for Minerals Revenue Management.

[FR Doc. 03-20354 Filed 8-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-469]

In the Matter of Certain Bearings and Packaging Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination To Remand Investigation to the Administrative Law Judge for Further Fact-Finding; Extension of Target Date for Completion of the Investigation

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to remand the above-referenced investigation to the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) for further fact-finding. The Commission has also determined to extend the target date in this investigation by six (6) months, *i.e.*, until February 12, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3012. Copies of the Commission's

Order, the public version of the ALJ's initial determination (ID), and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on April 16, 2002, based on a complaint filed by SKF USA, Inc. (SKF USA) of Norristown, PA against fourteen respondents. 67 FR 18632 (2002). Four respondents remain active in the investigation, with ten respondents having either settled with complainant or been found in default. The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain bearings by reason of infringement of registered and common law trademarks, dilution of trademarks, various acts in violation of the Lanham Act, and passing off. A count concerning "unfair pecuniary benefits" was dismissed by the Commission on September 23, 2002.

On April 10, 2003, the ALJ issued his final ID on violation and his recommended determination on remedy and bonding. The ALJ found a violation of section 337 by reason of infringement of SKF USA's registered and common law trademarks by each of the four remaining respondents, viz., Bearings Limited, Bohls Bearing and Transmission Service, CST Bearing Company, and McGuire Bearings Company, and recommended the issuance of a general exclusion order and cease and desist orders to the respondents found in violation. All active parties remaining in the investigation, including the Commission investigative attorney, filed petitions for review on April 21, 2003, and replies to the petitions on April 28, 2003.

On May 27, 2003, the Commission determined to review the ID in part and asked the parties to brief several questions relating to the issue of

material differences in the context of trademark infringement by gray market goods. 68 FR 32766-7 (June 2, 2002). Responses to the Commission's questions were filed on June 6, 2003, by all parties remaining in the investigation. Replies to the responses were filed by the same parties on June 13, 2003. Having examined the parties' submissions and the record in this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission determined to remand the investigation to the ALJ for further fact-finding concerning the material differences between complainant's and respondents' bearings. In order to allow sufficient time for the further fact-finding, the Commission extended the target date for completion of the investigation by six month, *i.e.*, until February 12, 2004.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.45 and 210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.45, 210.51).

Issued: August 6, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03-20386 Filed 8-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 701-TA-431 (Final)]

Drams and Dram Modules From Korea Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines,² pursuant to section 705(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from Korea of dynamic random access memory semiconductors (DRAMs) and DRAM modules, provided for in subheadings 8473.30.10 and 8542.21.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce

¹ The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² Commissioner Marcia E. Miller did not participate in this investigation.

(Commerce) to be subsidized by the Government of Korea.

Background

The Commission instituted this investigation effective November 1, 2002, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by Micron Technology, Inc., Boise, ID. The final phase of the investigation was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by Commerce that imports of DRAMs and DRAM modules from Korea were being subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission's investigation and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of April 16, 2003 (68 FR 18671). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on June 24, 2003, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on August 4, 2003. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3617 (August 2003), entitled *DRAMs and DRAM Modules from Korea: Investigation No. 701-TA-431 (Final)*.

Issued: August 4, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03-20365 Filed 8-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731-TA-1048-1053 (Preliminary)]

Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide From Australia, China, Greece, Ireland, Japan, and South Africa

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of antidumping investigations and scheduling of preliminary phase investigations.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of investigations and commencement of preliminary phase antidumping investigations Nos. 731-TA-1048-1053 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930