other fisheries-related businesses. NOAA needs to collect information to administer and manage the program. The information collected will be used to determine whether communities applying for allocations under the Program meet regulatory requirements, whether vessels and processors utilizing Community Development Program Quota species meet operational requirements, and to monitor whether quotas have been harvested or exceeded.

*Affected Public*: Not-for-profit institutions, business or other for-profit organizations.

*Frequency*: On occasion, weekly, annually.

*Respondent's Obligation*: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

*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: August 3, 2001.

**Madeleine Clayton,**

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

[FR Doc. 01–20114 Filed 8–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

**[I.D. 080701D]**

### 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*: NOAA Satellite Ground Station Customer Questionnaire.

*Form Number(s)*: None.

*OMB Approval Number*: 0648–0227.

*Type of Request*: Regular submission.

*Burden Hours*: 50.

*Number of Respondents*: 300.

*Average Hours Per Response*: 10 minutes.

*Needs and Uses*: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) operates four meteorological satellite imagery transmissions systems–two from geostationary (GOES) satellites and two from polar-orbiting (TIROS) satellites. The data transmitted are available worldwide, and any user can establish a ground receiving station for reception of the data without prior consent or other approval from NOAA. The questionnaire allows NOAA to learn about who uses the data, what and location equipment is used, and similar subjects.

*Affected Public*: Not-for-profit institutions, individuals and households, business or other for-profit organizations, farms, Federal, state, local or tribal government.

*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: August 3, 2001.

**Madeleine Clayton,**

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

[FR Doc. 01–20117 Filed 8–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–HR–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–427–098]**

### Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate From France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from a domestic interested party, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France for the period January 1, 2000, through December 31, 2000. This review covers one producer/exporter of subject merchandise, Rhodia, S.A.

We have preliminarily determined a dumping margin in this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on any entries of subject merchandise manufactured or exported by Rhodia, S.A.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 10, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George Callen, AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0180.

**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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

### Background

On January 18, 2001, the Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (66 FR 4796) with respect to the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate (ASM) from France. The petitioner, PQ Corporation, requested a review of Rhodia HPCII (formerly ''Rhone-Poulenc, S.A.'') (Rhodia) on January 23, 2001. In response to PQ Corporation's request, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review on February 28, 2001 (66 FR 12758), in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b).

### Scope of Order

Imports covered by the order are shipments of ASM, a crystallized silicate which is alkaline and readily soluble in water. Applications include waste paper de-inking, ore-flotation, bleach stabilization, clay processing, medium or heavy duty cleaning, and compounding into other detergent

formulations. This merchandise is classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States* (HTSUS) item numbers 2839.11.00 and 2839.19.00. The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order remains dispositive.

**Period of Review**

The period of review is January 1, 2000, through December 31, 2000.

**Facts Available**

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that, if an interested party (1) withholds information that has been requested by the Department, (2) fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested, subject to subsections 782(c)(1) and (e) of the Act, (3) significantly impedes a determination under the antidumping statute, or (4) provides such information but the information cannot be verified as provided in section 782(i) of the Act, then the Department shall, subject to section 782(d) of the Act, use facts otherwise available in determining dumping margins.

The Department sent Rhodia a questionnaire on March 30, 2001, with a due date of May 8, 2001, for providing information necessary to conduct a review of any shipments that the firm may have made to the United States during the period of review. Rhodia did not respond to our original questionnaire. On May 11, 2001, the Department sent a follow-up letter to Rhodia. Rhodia did not respond to the letter. Because Rhodia has withheld information we requested and has, in fact, made no effort to participate in this proceeding, we must use, pursuant to sections 776(a)(2)(A) and (B) of the Act, facts otherwise available to determine its dumping margins. Because Rhodia has provided no information whatsoever, we find that sections 782(d) and (e) are inapplicable.

Based on the lack of any response from Rhodia, we find that the company has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information. Therefore, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, the Department may use an inference that is adverse to the interests of Rhodia in selecting from among the facts otherwise available. This section also provides that an adverse inference may include reliance on information derived from the petition, the final determination in the investigation segment of the proceeding, a previous review under section 751 of the Act or a determination under section 753 of the Act, or any other information placed on the record. In addition, the Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong. (1994) (SAA), establishes that the Department may employ an adverse inference ''to ensure that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully.'' SAA at 870. In employing adverse inferences, the Department is instructed to consider ''the extent to which a party may benefit from its own lack of cooperation.'' *Id.* Because we find that Rhodia failed to cooperate by not complying with our request for information and in order to ensure that it does not benefit from its lack of cooperation, we are employing an adverse inference in selecting from the facts available.

The Department's practice when selecting an adverse rate from among the possible sources of information has been to ensure that the margin is sufficiently adverse ''as to effectuate the statutory purposes of the adverse facts available rule to induce respondents to provide the Department with complete and accurate information in a timely manner.'' *See Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors From Taiwan; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value,* 63 FR 8932 (February 23, 1998).

In order to ensure that the rate is sufficiently adverse so as to induce Rhodia's cooperation, we have assigned this company as adverse facts available a rate of 60.0 percent, the rate currently applicable to Rhodia, which is the margin calculated in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation using information provided by Rhodia. *See Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate from France; Antidumping Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value,* 45 FR 77498 (November 24, 1980).

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department when using secondary information shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate information used by reviewing independent sources reasonably at its disposal. Information from a prior segment of the proceeding, such as that used here, constitutes secondary information. The SAA provides that to ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. SAA at 870. As explained in *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews,* 61 FR 57391, 57392 (November 6, 1996), to corroborate secondary information, the Department will examine, to the extent practicable, the reliability and relevance of the information used.

Unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources from which the Department can derive calculated dumping margins; the only source for margins is administrative determinations. In an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. *See Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan; Notice of Final Results and Partial Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 62 FR 60472, 60477 (November 10, 1997).

With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. *See Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (February 22, 1996) (the Department disregarded the highest dumping margin as adverse best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin). There is no evidence of circumstances indicating that the margin used as facts available in this review is not appropriate. We note that Rhodia and its predecessor, Rhone-Poulenc, have failed to participate in numerous prior segments of this proceeding and thus have been subject to the rate of 60 percent for many years. Therefore, the requirements of section 776(c) of the Act are satisfied.

**Preliminary Results of the Review**

As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily determines that a margin of 60 percent exists for Rhodia for the period January 1, 2000, through December 31, 2000.

Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 30 days after publication of this notice. Interested parties may also submit written arguments in case briefs on these

preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue and a brief summary of the argument. Any hearing, if requested, will be held three days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs.

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including a discussion of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of Rhodia merchandise made during the period of review. The Department will issue appraisement instructions for Rhodia merchandise directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Rhodia will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 60.0 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (45 FR 77498, November 24, 1980). This deposit rate, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act

Dated: August 3, 2001.

**Faryar Shirzad,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01–20105 Filed 8–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–588–810]**

### Mechanical Transfer Presses From Japan: Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** On July 10, 2001, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review with the intent to revoke, in part, the antidumping duty order on mechanical transfer presses from Japan, as it pertains to certain large, hot-forging presses. *See Mechanical Transfer Presses From Japan: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Order and Intent to Revoke Order in Part,* 66 FR 35932 (July 10, 2001) (*Initiation and Preliminary Results*). In the *Initiation and Preliminary Results,* we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment; we did not receive, however, any comments on the preliminary results. We are now revoking this order, in part, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no interest in the continuation of the order as it pertains to the large, hot-forging presses described below.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 10, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Hoadley, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0666.

### The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On May 3, 2001, Sumitomo Heavy Industries, Ltd. (Sumitomo) requested that the Department partially revoke the antidumping duty order on mechanical transfer presses from Japan. Specifically, Sumitomo requested that the Department revoke the order as it pertains to imports meeting the following specifications: automatic forging presses within the current scope of the order, which operate at a forging temperature of 900 degrees centigrade or higher, and which have a capacity of 1600 metric tons or greater.

Sumitomo is a foreign producer of the products in question. Attached to its request, Sumitomo submitted two letters from the only two domestic parties claiming to be producers of subject merchandise, Enprotech Mechanical Services, Inc. (Enprotech) and IHI-Verson Press Technology, LLC. (Verson), stating that they did not oppose excluding large, hot-forging presses, as defined above, from the scope of the order. On June 11, 2001, we sent letters to all three domestic interested parties who have expressed an interest in this proceeding, the two domestic producers noted above and the International Union, United Auto Workers, requesting comments by June 15, 2001, either supporting or objecting to the partial revocation. We received no comments in opposition to the changed circumstances review or the partial revocation, and subsequently issued our preliminary determination to revoke the order in part in combination with the initiation of the changed circumstances review. We gave interested parties until July 24, 2001, to comment on the Initiation and Preliminary Results. We received no comments on our preliminary results.

### Scope of Changed Circumstances Review

Imports covered by the order include MTPs currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTSUS) item numbers 8462.99.0035 and 8466.94.5040. The HTSUS subheadings