

*Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994) and *Canadian Brass*, 57 FR 20460. Therefore, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company essentially operates as the same business entity as the former company, the Department will assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor.

We have examined the information provided by Dupont Dow and DDE Japan in their September 27, 2001 letter and determined that SDEM and DDE Japan are the successor-in-interest companies to SDP and its predecessor, Showa Neoprene. The management, production facilities, supplier relationships, sales facilities and customer base are essentially unchanged from those of SDP, and before that, Showa Neoprene. Therefore, we determine that the new joint venture entities essentially operate in the same manner as the predecessor companies of SDP and Showa Neoprene.

#### Final Results of Review

Based on our analysis in the *Preliminary Results*, we find that effective January 1, 1998, the restructured manufacturing and marketing joint ventures, SDEM and DDE Japan, are the successor-in-interest companies to Dupont Showa Denko (SDP) and its predecessor, Showa Neoprene. Further, SDEM and DDE Japan should be given the same antidumping duty treatment as SDP and its predecessor, Showa Neoprene, *i.e.*, zero percent antidumping duty cash deposit rate.

#### Comment: Successorship Effective Date

DuPont Dow and DDE Japan state that the final determination should explicitly indicate that, according to the facts on the record, SDEM and DDE Japan became the successor-in-interest companies to SDP and its predecessor, Showa Neoprene, effective January 1, 1998. *Department's Position:* We agree with DuPont Dow and DDE Japan and the effective date of January 1, 1998 is reflected in the Final Results of Review section below.

#### Cash Deposit

The cash deposit determination from this changed circumstances review will apply to all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this changed circumstances review. This deposit rate shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next relevant

administrative review. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service accordingly.

#### Notification

This notice also serves as a final reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Failure to timely notify the Department in writing of the return/destruction of APO material is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing these final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and Sec. 351.216 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: December 21, 2001.

#### Faryar Shirzad,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-32244 Filed 12-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-806]

#### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping New Shipper Review: Silicon Metal From the People's Republic of China

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 2, 2002.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jacqueline Arrowsmith or Maureen Flannery, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5255 or (202) 482-3020, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### The Applicable Statute

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 current regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

#### Background

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), on June 29, 2001, the Department received the timely and properly filed June 28, 2001 request

from Groupstars Chemical Company, Ltd., that we conduct a new shipper review of its sales of silicon metal. On July 31, 2001, the Department initiated a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal for the period of review (POR) of June 1, 2000 through May 31, 2001 (66 FR 41508).

#### Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Section 351.214(i)(1) of the Department's regulations requires the Department to issue preliminary results of a new shipper review within 180 days of the date of initiation. However, if the Secretary concludes that a new shipper review is extraordinarily complicated, the Secretary may extend the 180-day period to 300 days under section 351.214(i)(2) of the Department's regulations. Because of the problems the respondent has encountered in meeting the Department's filing requirements and the resultant delay to the analysis and verification, we find this review to be extraordinarily complicated.

Therefore, in accordance with section 351.214(i)(2) of the regulations, the Department is extending the 180-day time limit to 300 days. Since the 300th day falls on a federal holiday, the due date for the preliminary results is now the next business day, May 28, 2002. The final results will continue to be due 90 days after the date of issuance of the preliminary results.

Dated: December 20, 2001.

#### Joseph A. Spetrini,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.*

[FR Doc. 01-32248 Filed 12-31-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-475-819]

#### Certain Pasta From Italy: Amended Final Results of the Fourth Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Amendment of final results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On December 12, 2001, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** its final results of the fourth administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta from Italy for the period January

1 through December 31, 1999 (66 FR 64214). On December 10, 2001, we received a timely filed ministerial error allegation. Based on our analysis of this information, the Department of Commerce has revised the net subsidy rate for N. Puglisi & F. Industria Paste Alimentari S.p.A.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 2, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Meg Weems or Craig Matney, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2613 or 482-1778, respectively.

### Corrections

*N. Puglisi & F. Industria Paste Alimentari S.p.A. ("Puglisi")*

On December 10, 2001, respondent Puglisi timely filed a ministerial error allegation. Puglisi states that, with respect to a Law 64/86 industrial development loan ("IDL"), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") failed to deduct loan guarantee payments from the gross loan subsidy received by Puglisi during the period of review, resulting in a clerical error. Puglisi further explains that the Department added the loan guarantee payments to the "total amount of interest and fee payments made" and then again added the loan guarantee payments to the "total benchmark interest and fees," thereby nullifying the deduction of these fees from the countervailable subsidy. Puglisi suggests that the clerical error be corrected by either not including the annual fee payments in the "benchmark interest and fee amounts," or by deducting the annual fee payments from the gross countervailable subsidy for the loan. The petitioner has not commented on this ministerial error allegation.

We agree with Puglisi that the Department miscalculated the duty rate for one of Puglisi's Law 64/86 IDLs by inadvertently nullifying the deduction of the loan guarantee fees from the countervailable subsidy. We have corrected this error for the amended final results by deducting the annual fee payments from the "total interest and fee payments made," while excluding them from the "benchmark interest and fee amounts."

In the final results, we specified a total duty rate of 7.18 percent for Puglisi. In calculating this rate, we erroneously calculated the subsidy rate for Puglisi's Law 64/86 IDL to be 0.14 percent. The Law 64/86 IDL subsidy rate should have been 0.08 percent.

### Amended Final Results of Review

Pursuant to the Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.224(e), we correct the *ad valorem* rate for Puglisi to be 7.12 percent.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service ("Customs") to assess countervailing duties on all appropriate entries on or after January 1, 1999, and on or before December 31, 1999. The Department will issue liquidation instructions directly to Customs. The amended cash deposit requirements are effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice and shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This amendment to the final results of the countervailing duty administrative review is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, as amended, (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 351.213, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5)).

Dated: December 26, 2001.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for, Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-32247 Filed 12-31-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 122701A]

#### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Deep Seabed Mining Regulations for Exploration Licenses

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before March 4, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Madeleine Clayton, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6086, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington DC 20230 (or via Internet at MClayton@doc.gov).

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Joseph P. Flanagan at 301-713-3155, ext. 201 (or via Internet at joseph.flanagan@noaa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Abstract

NOAA regulations at 15 CFR 970 govern the issuing and monitoring of exploration licenses under the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act. Persons seeking a license must submit certain information that allows NOAA to ensure the applicant meets the standards of the Act. Persons with licenses are required to conduct monitoring and make reports, and they may request revisions to or transfers of licenses.

#### II. Method of Collection

Paper submissions are used.

#### III. Data

*OMB Number:* 0648-0145.

*Form Number:* None.

*Type of Review:* Regular submission.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit organizations.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 2.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 2000-4000 hours per application (no applications are expected) and 20 hours per report.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 40.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public:* \$120.

#### IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.