

requested that the Department of Commerce (the Department) conduct an expedited changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty finding on polychloroprene rubber (PR) from Japan. In response to this request, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review of the above-referenced finding.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 1, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Zev Primor, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4114.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On December 6, 1973, the Department of Treasury published in the **Federal Register** (38 FR 33593) the antidumping finding on PR from Japan. On January 14, 2004, SDK submitted a letter stating that they are the successor-in-interest to Showa DDE Manufacturing K.K. (SDEM) and DDE Japan Kabushiki Kaisha (DDE Japan) (collectively, SDEM/DDE Japan) and, as such, entitled to receive the same antidumping treatment as these companies have been accorded. Accordingly, SDK requested that the Department conduct an expedited changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty finding on PR from Japan pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) of the Department's regulations.

**Scope of Review**

Imports covered by this review are shipments of PR, an oil resistant synthetic rubber also known as polymerized chlorobutadiene or neoprene, currently classifiable under items 4002.41.00, 4002.49.00, 4003.00.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purpose. The Department's written description of the scope remains dispositive.

**Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review**

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for a review of, an antidumping duty finding which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. Information submitted by SDK regarding a change in ownership of the prior SDEM/DDE Japan joint venture

shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review. See 19 CFR 351.216(d).

In antidumping duty changed circumstances reviews involving a successor-in-interest determination, the Department typically examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) (*Canadian Brass*). While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily be dispositive, the Department generally will consider the new company to be the successor to the predecessor company if the resulting operations are essentially the same as those of the predecessor company. See, e.g., *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994), and *Canadian Brass*, 57 FR 20460. Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor. See, e.g., *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Final Results of Changes Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999). Although SDK submitted information indicating, allegedly, that with respect to subject merchandise, it operates in the same manner as its predecessor, SDEM/DDE Japan, the Department has determined that the submitted information is deficient and is currently in the process of collecting supplemental information.

Concerning SDK's request that the Department conduct an expedited antidumping duty changed circumstances review, the Department has determined that it would be inappropriate to expedite this action by combining the preliminary results of review with this notice of initiation, as permitted under 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). Because the submitted record supporting SDK's claims is deficient, the Department finds that an expedited proceeding is impracticable. Therefore, the Department is not issuing the preliminary results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review at this time.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty changed circumstances review, in accordance

with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i). This notice will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based and a description of any action proposed based on those results. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4)(ii), interested parties will have an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), the Department will issue the final results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review not later than 270 days after the date on which the review is initiated.

During the course of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review, we will not change the cash deposit requirements for the merchandise subject to review. The cash deposit will only be altered, if warranted, pursuant to the final results of this review.

This notice of initiation is in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1).

Dated: February 23, 2004.

**James J. Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 04-4496 Filed 2-27-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-351-824]

**Silicomanganese From Brazil: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Brazil. The final results of this review are now due no later than March 16, 2004.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 1, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Ellman, (202) 482-4852, or Katja Kravetsky, (202) 482-0108, AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On October 27, 2003, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from Brazil. See *Silicomanganese from Brazil: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 61185. We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from both the petitioner and the respondent. Currently, the final results of this administrative review are due no later than February 24, 2004.

**Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Review**

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), provides that the Department will issue the final results of an administrative review within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results were published. It provides further that, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the 120-day period, the Department may extend the period by 60 days.

This review involves complex cost issues, such as high inflation, and the Department needs additional time to consider the arguments raised by the parties after the preliminary results of review. For these reasons, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the final results within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results by 21 days. The final results of review are now due no later than March 16, 2004.

Dated: February 23, 2004.

**Jeffrey May,**

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

[FR Doc. 04-4494 Filed 2-27-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration****Export Trade Certificate of Review**

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance of an amended export trade certificate of review, application No. 87-17A04.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce has issued an amended Export Trade Certificate of Review ("Certificate") to The Association for Manufacturing Technology. Notice of issuance of the

original Certificate was published in the **Federal Register** on May 22, 1987 (52 FR 19371).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeffrey Anspacher, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482-5131, (this is not a toll free number) or by E-mail at [oetca@ita.doc.gov](mailto:oetca@ita.doc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. The regulations implementing Title III are found at 15 CFR part 325 (2003).

The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs ("OETCA") is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Department of Commerce to publish a summary of a Certificate in the **Federal Register**. Under section 305(a) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

**Description of Amended Certificate**

The Association for Manufacturing Technology's ("AMT") original certificate was issued on May 19, 1987 (52 FR 19371, May 22, 1987) and lastly amended on March 1, 2002 (67 FR 12524, March 19, 2002).

AMT's Certificate has been amended as follows:

(1) The following companies have been added as "Members" of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(l) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(l)):

A & A Manufacturing Company, Inc., New Berlin, WI;  
 Abbott Workholding Products, Manhattan, KS;  
 Action SuperAbrasive Products, Brimfield, OH;  
 Acu-Rite, Jamestown, NY;  
 Adept Technology Inc., Livermore, CA;  
 Agie Charmilles Group, Charlotte, NC;  
 Ahaus Tool and Engineering, Inc., Richmond, IN;  
 Airflow Systems, Inc., Dallas, TX;  
 Airtronics Gage & Machine Co., Elgin, IL;  
 Allen-Brady Co./Rockwell Automation, Milwaukee, WI;  
 Allied Machine & Engineering Corp., Dover, OH;  
 Aloris Tool Technology Co., Inc., Clifton, NJ;  
 AltaMAR Laser and Control, Fridley, MN;

Amada America Inc., Buena Park, CA;  
 Atlas Technologies Inc., Fenton, MI;  
 ATS Workholding, Inc., Anaheim, CA;  
 Automation Specialties, Inc., Howell, MI;  
 Automation Tool Company, Cookeville, TN;  
 Baublys Control Laser, Orlando, FL;  
 Beaumont Machine, Inc., Milford, OH;  
 Better Engineering, Mfg., Inc., Baltimore, MD;  
 Bock Workholding Inc., Mars, PA;  
 Bosch Rexroth-Electric Drives & Cntrls, Hoffman Estates, IL;  
 Brinkman International Group, Inc., Rochester, NY;  
 Buck Forkardt Inc., Portage, MI;  
 Carbology Inc., Detroit, MI;  
 Cedarberg Industries, Inc., Eagan, MN;  
 Chick Workholding Solutions, Inc., Warrendale, PA;  
 Cincinnati Grinding Technologies, Middletown, OH;  
 CNC Engineering, Inc., Enfield, CT;  
 Coe Press Equipment Corp., Sterling Heights, MI;  
 Columbus McKinnon for the activities of its Positech Division, Laurens, IA;  
 Control Gaging, Inc., Ann Arbor, MI;  
 CRI, Centerless Rebuilders, Inc., Chesterfield Township, MI;  
 Curran Manu. Corp. for the activities of its Royal Products Division, Hauppauge, NY;  
 Cutting Edge Optronics, Inc., Saint Charles, MO;  
 Cyril Bath Company, Monroe, NC;  
 Daco Jaw Company, Milwaukee, WI;  
 Daewoo Heavy Industries, America Corp., West Caldwell, NJ;  
 Detroit Edge Tool Company, Detroit, MI;  
 DiManco, Inc., Utica, NY;  
 Dorian Tool International, East Bernard, TX;  
 Doringer Cold Saws, Inc., Gardena, CA;  
 DP Technology Corp. /ESPRIT, Camarillo, CA;  
 DS Technology (USA) Inc., Cincinnati, OH;  
 Eagle Machine Tools, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, FL;  
 Eimeldingen Corporation, Indianapolis, IN;  
 Eitel Presses, Inc., Orwigsburg, PA;  
 EMAG L.L.C., Farmington Hills, MI;  
 Enerpac., Milwaukee, WI;  
 Engis Corporation, Wheeling, IL;  
 Eriez Magnetics, Erie, PA;  
 ExxonMobil Lubricants & Petrol Spec Co., Fairfax, VA;  
 Fagor Automation Corporation, Elk Grove Village, IL;  
 FANUC Robotics America, Inc., Rochester Hills, MI;  
 Fred V. Fowler Co., Inc., Newton, MA;  
 GE Fanuc Automation Americas, Inc., Charlottesville VA;  
 Gibbs & Associates, Moorpark, CA;  
 Giddings & Lewis LLC, Fon DU Lac, WI;