

until the completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the subject merchandise for which each respondent was both the producer and exporter (*see Initiation Notice*, 67 FR at 62439).

During the course of conducting this review and in response to the Department's original and supplemental questionnaires, however, both companies provided factors of production data which indicated that neither company was the producer of the subject merchandise it reported in its U.S. sales listing (*see* page 5 of Zhongjia's December 4, 2002, Section A questionnaire response, page 2 of Zhongjia's December 4, 2002, Section D questionnaire response, and pages 8 through 14 of Zhongjia's July 3, 2003, second supplemental questionnaire response; *see* page 5 of Minhui's December 4, 2002, Section A questionnaire response, page 2 of Minhui's December 4, 2002, Section D response, and pages 9 through 11 of Minhui's July 3, 2003, second supplemental questionnaire response). This data conflicted with each company's certification, for purposes of initiation, that it was both the exporter and producer of the merchandise subject to this review. Consequently, Zhongjia and Minhui misstated the facts when each claimed in its respective new shipper review request that it was both the exporter and producer of the merchandise subject to this review.

Because Zhongjia and Minhui did not provide a certification from the respective producers of the subject merchandise they sold or exported to the United States during the POR in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(ii)(B), neither respondent met the minimum requirements for an entitlement to a new shipper review. Had we realized that these exporters were not also the producers of the merchandise for which they were requesting a new shipper review at the initiation stage, we would not have initiated this review. The certification omission is fundamental to the initiation decision, and the exporters' failure to provide the necessary certifications, in addition to their misleading statements contained within the submitted certifications that these exporters were also "producers" of subject merchandise, would have led the Department to determine not to initiate a new shipper review of these exporters.

Consequently, the Department determines that it should not conduct further a review that was initiated based on faulty data (*see, e.g., Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China:*

Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review, 67 FR 65782 (October 28, 2002)). To do so permits manipulation of the new shipper review provision and allows parties, such as Zhongjia and Minhui, to reap the benefit of the new shipper bonding provision without meeting the minimal threshold requirements for entitlement to the new shipper review process (*see* Import Administration Policy Bulletin Number 03.2, entitled "Combination Rates in New Shipper Reviews," dated March 4, 2003). Indeed, if an exporter ships to the United States merchandise produced by another entity but, because of mis-certification, its importers receive the bond benefit for its self-produced merchandise during the new shipper review, then the wrong exporter/producer combination benefits from the bonding privilege as long as the new shipper review continues. Thus, rescission of the new shipper review rectifies this problem.

Because each respondent exporter's certification contained in its August 30, 2002, request for a new shipper review did not also contain a certification from the producer of the subject merchandise as required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(ii)(B), which each respondent was required to provide because neither company produced the merchandise subject to this review, as affirmed by the information contained in subsequent questionnaire responses, we find that there is a sufficient basis to rescind this new shipper review with respect to both companies for the reasons outlined above.

Comment Period

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Room B-099, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on September 10, 2003. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in case briefs and rebuttal briefs. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than August 27, 2003. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, will be due not later than September 3, 2003. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with

each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are also encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

The Department will issue its final decision, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or at the hearing, if held, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of this notice.

Notification

If we rescind this review, bonding will no longer be permitted to fulfill security requirements for shipments from Minhui or Zhongjia of certain preserved mushrooms from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final rescission notice. The cash deposit rate required for subject merchandise from the PRC NME entity (including Zhongjia and Minhui), entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of the final rescission notice will continue to be the PRC-wide rate of 198.63 percent. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This preliminary rescission notice is in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214.

Dated: July 28, 2003.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Grant Aldonas, Under Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-19754 Filed 8-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results in Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Extension of time limit for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 4, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Strollo at (202) 482-0629, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department

of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 25, 2003, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 14394 (March 25, 2003). The period of review is February 1, 2002, through March 31, 2003. The review covers seven exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tarriff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department shall make a preliminary determination in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The Act provides further, however, that the Department may extend the 245-day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period. Due to the large number of respondents and the time required to review and analyze multiple supplemental responses, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, we have fully extended the deadline until February 28, 2004.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: July 29, 2003.

Laurie Parkhill,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-19755 Filed 8-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Federal Consistency Appeal by Millennium Pipeline From an Objection by the New York Department of State

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (Commerce).

ACTION: Notice of closure—administrative appeal decision record.

SUMMARY: This announcement provides notice that the decision record has been closed for an administrative appeal filed with the Department of Commerce by

the Millennium Pipeline Company (Consistency Appeal of Millennium Pipeline Company, L.P.).

DATES: The decision record for the Millennium Pipeline Company's administrative appeal was closed on July 24, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Materials from the appeal record are available at the Internet site <http://www.orc.doc.gov/czma.htm> and at the Office of the General Counsel for Ocean Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1305 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Branden Blum, Senior Counselor, Office of the General Counsel for Ocean Services, via e-mail at gcos.inquiries@noa.gov, or at 301-713-2967, extension 186.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In June 2002, the Millennium Pipeline Company, L.P. (Millennium or Appellant) filed a notice of appeal with the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) pursuant to section 307(c)(3)(A) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), as amended 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*, and the Department of Commerce's implementing regulations, 15 CFR part 930, subpart H, (revised, effective January 8, 2001). The appeal was taken from an objection by the New York Department of State (State) to Millennium's consistency certification for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission permits to construct and operate a natural gas pipeline spanning approximately 420 miles from the U.S./Canada border to a terminus outside of New York City. The certification indicated that the project is a consistent with New York State's coastal management program. The project would traverse Lake Erie and cross the Hudson River, affecting the natural resources or land and water uses of New York's coastal zone.

The Appellant requested the Secretary to override the State's consistency objection for a procedural reason, concerning the timing of the State's objection to the Millennium project. The Appellant also requested an override of the State's objection on the two substantive grounds provided in the CZMA. The first ground requires the Secretary to determine that the proposed activity is "consistent with the objective" of the CZMA. The second substantive ground for overriding a State's objection considers whether the proposed activity is necessary in the interest of national security. Decisions for CZMA administrative appeals are

based on information contained in a decision record. The Millennium appeal decision record includes materials submitted by the parties, the public and interested federal agencies, and was closed on July 24, 2003. It is expected that no further information, briefs or comments will be considered in deciding the appeal.

The CZMA requires that a notice be published in the **Federal Register** indicating the date on which the decision record has been closed. 16 U.S.C. 1465(a). A final decision of the Millennium appeal is to be issued no later than 90 days after the date of publication of this notice. 16 U.S.C. 1465(a). The deadline may be extended by publishing (within the 90-day period) a subsequent notice explaining why a decision cannot be issued within the time frame. In this event, a final decision is to be issued no later than 45 days after the date of publication of the subsequent notice. 16 U.S.C. 1465(b).

Additional information about the Millennium appeal and the CZMA appeals process is available from the Department of Commerce CZMA appeals Web site <http://www.ogc.doc.gov/czma.htm>.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog No. 11.419 Coastal Zone Management Program Assistance.)

Dated: July 28, 2003.

James R. Walpole,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 03-19591 Filed 8-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 072803A]

ICCAT Advisory Committee; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Advisory Committee to the U.S. Section to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), in conjunction with the International Fisheries Division of NMFS, announces a regional public meeting to be held in August in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled for August 14, 2003, from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands at the