D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States to Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, or the Republic of Yemen; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, or the Republic of Yemen, and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, or the Republic of Yemen. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Fifth, that after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Serfilco by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order.

Sixth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.origin technology.

Seventh, that the proposed charging letter, the Settlement Agreement, and this Order shall be made available to the public.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

Entered this 13th day of March 2003.

Lisa A. Prager,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 03–14377 Filed 6–6–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DT–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-791-809]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Administrative Antidumping Review: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from South Africa

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce. **SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hotrolled carbon steel flat products from South Africa in response to requests by petitioners Bethlehem Steel Corporation, National Steel Corporation, United States Steel Corporation, and Nucor Corporation. The review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States for the period May 3, 2001 through August 31, 2002, by Iscor Ltd. and Saldanha Steel Ltd. (together, Iscor/ Saldanha¹), and Highveld Steel & Vanadium Corp. Ltd. (Highveld). For the reasons discussed below, we are extending the preliminary results of this administrative review by 30 days, to no later than July 2, 2003.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 9, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elfi Blum or Scot Fullerton at (202) 482– 0197 or (202) 482–1386, respectively; Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 19, 2001, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon

steel flat products from South Africa (66 FR 48242). On September 30, 2002, in accordance with Section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and section 19 CFR 351.213(b) of the regulations, petitioners Bethlehem Steel Corporation, National Steel Corporation, and United States Steel Corporation requested a review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from South Africa. On September 30, 2002, petitioner Nucor Corporation also requested a review of this antidumping duty order. On October 24, 2002, we published a notice of "Initiation of Antidumping Review." See 67 FR 65336. On December 30, 2002, Iscor/Saldanha informed the Department it was unable to respond to the Department's questionnaire. On January 21, 2003, Highveld informed the Department that it was withdrawing its participation in the administrative review.

On February 19, 2003, petitioners Bethlehem Steel Corporation, National Steel Corporation, and United States Steel Corporation submitted factual information and arguments for determining a new total facts available margin for respondents. On March 26, 2003, Highveld submitted comments contesting petitioners' methodology for updating Highveld's facts available margin. On May 20, 2003, Iscor/ Saldanha also submitted comments contesting petitioners' methodology for updating the facts available margin.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of a review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results within the statutory time limit of 245 days from the last day of the anniversary month of the order for which the administrative review was requested. Because of the complexity and timing of certain issues in this case, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. The Department requires additional time to evaluate information submitted by petitioners regarding the determination of facts available.

Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results by 30 days, to no later than July 2, 2003.

¹ In the final results of the antidumping duty investigation, the Department determined that Iscor and Saldanha were affiliated, and should be treated as a single entity for purposes of the investigation. See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from South Africa, 66 FR 48242 (Sept. 19, 2001) (LTFV investigation). This was based on information on the public record of the contemporaneous countervailing duty investigation of hot-rolled products from South Africa that 1) Iscor is a 50 percent shareholder in Saldanha, and is in a position to exercise control of Saldanha's assets, and 2) both companies produce the subject merchandise. In this review, the Department requested that, if the circumstances had not changed, the two parties file a combined response. The notice of appearance was filed for Iscor, including its subsidiary Saldanha.

Dated: June 2, 2003. Barbara E. Tillman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III. [FR Doc. 03–14443 Filed 6–6–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-839]

Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from Korea; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce. **ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of 2001–2002 administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber from Korea. The period of review is May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002. This review covers imports of certain polyester staple fiber from two producers/exporters.

We have preliminarily found that sales of subject merchandise have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. We will issue the final results not later than 120 days from the date of publication of this notice.

DATES: EFFECTIVE DATE: June 9, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew McAllister, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1174.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 25, 2000, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published an antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber ("PSF") from Korea. (*See* 65 FR 33807). On May 6, 2002, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of this order. (See 67 FR 30356). On May 30, 2002, Daeyang Industrial Co., Ltd. ("Daeyang"), Sunglim Co., Ltd.

("Sunglim"), Huvis Corporation ("Huvis"), and Estal Industry Co., Ltd. ("Estal") requested administrative reviews. On May 31, 2002, Sam Young Synthetics Co., Ltd. ("Sam Young"), Mijung Ind. Co., Ltd. ("Mijung"), Keon Baek Co., Ltd. ("Keon Baek"), and East Young Co., Ltd. ("East Young") made similar requests for administrative reviews. Also, on May 31, 2002, Stein Fibers, Ltd. ("Stein Fibers"), an interested party in this review, requested an administrative review of imports of the subject merchandise produced by Sam Young, Mijung, Keon Baek, East Young, Huvis, Daeyang, and Estal. On June 25, 2002, the Department published a notice initiating the review for the period May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002. (See 67 FR 42753).

On July 10, 2002, we issued antidumping questionnaires in this review. On August 2, 2002, Sunglim withdrew its request for review. On August 16, 2002, Sam Young, Mijung, Keon Baek, Estal, and Daeyang withdrew their requests for review. Also, on August 16, 2002, Stein Fibers withdrew its request for administrative reviews of the shipments of Sam Young, Mijung, Keon Baek, Daeyang, and Estal. *See "Partial Rescission"* section, below.

We received responses from East Young and Huvis on September 5, 2002. As a result of certain below cost sales being disregarded in the previous administrative review, on October 17, 2002, we instructed Huvis to respond to the cost questionnaire. On November 14, 2002, we received Huvis' response to the cost questionnaire.

On September 30, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.301(d)(2)(ii), Arteva Specialties S.a.r.l., d/b/a KoSa and Wellman, Inc. ("the petitioners"), alleged that East Young had made sales to the United Kingdom, East Young's reported third-country market, at prices below the cost of production ("COP") during the POR. On October 2, 2002, East Young submitted an objection to the petitioners' September 30, 2002, COP allegation on the basis that it was untimely filed, inasmuch as the deadline for alleging that East Young made sales in its third-country market at prices below the COP was September 26, 2002. However, we accepted the petitioners' allegation of sales below COP and proceeded to examine the sufficiency of the allegation because it was not submitted so late that the Department would be unnecessarily delayed in reviewing the substance of the allegation nor would it cause other interested parties difficulties in representing their interests. See Memorandum from Team to Susan Kuhbach, "Petitioners' Allegation of

Sales Below Cost of Production," dated October 21, 2002, which is on file in the Central Records Unit ("CRU") in room B-099 of the main Department building.

On October 29, 2002, East Young submitted further objections to the timeliness and merits of the petitioners' cost allegation. On November 4, 2002, the petitioners rebutted East Young's October 29, 2002, submission. On November 6, 2002, East Young rebutted the petitioners' November 4, 2002, submission. On December 6, 2002, we found that the petitioners' allegation did not provide a reasonable basis to initiate a COP investigation on East Young's U.K. sales because the below-cost sales were not representative of the broader range of foreign models that may be used to determine normal value ("NV") for comparison to U.S. sales. See Memorandum from Team to John Brinkmann, "Petitioners' Allegation of Sales Below the Cost of Production for East Young Co., Ltd.," dated December 6, 2002, which is on file in the CRU.

In its section B Questionnaire response, East Young reported the United Kingdom as its comparison market. In their September 30, 2002, cost allegation and in an October 28, 2002, letter, the petitioners alleged that the United Kingdom was not an appropriate third-country market for calculating East Young's NV because of the existence of a dumping finding on PSF from Korea in the European Union. On November 4, 2002, East Young submitted an objection to the petitioners' October 28, 2002. submission, stating that the United Kingdom is its most representative comparison market. In the Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach, "Selection of Comparison Market for East Young," dated November 20, 2002 ("East Young Comparison Market Memorandum"), which is on file in the CRU, we recognized that the European Union has made a finding of dumping concerning PSF from Korea that includes PSF currently subject to an order in the United States and which applies to East Young's merchandise. As a result, we indicated that reliance on East Young's sales to the United Kingdom may not be appropriate for purposes of calculating NV in this review. While we did not immediately dismiss East Young's sales to the United Kingdom, we instructed East Young to submit a revised section B response that includes sales both to the United Kingdom and to its next largest thirdcountry market for which no finding of dumping exists and which meets the criteria of section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See East Young Comparison