

with a linewidth of less than 20 kHz to probe the super narrow transition in a single trapped and laser cooled mercury ion for development of stable optical frequency standards. A domestic manufacturer of similar equipment advised March 25, 2003, that (1) these capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Gerald A. Zerdy,**

*Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 03-8237 Filed 4-3-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### University of Kentucky; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Suite 4100W, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

*Docket Number:* 03-004.

*Applicant:* University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.

*Instrument:* IR Image Furnace, Model SCII-MDH-11020.

*Manufacturer:* NEC Machinery Corporation, Japan.

*Intended Use:* See notice at 68 FR 8210, February 20, 2003.

*Comments:* None received.

*Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

*Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides a dual mirror image furnace with a homogeneous temperature gradient around the horizontal plane with a simultaneous steeper temperature gradient along the vertical portion for growth of various large single crystals. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration advised May 8, 2002 that (1) this capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no

domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use (comparable case).

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

**Gerald A. Zerdy,**

*Program Manager, Statutory Import Programs Staff.*

[FR Doc. 03-8239 Filed 4-3-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-507-501]

#### Certain In-shell Pistachios from the Islamic Republic of Iran: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain in-shell pistachios from the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran) for the period January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001. If the final results remain the same as the preliminary results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the "Preliminary Results of Review" section of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. (See the "Public Comment" section of this notice.)

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 4, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Darla Brown, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office VI, Group II, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4012, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-2849.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**Background**

On March 11, 1986, the Department published in the *Federal Register* the countervailing duty order on certain in-shell pistachios from Iran. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Order: In-shell Pistachios from Iran*, 51 FR 8344 (March 11, 1986) (*In-shell*

*Pistachios*). On March 1, 2001, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" (67 FR 9438). On March 22, 2002, we received a timely request for an administrative review from Cyrus Marketing, the exclusive representative of the Rafsanjan Pistachio Producers Cooperative (RPPC), the respondent company in this proceeding. On April 24, 2002, we initiated an administrative review covering the period of review (POR) January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001 (67 FR 20089).

On June 11, 2002, we issued our initial questionnaire to the Government of Iran (GOI) and RPPC. On September 17, 2002, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to RPPC.

On October 23, 2002, we extended the period for the completion of the *Preliminary Results* pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). See *Certain In-shell Pistachios from the Islamic Republic of Iran: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 65091 (October 23, 2002).

On February 20, 2003, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to the GOI. On March 5, 2003, we issued a second supplemental questionnaire to RPPC. On March 19, 2003, we received from the GOI a partial response to the Department's February 20, 2002, supplemental questionnaire.

On March 20, 2003, we sent a letter to the GOI, extending for the second time the time limit for the submission of its full response to the supplemental questionnaire issued by the Department on February 20, 2003. The due date of the supplemental questionnaire was extended until March 25, 2003.

However, we stated in the letter that, given the proximity of this extended due date to the date of our preliminary results (*i.e.*, March 31, 2003), we could not guarantee that we would be able to analyze the information contained in the supplemental response in time to incorporate that information in our preliminary results.

On March 21, 2003, we sent a letter to RPPC, extending for the second time the time limit for the submission of its response to the second supplemental questionnaire issued by the Department on March 5, 2003. The due date of the supplemental questionnaire was extended until March 25, 2003. However, we stated in the letter that, given the proximity of this extended due date to the date of our preliminary results (*i.e.*, March 31, 2003), we could not guarantee that we would be able to analyze the information contained in