

than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to each exporter named in the petition, as appropriate.

International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will determine, no later than May 21, 2001, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act. Effective January 20, 2001, Bernard T. Carreau is fulfilling the duties of the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Dated: April 26, 2001.

Bernard T. Carreau,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-11149 Filed 5-2-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-815]

Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 3, 2001.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of

China. The review covers the period August 1, 1999 through July 31, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sean Carey or Samantha Denenberg, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3964 or (202) 482-1386, respectively.

Postponement of Preliminary Results of Review

On October 2, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China, covering the period August 1, 1999 through July 31, 2000 (65 FR 58733). The preliminary results are currently due no later than May 3, 2001.

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to issue its preliminary results within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested. However, if it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for a preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days.

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results to no later than August 31, 2001. See Memorandum from Barbara E. Tillman to Joseph A. Spetrini, dated April 26, 2001, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Commerce Building. This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: April 27, 2001.

Richard O. Weible,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 01-11151 Filed 5-2-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-841]

Vector Supercomputers From Japan: Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of changed circumstances review, and revocation of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On March 13, 2001, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review with the intent to revoke the antidumping duty order on certain vector supercomputers from Japan. See *Certain Vector Supercomputers From Japan: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Order and Intent to Revoke Order* ("Initiation and Preliminary Results"), 66 FR 14547 (March 13, 2001). In our *Initiation and Preliminary Results*, we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment. No interested party opposed the preliminary results.

Therefore, we are now revoking this order because the domestic producer of the like product has expressed no interest in the continuation of the order.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 3, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mark Young or James Terpstra AD/CVD Enforcement, Office VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6397, or (202) 482-3965 respectively.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 regulations as codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 27, 2001, Cray Inc. ("Cray") requested that the Department

conduct a changed circumstances review and revoke the antidumping duty order on vector supercomputers from Japan, retroactive to October 1, 2000. In its February 27, 2001 request, Cray claims that it is the only U.S. producer of vector supercomputers and was the sole petitioner in the antidumping investigation that led to the antidumping order. Further, Cray states that it no longer has an interest in maintaining this order. As noted above, we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*. We received no comments from interested parties. On March 26, 2001 we received a submission from Skymoon Ventures ("Skymoon") in support of revocation of the order. Skymoon identified itself as being part of the "high technology industry." However, Skymoon produced no evidence that it was an interested party within the meaning of section 771(9)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b). Therefore, we have not considered its comments in these final results.

Scope of Review

The scope of this order consists of all vector supercomputers, whether new or used, and whether in assembled or unassembled form, as well as vector supercomputer spare parts, repair parts, upgrades, and system software, shipped to fulfill the requirements of a contract entered into on or after October 16, 1997, for the sale and, if included, maintenance of a vector supercomputer. A vector supercomputer is any computer with a vector hardware unit as an integral part of its central processing unit boards.

In general, the vector supercomputers imported from Japan, whether assembled or unassembled, covered by this order are classifiable under heading 8471 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States ("HTS"). Merchandise properly classified under HTS numbers 8471.10 and 8471.30, however, is excluded from the scope of this order. Although, these references to the HTS are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Final Results of Review; Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

The affirmative statement of no interest by petitioners concerning vector supercomputers, as described herein, constitutes changed circumstances sufficient to warrant revocation of this order. Furthermore, no interested party commented on the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*. Therefore, the

Department is revoking the order on certain vector supercomputers from Japan, in accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d) and 351.222(g), effective October 1, 2000.

We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service ("Customs") to end the suspension of liquidation effective October 1, 2000, and to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties, as applicable, and to refund any estimated antidumping duties collected for all unliquidated entries of certain vector supercomputers meeting the specifications indicated above entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after October 1, 2000. We will also instruct Customs to pay interest on such refunds in accordance with section 778 of the Act.

This notice also serves as a 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 351.306. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This changed circumstances administrative review, revocation of the antidumping duty order and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and sections 351.216 and 351.222(g) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: April 27, 2001.

Timothy J. Hauser,

Acting Under Secretary for International Trade.

[FR Doc. 01-11272 Filed 5-1-01; 2:32 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904 NAFTA Panel Reviews; Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On April 6, 2001, CEMEX, S.A. de C.V. ("CEMEX") filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of

the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the 9th Administrative review of the antidumping duty order made by the International Trade Administration, respecting Gray Portland Cement and Clinker from Mexico. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** (66 Fed. Reg. 14889) on March 14, 2001. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA-MEX-2001-1904-04 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Caratina L. Alston, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on April 6, 2001, requesting panel review of the 9th administrative review of the antidumping duty order described above.

The Rules provide that:

(a) A Party or interested person may challenge the final determination in whole or in part by filing a Complaint in accordance with Rule 39 within 30 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Complaint is May 7, 2001);

(b) a Party, investigating authority or interested person that does not file a Complaint but that intends to appear in support of any reviewable portion of the final determination may participate in the panel review by filing a Notice of Appearance in accordance with Rule 40 within 45 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline