

(Individual Component)  
8415-00-NSH-1141—Sub Belt  
Holster Adapter (Individual  
Component)  
NPA: Chautauqua County Chapter,  
NYSARC, Jamestown, New York.  
*Contract Activity:* U.S. Army Robert  
Morris Acquisition Center, Natick,  
Massachusetts.

#### Services:

Service Type/Location: Grounds  
Maintenance Navy & Marine Corps  
Reserve Center 3144 Clement  
Avenue, Alameda, California.

NPA: Rubicon Programs, Inc.,  
Richmond, California.

*Contract Activity:* Naval Facilities  
Engineering Command, Alameda,  
California.

Sheryl D. Kennerly,

*Director, Information Management.*

[FR Doc. 03-31382 Filed 12-18-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

#### COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

##### Procurement List Additions

**AGENCY:** Committee for Purchase from  
People Who Are Blind or Severely  
Disabled.

**ACTION:** Additions to Procurement List.

**SUMMARY:** This action adds to the  
Procurement List services to be  
furnished by nonprofit agencies  
employing persons who are blind or  
have other severe disabilities.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 18, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Committee for Purchase  
From People Who Are Blind or Severely  
Disabled, Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800,  
1421 Jefferson Davis Highway,  
Arlington, Virginia, 22202-3259.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Sheryl D. Kennerly, (703) 603-7740.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

On October 24, 2003, the Committee  
for Purchase From People Who Are  
Blind or Severely Disabled published  
notice (68 FR 60908) of proposed  
additions to the Procurement List. After  
consideration of the material presented  
to it concerning capability of qualified  
nonprofit agencies to provide the  
services and impact of the additions on  
the current or most recent contractors,  
the Committee has determined that the  
services listed below are suitable for  
procurement by the Federal Government  
under 41 U.S.C. 46-48c and 41 CFR 51-  
2.4.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

I certify that the following action will  
not have a significant impact on a  
substantial number of small entities.  
The major factors considered for this  
certification were:

1. The action will not result in any  
additional reporting, recordkeeping or  
other compliance requirements for small  
entities other than the small  
organizations that will furnish the  
services to the Government.

2. The action will result in  
authorizing small entities to furnish the  
services to the Government.

3. There are no known regulatory  
alternatives which would accomplish  
the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-  
O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in  
connection with the services proposed  
for addition to the Procurement List.

#### End of Certification

Accordingly, the following services  
are added to the Procurement List:

##### Services

Service Type/Location: Custodial  
Services, Marine Corps Air Station,  
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

NPA: Coastal Enterprises of  
Jacksonville, Inc., Jacksonville,  
North Carolina.

*Contract Activity:* Naval Facilities  
Engineering Command, Camp  
Lejeune, North Carolina.

Service Type/Location: Mail and  
Messenger Service, Tobyhanna  
Army Depot, Tobyhanna,  
Pennsylvania.

NPA: The Burnley Workshop of the  
Poconos, Inc., Stroudsburg,  
Pennsylvania.

*Contract Activity:* Tobyhanna Army  
Depot, Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania.

This action does not affect current  
contracts awarded prior to the effective  
date of this addition or options that may  
be exercised under those contracts.

Sheryl D. Kennerly,

*Director, Information Management.*

[FR Doc. 03-31383 Filed 12-18-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-570-892, A-533-838]

#### Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from India and the People's Republic of China

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

**ACTION:** Initiation of Antidumping Duty  
Investigations.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 19, 2003.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Layton at (202) 482-0371 or Chris  
Welty at (202) 482-0186, AD/CVD  
Enforcement Office 5, Import  
Administration, International Trade  
Administration, U.S. Department of  
Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution  
Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS:

##### The Petition

On November 21, 2003, the U.S.  
Department of Commerce (the  
Department) received a petition filed in  
proper form by Sun Chemical  
Corporation (Sun) and Nation Ford  
Chemical Company (collectively, the  
petitioners). The Department received  
supplemental information from the  
petitioners on December 4, 2003.

In accordance with section 732(b)(1)  
of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended  
(the Act), the petitioners allege that  
imports of carbazole violet pigment 23  
(CVP-23) from India and the People's  
Republic of China (PRC) are, or are  
likely to be, sold in the United States at  
less than fair value within the meaning  
of section 731 of the Act, and that  
imports from India and the PRC are  
materially injuring, or are threatening to  
materially injure, an industry in the  
United States.

The Department finds that the  
petitioners filed the petition on behalf of  
the domestic industry because they are  
interested parties as defined in section  
771(9)(C) of the Act and they have  
demonstrated sufficient industry  
support with respect to each of the  
antidumping investigations that they are  
requesting the Department to initiate.  
*See infra*, "Determination of Industry  
Support for the Petition."

#### Periods of Investigation

The anticipated period of  
investigation (POI) for India is October  
1, 2002, through September 30, 2003,  
and for the PRC it is April 1, 2003,  
through September 30, 2003. *See* section  
351.204(b)(1) of the Department's  
regulations (*Antidumping Duties*;  
*Countervailing Duties*; *Final Rule*, 62 FR  
27296, 27385 (May 19, 1997)).

#### Scope of Investigations

The merchandise covered by these  
investigations is carbazole violet 23  
identified as Color Index No. 51319 and  
Chemical Abstract No. 6358-30-1, with  
the chemical name of *diindolo [3,2-  
b:3',2'-m]triphenodioxazine, 8,18-*

*dichloro-5, 15 5,15-diethy-5,15-dihydro-*, and molecular formula of  $C_{34}H_{22}Cl_2N_4O_2$ .<sup>1</sup> The subject merchandise includes the crude pigment in any form (e.g., dry powder, paste, wet cake) and finished pigment in the form of presscake and dry color. Pigment dispersions in any form (e.g., pigments dispersed in oleoresins, flammable solvents, water) are not included within the scope of the investigations.

The merchandise subject to these investigations is classifiable under subheading 3204.17.9040 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petition, we discussed the scope with the petitioners to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

#### Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that the Department's industry support determination, which is to be made before the initiation of the investigation, be based on whether a minimum percentage of the relevant industry supports the petition. A petition satisfies this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the

domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall either poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.<sup>2</sup>

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," i.e., the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

In this case, the petition covers a single class or kind of merchandise, CVP-23, as defined in the "Scope of Investigations" section, above. The petitioners do not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations. Further,

based on our analysis of the information presented to the Department by the petitioners, we have determined that there is a single domestic like product which is consistent with the definition of the "Scope of the Investigation" section above and have analyzed industry support in terms of this domestic like product.

The Department has determined that the petitioners have established industry support representing over 50 percent of total production of the domestic like product, requiring no further action by the Department pursuant to section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act. In addition, the Department received no opposition to the petition from domestic producers of the like product. Therefore, the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act are met. Furthermore, the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for or opposition to the petition. Thus, the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act also are met.

Accordingly, we determine that the petition is filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act. See Office 5 AD/CVD Enforcement, Initiation Checklist: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 (CVP-23) from India and the People's Republic of China (December 11, 2003) (Initiation Checklist) at Attachment II, on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the Department of Commerce.

#### Export Price and Normal Value

The following are descriptions of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate these investigations. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. and home market prices and factors of production are discussed in greater detail in the Initiation Checklist. Should the need arise to use any of this information as facts available under section 776 of the Act in our preliminary or final determinations, we may re-examine the information and revise the margin calculations, if appropriate.

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the bracketed section of the product description, [3,2-b:3',2'-m], is not business proprietary information. In this case, the brackets are simply part of the chemical nomenclature. See December 4, 2003, amendment to petition at 8.

<sup>2</sup> See *USEC, Inc., v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1,8 (CIT 2001), citing *Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd., v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988). See also *High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

## India

### Export Price

The petitioners based export price (EP) on average unit values of CVP-23 imports from India for the POI. The petitioners derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3204.17.9040.

### Normal Value

With respect to normal value (NV), the petitioners provided a home market price for CVP-23 based on a price list obtained during the POI. The price was quoted in Indian rupees per kilogram on an ex-warehouse basis with the Central Excise and Sales Tax included. The petitioners adjusted this price by deducting the Central Excise and Sales Tax and converting the Indian value to U.S. dollars per pound using the exchange rates from the Department's website.

The estimated dumping margin for subject merchandise from India, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on a home market price quote, is 147.59 percent.

### PRC

#### Export Price

The petitioner based EP on average unit values of CVP-23 imports from the PRC during the POI. The petitioner derived such values from import statistics under the HTSUS subheading 3204.17.9040.

#### Normal Value

The petitioner alleges that the PRC is a NME country, and notes that in all previous investigations the Department has determined that the PRC is a NME. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination in the Less Than Fair Value Investigation of Barium Carbonate From the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 46577, 46577–46578 (August 6, 2003). In accordance with section 771(18)(C) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country has at one time been considered a NME shall remain in effect until revoked. Therefore, the PRC will continue to be treated as a NME country unless and until its NME status is revoked. Pursuant to section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, because the PRC's status as a NME remains in effect, the petitioner determined the dumping margin using a NME analysis.

The petitioners assert that India is the most appropriate surrogate country for the PRC, claiming that India is: (1) A market economy; (2) at a level of economic development comparable to the PRC in terms of per-capita gross national income; and (3) a commercial producer of the subject merchandise.

Based on the information provided by the petitioners, we believe that the petitioners' use of India as a surrogate country is appropriate for purposes of initiation of this investigation.

With respect to NV, the petitioners calculated a NV based on the constructed values for crude and finished CVP-23, which were then weight-averaged based on the relative quantity of crude and finished color pigment imported during the POI. The petitioners provided constructed values based on Indian surrogate values and factors of production from the production processes of Indian and U.S. producers of CVP-23. Most of the Indian material inputs for the production of CVP-23 are taken from a schedule published by the Government of India and used to calculate import credits in a program called the Duty Entitlement Passbook Scheme. The import credits are based on the quantity of physical inputs used to produce crude CVP-23 and other products covered by the program. For those inputs not reported by the Indian government, the petitioners relied on their own experience in producing crude and finished CVP-23, and they adjusted for any known differences between their production process, the Indian production process, and the Chinese CVP-23 production process. Petitioners were unable to obtain publicly available prices for two material inputs, chloranil and para toluene sulphonyl chloride, in India or any other surrogate country and, therefore, submitted price quotes from Indian suppliers. We determined these prices were sufficient for initiation purposes.

Where applicable, the petitioners adjusted values to be exclusive of excise and sales taxes. Indian values were converted to U.S. dollars using the exchange rates from the Department's website. Where surrogate values were not contemporaneous with the POI, the petitioners adjusted such values using wholesale price indices for all commodities from India.

For selling, general and administrative expenses, profit and packaging, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the 2001–2002 financial reports of Pidilite Industries Ltd., which according to its website is the largest producer of CVP-23 in India.

The estimated dumping margin for the PRC, based on a comparison of EP and NV based on a weight-averaged constructed value, is 370.06 percent.

### Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by the petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of CVP-23 from India and

the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

### Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitioners allege that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the cumulated imports from India and the PRC of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV.

The petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is evident in the declining trends in net operating profits, net sales volumes, domestic prices, revenue, profit-to-sales ratios, production employment, capacity utilization, and domestic market share. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. import data, lost sales, and pricing information.

The Department has assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See the Initiation Checklist.*

### Initiation of Antidumping Investigations

Based upon our examination of the petition, we have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. *See the Initiation Checklist.* Therefore, we are initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of CVP-23 from India and the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of these initiations.

### Distribution of Copies of the Petition

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 and the PRC. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to each exporter named in the petition, as provided for under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

### ITC 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 January 5, 2004, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of

CVP-23 from India and the PRC 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.

Dated: December 11, 2003.

**James Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E3-00596 Filed 12-18-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-122-822]

#### Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Canada: Rescission, in Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On September 30, 2003, the Department published the initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada, covering the period August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2003. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Request for Revocation and Deferral of Administrative Reviews* (68 FR 56262) ("Initiation"). This administrative review was initiated on the following exporters: Continuous Color Coat, Ltd. ("CCC"), Dofasco Inc. ("Dofasco"), Ideal Roofing Company, Ltd. ("Ideal Roofing"), Impact Steel Canada, Ltd. ("Impact Steel"), Russel Metals Export ("Russel Metals"), Sorevco and Company, Ltd. ("Sorevco"), and Stelco Inc. ("Stelco"). For the reasons discussed below, we are rescinding the administrative reviews of CCC, Impact Steel, and Ideal Roofing.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 19, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott Lindsay or Dana Mermelstein at (202) 482-0780 and (202) 482-1391, respectively; Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On September 30, 2003, the Department published the initiation of administrative review of CCC, Dofasco, Ideal Roofing, Impact Steel, Russel Metals, Sorevco, and Stelco, covering the period August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2003. *See Initiation*. On October 10, 2003, the International Steel Group ("ISG") withdrew its request for an administrative review of CCC. On October 29, 2003, Impact Steel withdrew its own request for an administrative review. Each request was the only request for review of these two companies. On October 10, 2003, Ideal Roofing withdrew its request for an administrative review. On November 18, 2003, United States Steel Corporation ("USSC") also withdrew its request for an administrative review of Ideal Roofing. These were the only requests for review of Ideal Roofing.

#### Rescission, in Part, of the Administrative Review

Pursuant to the Department's regulations, the Department will rescind an administrative review "if a party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review." *See* 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Since both ISG and Impact Steel submitted timely withdrawals of their requests for review of CCC and Impact Steel, respectively, and since they were the only requesters, the Department is rescinding its antidumping administrative review of these companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Since Ideal Roofing and USSC timely withdrew their request for review, and they were the only requesters for Ideal Roofing, we are rescinding our review of Ideal Roofing. Based on these rescissions, the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada covering the period August 1, 2002, through July 31, 2003, now covers the following companies: Dofasco, Russel Metals, Sorevco, and Stelco.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4) of the regulations.

Dated: December 9, 2003.

**James J. Jochum,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E3-00595 Filed 12-18-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-831]

#### Fresh Garlic From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of New Shipper Reviews

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limit for the preliminary results of new shipper reviews.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the People's Republic of China until April 25, 2004. This extension applies to the new shipper reviews of the following seven exporters: Linyi Sanshan Import & Export Trading Co., Ltd., Sunny Import & Export Limited, Linshu Dading Private Agricultural Products Co., Ltd., Tancheng County Dexion Foods Co., Ltd., Jinxiang Dong Yun Freezing Storage Co., Ltd., Shanghai Ever Rich Trade Company, and Taian Ziyang Food Co., Ltd. The period of review is November 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** December 19, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Ellman or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4852 and (202) 482-1690, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On July 7, 2003, the Department of Commerce (the Department) announced the initiation of the new shipper reviews for seven companies. *See Notice of Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Reviews: Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 40242.

The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), at section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) provides that the Department will issue the preliminary results of a new shipper review of an antidumping duty order within 180 days after the date on which the new shipper review was initiated. The Act also provides that the Department may extend that 180-day period to 300 days if it concludes that the new shipper review is