

help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at one of the following addresses:

1. Submissions Via Express/Package Delivery Services: Foreign-Trade-Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building—Suite 4100W, 1099 14th St. NW., Washington, DC 20005; or

2. Submissions Via the U.S. Postal Service: Foreign-Trade-Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB—Suite 4100W, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is July 7, 2003. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to July 21, 2003.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board's Executive Secretary at address Number 1 listed above, and at the U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, 8235 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 520, St. Louis, MO 63105.

Dated: April 29, 2003.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-11176 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties

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

ACTION: Notice of policy concerning assessment of antidumping duties

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce hereby issues clarification on the automatic-liquidation regulation where a reseller has been involved in the chain of commerce.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurie Parkhill, Office 3, Import Administration, at 202-482-4733, or Patrick Gallagher, Office of Chief

Counsel for Import Administration, at 202-482-5053.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 1, 2003 (*see* discussion below).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice clarifies the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulation, 19 CFR 351.212(c), regarding automatic liquidation where an intermediary (*e.g.*, a reseller, a trading company, an exporter) exports the merchandise. This notice uses the term "reseller" to apply to any intermediary that could be an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Background

On October 15, 1998, the Department published a proposed clarification of the Department's position on the automatic-liquidation procedures for a reseller and invited public comment on that clarification. *See Notice and Request for Comment on Policy Concerning Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 63 FR 55361. On November 12, 1998, we published a notice of *Rebuttal Period for Comments on Policy Concerning Assessment of Antidumping Duties* (63 FR 63288) which extended the period for initial comments to November 13, 1998, established a rebuttal period until December 4, 1998, and provided for the submission of comments and rebuttal in an electronic format for posting to the Import Administration internet home page. The Department received several written comments and rebuttals regarding the proposed assessment clarification. Given the time which had elapsed since the original publication of the proposal, on March 25, 2002, the Department published a notice of an additional one-week comment period (67 FR 13599). The Department received additional comments by April 1, 2002.

In preparing this final clarification, the Department reviewed and considered each of the comments it received carefully. Although we received several comments after the originally established deadlines, we have decided to consider and respond to all comments in order to allow for a thorough analysis of this issue.

As described in the October 15, 1998, **Federal Register** notice, automatic liquidation at the cash-deposit rate required at the time of entry can only apply to a reseller which does not have its own rate if no administrative review has been requested, either of the reseller or of any producer of merchandise the reseller exported to the United States. If the Department conducts a review of a producer of the reseller's merchandise where entries of the merchandise were

suspended at the producer's rate, automatic liquidation will not apply to the reseller's sales. If, in the course of an administrative review, the Department determines that the producer knew, or should have known, that the merchandise it sold to the reseller was destined for the United States, the reseller's merchandise will be liquidated at the producer's assessment rate which the Department calculates for the producer in the review. If, on the other hand, the Department determines in the administrative review that the producer did not know that the merchandise it sold to the reseller was destined for the United States, the reseller's merchandise will not be liquidated at the assessment rate the Department determines for the producer or automatically at the rate required as a deposit at the time of entry. In that situation, the entries of merchandise from the reseller during the period of review will be liquidated at the all-others rate if there was no company-specific review of the reseller for that review period.

Analysis of Comments Received

Comment 1: The Canadian Government contends that Canadian enterprises, due to the integrated nature of the North American market and the consequent special nature of Canadian/U.S. trade, will bear the preponderance of the impact of any such change in policy.

Response: We have found no evidence to indicate that this clarification will have a greater impact on any segment of the market or any of our trading partners.

Comment 2: The Canadian Government comments that the Department's proposal would essentially remove the provisions of 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1) with respect to resellers without providing an explanation of the circumstances that gave rise to the proposed clarification of the policy. It argues further that the Department must provide evidence as to why such a change is necessary in order to justify a policy change which would be detrimental for many resellers and it questions whether the integrity of an antidumping duty order has been harmed through the imports from a reseller.

Response: In various proceedings parties have claimed that entries should be liquidated at many different rates in cases where entries involving resellers have not been reviewed. Parties have claimed, depending on the situation, that the results of the Department's review of the producer should apply,