

7208.10.30.00, 7208.10.60.00,
 7208.25.30.00, 7208.25.60.00,
 7208.26.00.30, 7208.26.00.60,
 7208.27.00.30, 7208.27.00.60,
 7208.36.00.30, 7208.36.00.60,
 7208.37.00.30, 7208.37.00.60,
 7208.38.00.15, 7208.38.00.30,
 7208.38.00.90, 7208.39.00.15,
 7208.39.00.30, 7208.39.00.90,
 7208.40.60.30, 7208.40.60.60,
 7208.53.00.00, 7208.54.00.00,
 7208.90.00.00, 7211.14.00.90,
 7211.19.15.00, 7211.19.20.00,
 7211.19.30.00, 7211.19.45.00,
 7211.19.60.00, 7211.19.75.30,
 7211.19.75.60, and 7211.19.75.90.
 Certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat
 products covered by this investigation,
 including vacuum degassed fully
 stabilized; high strength low alloy; and
 the substrate for motor lamination steel
 may also enter under the following tariff
 numbers: 7225.11.00.00, 7225.19.00.00,
 7225.30.30.50, 7225.30.70.00,
 7225.40.70.00, 7225.99.00.90,
 7226.11.10.00, 7226.11.90.30,
 7226.11.90.60, 7226.19.10.00,
 7226.19.90.00, 7226.91.50.00,
 7226.91.70.00, 7226.91.80.00, and
 7226.99.00.00. Subject merchandise
 may also enter under 7210.70.30.00,
 7210.90.90.00, 7211.14.00.30,
 7212.40.10.00, 7212.40.50.00, and
 7212.50.00.00. Although the HTSUS
 subheadings are provided for
 convenience and U.S. Customs
 purposes, the Department's written
 description of the merchandise under
 investigation is dispositive.

Amended Final Determination

Saldanha Steel's first allegation is that we made a ministerial error in our calculation of the benefit from loan guarantees provided by the IDC by calculating the difference between the IDC's guarantee fee and a commercial guarantee fee, as well as the difference between the actual interest rate and a commercial interest rate for an unguaranteed loan. We disagree. We believe that Saldanha Steel's allegation constitutes an argument with the Department's methodology in calculating the benefit from these loan guarantees, rather than a ministerial error. Section 351.224(f) of the Department's regulations defines a ministerial error as "an error in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other similar type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial." 19 CFR 351.224(f). Saldanha Steel's disagreement with our method for calculating the benefit from the guarantee program does not constitute an allegation of an "unintentional error." The Department intentionally used the formula described above, as well as an unguaranteed commercial loan benchmark, in calculating the amount of the benefit. See *Memorandum from Joseph Spetrini to Faryar Shirzad, Regarding Issues and Decision*

Memorandum in the Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from South Africa (September 21, 2001), at 17. Likewise, the Department explicitly and intentionally rejected the use of Saldanha Steel's actual loans as possible benchmarks. *Id.*, at 8.

Saldanha Steel's second allegation is that we made a ministerial error in our calculation of the benefit from the Findevco Ltd. loan. Saldanha Steel claims that the Department verified that it made actual and scheduled interest payments before 2003 on the loan it received from Findevco Ltd., which loan was determined to be countervailable by the Department, and that such interest payments were omitted from the calculation. We agree that this omission constitutes a ministerial error within the meaning of section 351.224(f) of the Department's regulations. We have, therefore, corrected our calculation to include these payments.

This correction resulted in the total combined countervailable subsidy rate attributable to Saldanha Steel and Iscor decreasing from 6.37 percent *ad valorem* to 5.76 percent *ad valorem*. Because the "all others" rate is based on the combined Saldanha Steel and Iscor rate, the correction also results in an identical change in the "all others" rate.

Subsidy Rates

Producer/exporter	Subsidy rate
Saldanha Steel/Iscor	5.76 % <i>Ad Valorem</i> .
All Others	5.76 % <i>Ad Valorem</i> .

This determination is issued and published pursuant to section 351.224(e) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: November 8, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-28756 Filed 11-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request—Customer Satisfaction Surveys (Fast Track Recall Survey, Ombudsman Survey, State Partner Survey, Hotline Survey, and Clearinghouse Survey)

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) requests comments on proposed surveys to determine customers' level of satisfaction with existing services. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice

before requesting approval of this collection of information from the Office of Management and Budget.

DATES: Written comments must be received by the Office of the Secretary not later than January 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be captioned "Customer Satisfaction Surveys" and mailed to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207, or delivered to the attention of that office, room 419, North Tower, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland, 20814. Written comments may also be sent to the Office of the Secretary by facsimile at (301) 504-0127 or by e-mail at cpsc-os@cpsc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information about the proposed collection of information, or to obtain a copy of the questions to be used for this

collection of information, call or write Linda L. Glatz, management and program analyst, Office of Planning and Evaluation, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; (301) 504-0416, Ext. 2264.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

This request for clearance of several planned customer satisfaction surveys is in response to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)-related evaluations of service quality and customer satisfaction. "Customers" of CPSC include any individual or entity interested in or affected by agency activities. These would include, but not be limited to, (1) Consumers telephoning the Hotline to report product-related incidents, or to receive information; (2) consumers, industry members, or others contacting the National Injury Information Clearinghouse for information; (3) State representatives who work with CPSC on cooperative programs; (4) firms using CPSC's Fast-Track Product Recall Program to report and simultaneously propose satisfactory product recall plans; and (5) small businesses that have sought information or assistance from the CPSC's small business ombudsman.

The information will be used by the CPSC Office of Planning and Evaluation to prepare sections of the agency's annual performance report (required by the GPRA). This information will provide measures of the quality and effectiveness of agency efforts related to three goals in its strategic plan (informing the public, industry services, and customer satisfaction). If this information is not collected, the Commission would not have useful measures of its effectiveness in providing useful services to consumers and others, and information necessary to guide program development would not be available.

B. Estimated Burden

The surveys will be conducted by in-house staff through telephone or in writing by (1) Customer service follow-up queries with samples of telephone Hotline callers, (2) surveying a sample of firms using the Fast-track Product Recall Program to assess their views and suggestions for improvements in the service aspects of the program, and (3) conducting mail surveys of state partners and samples of customers of the National Injury Information Clearinghouse. Fewer than 5 customer surveys or information collection

activities a year would be conducted using this clearance.

The Commission staff estimates the number of annual respondents to be about 1,504. Among the anticipated sources and annual respondents are:

Hotline	1,000
National Injury Information Clearinghouse	300
Small Businesses	50
State Partners	54
Fast Track Product Recall Program	100
	1,504

The average time needed for each response is estimated at 3.5 minutes. Thus, the annual time burden would be about 5,264 ($3.5 \times 1,504$) minutes or 88 hours. Using \$13.50 an hour (the average hourly wage for all private industry workers, according to the 2000 edition of the *Statistical Abstract of the U.S.*) times 88 hours, the cost would be negligible (a total of about \$1,188 per year).

C. Requests for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed surveys. The Commission specifically seeks information relevant to the following topics:

- Whether the surveys described above are necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;
- Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collections of information are accurate;
- Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
- Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: November 9, 2001.

Todd Stevenson,

Acting Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 01-28685 Filed 11-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

ACTION: Correction notice.

SUMMARY: On November 1, 2001, a 60-day notice inviting comment from the public was inadvertently published for the "High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)" in the **Federal Register** (Volume 66, Number 212) dated November 1, 2001. This information collection is being submitted under the Streamlined Clearance Process for Discretionary Grant Information Collection (1890-0001). Therefore, this notice amends the public comment period for this program to 30 days. The Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer, hereby issues a correction notice on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Since an incorrect public notice was published on November 1, the Department of Education is correcting the end date to the 30 days as required for discretionary grants instead of 60 days.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 17, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Karen Lee, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, N.W., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the Internet address *Karen_F._Lee@OMB.EOP.GOV*. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, or should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651 or should be electronically mailed to the Internet address *OCIO_IMB_Issues@ed.gov*, or should be faxed to 202-708-9346.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Kathy Axt at (540) 776-7742.

Dated: November 9, 2001.

John Tressler,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-28686 Filed 11-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.