County). Proposed Site 5 (2,029 acres) is located at the CenterPoint Intermodal Center just west of the Village of Elwood, approximately 2½ miles east of Interstate 55 and approximately 1 mile south of Arsenal Road. The site was formerly the Joliet Arsenal, a U.S. Army ammunition plant, and is currently being developed for commercial use as an intermodal facility and industrial park. The majority of the site is owned by CenterPoint Properties Trust. No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

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

1. Submissions via Express/Package Delivery Services: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Franklin Court Building—Suite 4100W, 1099—14th Street 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 Avenue NW. Washington, DC 20230.

The closing period for their receipt is July 21, 2003. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to August 4, 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 the first address listed above, and at the U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, 55 West Monroe Street, Suite 2440, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

Dated: May 12, 2003.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–12637 Filed 5–19–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549–807]

Notice of Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Thailand

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: We are rescinding the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Thailand with respect to Thai Benkan Corporation, Ltd., (TBC) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zev Primor or Ronald Trentham, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4114 or 482–6320, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 6, 1992, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings (pipe fittings) from Thailand (57 FR 29702). On July 1, 2002, the Department published a ''Notice of Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' on pipe fittings from Thailand (67 FR 44172). On July 31, 2002, the petitioner in this proceeding, Trinity Fitting Group, requested, in accordance with section 351.213(b) (2002) of the Department's regulations, an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from Thailand covering the period July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002, with respect to TBC. On August 15, 2002, TBC submitted a letter certifying that neither it nor its U.S. affiliate, Benkan America, Inc., sold, exported or shipped for entry and/or consumption in the United States subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). We published a notice of initiation of the review with respect to TBC on August 27, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 67 FR 55000 (August 27, 2002). On March 24, 2003, the Department published the preliminary notice of intent to rescind this administrative review. *See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Thailand: Preliminary Notice of Intent to Rescind Administrative Review*, 68 FR 14192 (March 24, 2003). As discussed in the notice of preliminary results, this review covers TBC's shipments of the subject merchandise during the POR; however, based upon our shipment data query, we determined that TBC was a non-shipper for the purpose of this review. We invited interested parties to comment on our preliminary results. Interested parties did not submit case briefs or request a hearing.

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this order is certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings, having an inside diameter of less than 14 inches, imported in either finished or unfinished form. These formed or forged pipe fittings are used to join sections in piping systems where conditions require permanent, welded connections, as distinguished from fittings based on other fastening methods (*e.g.*, threaded, grooved, or bolted fittings). Carbon steel pipe fittings are currently classified under subheading 7307.93.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Rescission of Administrative Review

We provided interested parties with an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. As noted above, however, we received no comments. As discussed in the preliminary results, because TBC made no entries, exports or sales of the subject merchandise to the United States during the POR, we determine that it was a non-shipper. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with Department practice, we are rescinding our review of TBC (see, e.g., *Certain Non-Frozen Apple Juice Concentrate from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of 1999–2001 Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review*, 67 FR 68987 (November 14, 2002); see also, *Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 40913(June 14, 2002)).

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to an administrative

protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of return and/or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO are sanctionable violations.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 751(a) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and section 351.213(d) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: May 13, 2003.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–12635 Filed 5–19–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-122–822]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Canada; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Accordance with North American Free Trade Agreement Binational Panel Decision

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

SUMMARY: On September 13, 1999, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Panel affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department) second remand determination arising from the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada. *See North American Free Trade Agreement Article 1904 Binational Panel Review*, USA-97–1904–3, September 13, 1999. As a result of this final and conclusive Binational Panel Review decision, we are amending the final results of review in this matter and will instruct the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (BCBP) to liquidate entries subject to these amended final results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley or Julio Fernandez, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3148 and (202) 482–0961, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 18, 1993, the Department issued antidumping duty orders on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada. *See Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada*, 58 FR 44162 (August 19, 1993). On April 15, 1997, the Department issued its final results of the second administrative review of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products for three exporters, Dofasco, Inc. (Dofasco), Continuous Colour Coat (CCC), and Stelco, Inc. (Stelco), and certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate for two exporters, Algoma Inc. and Stelco, covering the period of August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995. *See Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 62 FR 18448 (April 15, 1997) (*Final Results*).

At the request of Stelco, a NAFTA Binational Panel (the Panel) was established, and, on June 4, 1998, the Panel remanded the review of the final results on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products to the Department. The Panel remanded the review for the Department to reconsider, among other issues, its valuation of coating services performed by Stelco's affiliate, Baycoat Partnership (Baycoat). The Panel instructed the Department to reconsider Stelco's costs for coating services under § 773(f)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), in conjunction with § 351.407(b)of the Department's regulations. At the same time, the Panel ruled that §§ 773(f)(2) and (f)(3) of the Act were inapplicable. *See NAFTA Binational Panel Decision of June 4, 1998* (*Panel Decision I*). The other two companies subject to the second administrative review of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada (Dofasco and CCC) were not involved in the *Second Remand Determination*.

On September 3, 1998, in accordance with the Panel's remand order, the Department issued its first remand determination in this matter. *See Final Remand Determination: NAFTA, Article 1904 Binational Panel Review, USA-97–1904–3* (September 3, 1998). Stelco challenged the Department's decision not to adjust the transfer price by its affiliate's return of profit. On January 29, 1999, the Panel remanded the review to the Department for the second time to reconsider the calculation of transfer price, and to take into account all evidence on the record. *See NAFTA Binational Panel Decision of January 20, 1999* (*Panel Decision II*). To ensure that the record contained all information necessary to make a final determination that would comply with the Panel's instructions, the Department reopened the record and verified the new information submitted by Stelco.

On June 14, 1999, in accordance with the Panel's remand order, the Department issued its second remand determination in this matter. *See Final Remand Determination: NAFTA, Article 1904 Binational Panel Review, USA-97–1904–3* (June 14, 1999) (*Second Remand Determination*). In this *Second Remand Determination*, the Department explained that there is a difference in Stelco's accounting records regarding Baycoat profits recorded and Baycoat profits remitted, as well as Baycoat profits on amounts charged to Stelco. Since profits remitted cannot be tied to any individual invoices, adjustments to transfer price cannot be made by profits remitted on individual sales. Baycoat profits, as recorded in Stelco's financial statements, may include profits on job orders performed for Baycoat's other owner, as well as other parties. Therefore, the Department made adjustments to the transfer price based on an allocated amount of the profits earned by Baycoat on Stelco job orders. The Department reallocated total per unit profit (Stelco's per-unit profit, as derived by Stelco, multiplied by two), by multiplying it by the ratio of the value charged to Stelco by Baycoat (as it appears in Baycoat's records) to the total value produced by Baycoat. We allocated interest and general and administrative expenses (G&A) by class by multiplying the interest and G&A per net ton times two, and then multiplying the product by the ratio of total value of Baycoat sales to Stelco to Baycoat's total sales value. We subtracted allocated interest and G&A expenses from the cost per net ton, since Baycoat's interest and G&A are already included and accounted for in Stelco's overall interest and G&A expense calculation. On September 13, 1999, the Panel upheld the Department's Second Remand Determination.

The Department faced a similar issue in the subsequent administrative review of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Canada, covering the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996, which was also remanded to the Department by the