time for making its determination by not more than 90 days, if it determines that the review is extraordinarily complicated. As set forth in section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a sunset review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order, as is the case in all of these proceedings. A transition order is defined as including countervailing or antidumping duty orders which were in effect on January 1, 1995, the date on which the WTO Agreement's provisions on sunset reviews went into effect. Transition orders are treated as issued on January 1, 1995. *See* section 751(c)(6)(D) of the Act. These orders were issued prior to January 1, 1995, thus are deemed issued on January 1, 1995, for purposes of the sunset proceeding. Therefore, the Department has determined, pursuant to section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, that the sunset reviews of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Korea and Taiwan, the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from China and Taiwan, the antidumping duty order on internal combustion industrial forklift trucks from Japan, and the antidumping duty order on raw in-shell pistachios from Iran are extraordinarily complicated and require additional time for the Department to complete its analysis.

The Department's final results of these sunset reviews were scheduled for June 29, 2005. The Department will extend the deadlines in these proceedings and, as a result, intends to issue the final results of the expedited sunset reviews on the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Korea and Taiwan, the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from China and Taiwan, the antidumping duty order on internal combustion industrial forklift trucks from Japan, and the antidumping duty order on raw in-shell pistachios from Iran on September 27, 2005, 90 days from the original scheduled date of the final results of these sunset reviews.

This notice is issued in accordance with sections 751 (c)(5)(B) and (C)(v) of the Act.

Dated: May 10, 2005.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5–2440 Filed 5–13–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–830]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico

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

SUMMARY: On November 8, 2004, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. The review covers two producers of the subject merchandise. The period of review (''POR'') is April 10, 2002, through September 30, 2003. Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the Final Results of Review section.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 16, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyman Armstrong or Dennis McClure, at (202) 482–3601 or (202) 482–5973, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 8, 2004, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. *See Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Steel Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, 69 FR 64722 (November 8, 2004) (''*Preliminary Results*''). We conducted a sales and cost verification at Hylsa Puebla, S.A. de C.V. (''Hylsa'') from November 30 through December 11, 2004. On December 8, 2004, Hylsa requested a hearing. On February 24, 2005, Hylsa withdrew its request for a hearing. No other interested parties requested a hearing.

We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On February 22, 2005, we received case briefs from Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (''SICARTSA'') and Hylsa, and from the petitioners, Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., ISG Georgetown Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc. All parties submitted rebuttal briefs on February 28, 2005.

Scope of the Order

Effective July 24, 2003, in accordance with the Department's *Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Orders, and Intent to Revoke Orders in Part*, 68 FR 64079 (November 12, 2003), the scope of this order was amended. Therefore, for purposes of this review, the scope of the order during the first part of the POR was different from the scope during the latter half of the POR. The scope in effect during each portion of the POR is described below.

Scope of Order from October 29, 2002, through July 23, 2003

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) definitions for (a) Stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (i.e., products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3)

0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

The designation of the products as ''tire cord quality'' or ''tire bead quality'' indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, and 7227.90.6059 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Scope of Order from July 24, 2003, through the end of the POR

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the HTSUS definitions for (a) Stainless steel; (b) tool steel; c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003.

The designation of the products as ''tire cord quality'' or ''tire bead quality'' indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should the petitioners or other

interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, and 7227.90.6059 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.[1]

Analysis of Comments Received

The issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* to Joseph A. Spetrini, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Barbara E. Tillman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary (*Decision Memorandum*), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues addressed in the *Decision Memorandum* is appended to this notice. The *Decision Memorandum* is on file in the Central Records Unit in Room B–099 of the main Commerce building, and can also be accessed directly on the Web at *http://www.ia.ita.doc.gov/frn.* The paper copy and electronic version of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received for Hylsa, we have: (1) Accepted new databases and made changes based on minor corrections presented at verification; (2) classified export credit expense as a direct selling expense rather than an indirect selling expense; (3) recalculated Hylsa's warranty expense based on a three-year average; (4) recalculated home market and U.S. credit expenses; and (5) corrected clerical errors with respect to billing adjustments, early payment discounts, and commission offset.

Based on our analysis of comments received for SICARTSA, we have: (1) Recalculated the financial expense ratio to include all exchange gains and losses and changes in monetary position as reported on the audited financial statements and deducted an amount in the denominator (i.e., from the costs of goods sold) of the ratio to account for packing for all affiliated parties; (2) recalculated general and administrative expenses to exclude exchange gains and losses related to accounts payable; (3) adjusted the cost of manufacturing for affiliated iron ore purchases; and (4) made corrections to our calculation for programming errors.

For SICARTSA, in addition to the changes explained in the *Decision Memorandum*, we made the following changes based on a review of the preliminary calculations. We used the U.S. dollar short-term borrowing rate for home market sales made in U.S. dollars to calculate imputed credit expenses. When there were missing payment dates, we used the date of SICARTSA's last submission to calculate imputed credit expenses. We also made a correction to the home market sales revenue used to calculate the constructed export price profit. *See* May 9, 2005, *Final Results Calculation Memorandum Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas S.A. de C.V.*

Both Hylsa's and SICARTSA's adjustments are discussed in detail in the *Decision Memorandum*.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average margins exist for the period April 10, 2002, through September 30, 2003:

Producer	Weighted–average margin (percentage)
Hylsa	5.45
SICARTSA	1.06

Assessment

The Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department has calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

Cash Deposits

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) For SICARTSA and Hylsa, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate from the final determination; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the producer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the final determination; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review or the investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 20.11 percent, the ''All Others'' rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402 (f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with

[1] Effective January 1, 2005, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reclassified certain HTSUS numbers related to the subject merchandise. *See http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/ tariff__chapters__current/ toc.html.*

sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 9, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

APPENDIX

I. List of Comments:

Hylsa Puebla S.A. (Hysla)

Comment 1: Minor Corrections
Comment 2: Transamerica Sales
Comment 3: Credit Insurance Premiums
Comment 4: Return Expenses Discovered at Verification
Comment 5: Interest Rates Used To Calculate Credit Expense
Comment 6: Hylsa's Warranty Expenses
Comment 7: Ministerial Errors

Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (SICARTSA)

Comment 8: Sales Made Within Extended Period of Time
Comment 9: Use of Actual Yield Factor
Comment 10: Costs Related to Plant Shutdowns
Comment 11: Expenses Related to Parent Company G&A
Comment 12: Adjustments to Financial Expense
a. Net Interest Expense
b. Foreign Exchange Gains and Losses
c. Changes in Monetary Position
d. Consolidated Packing Expenses
Comment 13: Major Input Test
Comment 14: Ministerial Errors
Comment 15: Treatment of Negative Dumping Margins

[FR Doc. E5–2439 Filed 5–13–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–122–838

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Winton Global Lumber Ltd. (Winton Global), the Department of Commerce is initiating a changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada and issuing this notice of preliminary results. We have preliminarily determined that Winton Global Lumber Ltd. (Winton Global) is the successor-in-interest to The Pas Lumber Company Ltd. (The Pas).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 16, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel O'Brien or David Neubacher, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1376 or (202) 482–5823, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background:

On May 22, 2002, the Department issued the antidumping duty order on Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada*, 67 Fed. Reg. 36067 (May 22, 2002). On April 21, 2005, Winton Global requested that the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiate and conduct an expedited changed circumstances review, in accordance with sections 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3)(ii) (2003) of the Department's regulations, to confirm that Winton Global is the successor-in-interest to The Pas. In its request, Winton Global states that it changed its name to Winton Global from The Pas on January 11, 2005 and provided supporting documentation.

Scope of the Order

For purposes of the order, the products covered are certain softwood lumber products from Canada. For a complete description of the scope of the order, *see Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada*, 70 FR 3358 (January 24, 2005).

Initiation and Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for a review of, an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. As indicated in the Background section, we have received information indicating that The Pas has changed its name to Winton Global. This constitutes changed circumstances warranting a review of the order. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act, we are initiating a changed circumstances review based upon the information contained in Winton Global's submissions.

Section 351.221(c)(3)(ii) of the regulations permits the Department to combine the notice of initiation of a changed circumstances review and the notice of preliminary results if the Department concludes that expedited action is warranted. In this instance, because we have on the record the information necessary to make a preliminary finding, we find that expedited action is warranted and have combined the notice of initiation and the notice of preliminary results.

In making successor-in-interest determinations, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. *See, e.g., Polychloroprene Rubber from Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 67 FR 58 (January 2, 2002) citing, *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992). While no single factor, or combination of factors, will necessarily prove dispositive, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to its predecessor company if the resulting operations are essentially the same as the predecessor company. *Id.* citing, *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as its predecessor, the Department will assign the new company the cash-deposit rate of its predecessor.

In its April 21, 2005, submission, Winton Global argues that it merely changed its name to Winton Global from The Pas, and that Winton Global is the identical company to The Pas. As such, Winton Global states that the company's personnel, operations, supplier/customer relationships, and facilities have not changed. To support its claims, Winton Global submitted numerous documents, including: (1) The Certificate of Change of Name issued by the Government of British Columbia; (2) Customs Form 5016 notifying U.S. Customs and Border Protection of the name change; (3) a rider to Customs Form 301 certifying that Winton Global Ltd. is the same entity as the entity formerly known as The Pas Lumber Company Ltd.; (4) a copy of the corporate consent resolution of the shareholders of The Pas to change the corporate name; (5) a Corporate