

Dated: July 6, 2005.

Madeleine Clayton,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-13598 Filed 7-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance of the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13.

Bureau: International Trade Administration.

Title: Mission/Exhibition Evaluation.
Agency Form Number: ITA-4075P.
OMB Number: 0625-0034.

Type of Request: Regular submission.
Burden: 167 hours.

Number of Respondents: 2,000.

Avg. Hours Per Response: 5 minutes.

Needs and Uses: U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) and DOC-certified trade missions and exhibitions are overseas events planned, organized and led by government and non-government export promotion agencies such as industry trade associations, agencies of Federal, state and local governments; chambers of commerce; regional consortia; and other export oriented groups. This form is used to: (1) Evaluate the effectiveness of DOC or DOC-certified overseas trade events through the collection of information relating to required performance measures; (2) document the results of participation in DOC trade events; (3) evaluate results reported by small to mid-sized, new-to-exports/new-to-market U.S. companies; (4) document the successful completion of trade promotion activities conducted by overseas DOC offices; and (5) identify strengths and weaknesses of DOC trade promotion programs in the interest of improving service to the U.S. business community. This request is being submitted to extend OMB authority for this information collection form to enable participants to continue to address whether or not their overall objective(s) were met by participating in a particular trade mission or exhibition.

Affected Public: Business or other for profit, not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit, voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395-7340.

Copies of the above information collection can be obtained by calling or

writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6612, 14th & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. Phone Number: (202) 482-3129. E-mail: dHynek@doc.gov.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov or fax (202) 395-7285, within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 6, 2005.

Madeleine Clayton,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-13596 Filed 7-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-FP-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13.

Bureau: International Trade Administration.

Title: Application for an Export Trade Certificate of Review.

Agency Form Number: ITA-4093P.

OMB Number: 0625-0125.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden: 384 hours.

Number of Respondents: 12.

Avg. Hours Per Response: 32 hours.

Needs and Uses: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (Pub. L. 97-290, 96 Stat. 1233-1247), requires the Department of Commerce to establish a program to evaluate applications for an Export Trade Certificates of Review (antitrust preclearance for joint export related activities), and with the concurrence of the Department of Justice, issue such certificates where the requirements of the Act are satisfied. The Act requires that Commerce and Justice conduct economic and legal antitrust analyses prior to the issuance of a certificate. The collection of information is necessary to conduct the required economic and legal antitrust analyses. Without the information, there could be no basis upon which a certificate could be issued.

In the Department of Commerce, the economic and legal analyses are performed by the Office of Export Trading Company Affairs and the Office

of the General Counsel, respectively. The Department of Justice analyses will be conducted by its Antitrust Division. The purpose of such analyses is to make a determination as to whether or not to issue an Export Trade Certificate of Review. A certificate provides its holder and the members named in the certificate (a) immunity from government actions under state and Federal antitrust laws for the export conduct specified in the certificate; (b) some protection from frivolous private suits by limiting their liability in private actions from treble to actual damages when the challenged activities are covered by an Export Certificate of Review. Title III was enacted to reduce uncertainty regarding application of U.S. antitrust laws to export activities—especially those involving actions by domestic competitors. Application for an export trade certificate of review is voluntary.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit, not-for-profit institutions, state, local or tribal Government.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit, voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395-7340.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-0266, Department of Commerce, Room 6612, 14th and Constitution, NW., Washington, DC 20230. E-mail: dHynek@doc.gov.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov or fax (202) 395-7285 within 30 days of the publication of this notice.

Dated: July 6, 2005.

Madeline Clayton,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-13597 Filed 7-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-274-804]

Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by interested parties, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and alloy steel wire rod ("wire rod") from Trinidad and Tobago for the period of review ("POR") October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004.

We preliminarily determine that during the POR, Carribbean Ispat Limited and its affiliates Ispat North America Inc. ("INA") and Walker Wire (Ipsat) Inc. ("Walker Wire") (collectively "CIL"), sold subject merchandise at less than normal value ("NV"). If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price ("EP") or constructed export price ("CEP") and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments in this segment of the proceeding should also submit with them: (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the comments. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an electronic version of the public version of any such comments on diskette.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis McClure or James Terpstra, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5973 or (202) 482-3965, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago; *see Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 ("Wire Rod Orders"). On October 1, 2004, we published in the **Federal Register** a *Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation*, 69 FR 58889.

We received timely requests for review from petitioners¹, and CIL², in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2). On November 19, 2004, we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004, naming CIL as the respondent. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 69 FR 67701 (November 19, 2004). On December 1, 2004, we sent a questionnaire to CIL.³

Section B: Comparison Market Sales
Section C: Sales to the United States
Section D: Cost of Production and Constructed Value

Section E: Cost of Further Manufacture or Assembly Performed in the United States

CIL submitted its responses to sections A through D of the Department's questionnaire on January 31, 2005, and sections C and E relating to Walker Wire on February 28, 2005. On April 27, 2005, the petitioners submitted comments on CIL's questionnaire response.

On March 22, 2005, the Department issued a section A-E supplemental questionnaire to CIL. We received the response to the supplemental questionnaire on April 20, 2005. On May 5, 2005, the Department issued a second section A-E supplemental questionnaire to CIL. We received the response to the second supplemental questionnaire on May 25, 2005.

On June 6, 2005, the petitioners requested that the Department issue additional questions with regard to CIL's claimed level of trade ("LOT") and request for a CEP Offset.

On June 14, 2005, the Department received a reconciliation of CIL's home market and U.S. sales database to its income statements.

Scope of the Order

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

¹ The petitioners are ISG Georgetown Inc. (formerly Georgetown Steel Company), Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc. (formerly Co-Steel Raritan, Inc.), Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc.

² On May 2, 2005, we preliminarily found that Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited is the successor-in-interest to CIL. *See Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 22634.

³ Section A: Organization, Accounting Practices, Markets and Merchandise

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. *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 68 FR 64079 (November 12, 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 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 under review 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.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the Scope of the Order section, above, and sold in Trinidad and Tobago during the POR are considered to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We have relied on eight criteria to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to comparison market sales of the foreign like product: grade range, carbon content range, surface quality, deoxidation, maximum total residual content, heat treatment, diameter range, and coating. These characteristics have been weighted by the Department where appropriate. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed above.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago were made in the United States at less than NV, we compared the EP or CEP to the NV, as described in the "Export Price and Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used, as appropriate, EP or CEP, in accordance with sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act. We calculated EP when the merchandise was sold by the producer or exporter outside the United States directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and when CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts on the record. We calculated CEP for

those sales where a person in the United States, affiliated with the foreign exporter or acting for the account of the exporter, made the sale to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States of the subject merchandise. We based EP and CEP on the packed prices charged to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States and the applicable terms of sale. When appropriate, we reduced these prices to reflect discounts and increased the prices to reflect billing adjustments and surcharges.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, for movement expenses including inland freight, international freight, demurrage expenses, marine insurance, survey fees, U.S. customs duties and various U.S. movement expenses from arrival to delivery.

For CEP, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, when appropriate, we deducted from the starting price those selling expenses that were incurred in selling the subject merchandise in the United States, including direct selling expenses (cost of credit, warranty, and further manufacturing). In addition, we deducted indirect selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States. These expenses include certain indirect selling expenses incurred by affiliated U.S. distributors. We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and (f) of the Act. Furthermore, we recalculated INA's credit expense and inventory carrying costs as we did in the final results of the first administrative review. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 12648 (March 15, 2005) ("First Review") and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6.

Normal Value

A. SELECTION OF COMPARISON MARKETS

To determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared CIL's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, because CIL had an aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product that was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

B. COST OF PRODUCTION ANALYSIS

The Department found and disregarded home market sales that were made below the cost of production (“COP”) in the most recently completed segment of the proceeding in which CIL participated. See *First Review*. Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales by CIL of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review were made at prices below the COP. Therefore, we initiated a cost investigation of the respondent.

1. Calculation of COP

Before making any comparisons to NV, we conducted a COP analysis of CIL, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, to determine whether the respondent’s comparison market sales were made below the COP. We calculated the COP based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses (“SG&A”) and packing, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. CIL reported cost databases based on generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”) in Trinidad and Tobago and U.S. GAAP. Pursuant to section 773(f)(1)(A) of the Act, the Department relied on CIL’s cost database which was based on CIL’s audited financial statements prepared in accordance with their home country GAAP (*i.e.*, IAS) as submitted.⁴

In addition, CIL requested that we use control number-specific costs for two six-month cost periods (October 2003 through March 2004 and April 2004 through September 2004) to account for the increase in raw material (*i.e.*, iron ore and various alloys used in the production of wire rod) prices during the POR. CIL based its request, in its January 31, 2005, section D response, on the fact that the cost of certain inputs increased substantially.

Our normal practice for a respondent in a country that is not experiencing high inflation is to calculate a single weighted-average cost for the entire POR except in unusual cases where this preferred method would not yield an appropriate comparison in the margin calculation. See *Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent to Revoke Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from the Netherlands*, 64 FR 48760 (September 8, 1999) citing *Final*

Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from the Republic of Korea; 64 FR 30664, 30676 (June 8, 1999) (concluding that weighted-average costs for two periods were permissible where major declines in currency valuations distorted the margin calculations); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors from Taiwan*, 63 FR 8909, 8925 (February 23, 1998) (calculating quarterly weighted-average costs due to a significant and consistent price and cost decline in the market); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit and Above from the Republic of Korea*; 58 FR 15467, 15476 (March 23, 1993) (determining that the Department may use quarterly weighted-average costs where there exists a consistent downward trend in both U.S. and home market prices during the period); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Erasable Programmable Read Only Memories from Japan*; 51 FR 39680, 39682 (October 30, 1986) (finding that significant changes in the COP during a short period of time due to technological advancements and changes in production process justified the use of quarterly weighted-average costs).

We have reviewed the information on the record. CIL has not demonstrated that the raw material price increases were significant and/or consistent and would distort the margin calculation. Therefore, we followed our normal practice of calculating a single weighted-average cost for the POR.

2. Test of Comparison Market Prices

As required under section 773(b)(2) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the per-unit price of the comparison market sales of the foreign like product, to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices were sufficient to permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We determined the net comparison market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses which were excluded from COP for comparison purposes.

3. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard

any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in “substantial quantities.” Where 20 percent or more of a respondent’s sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in “substantial quantities.” See section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. Further, the sales were made within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, because they were made over the course of the POR. In such cases, because we compared prices to POR-average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of this administrative review, we disregarded below-cost sales of a given product and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. See *Preliminary Calculation Memorandum for Caribbean Ispat Ltd.*, dated July 5, 2005, on file in the Central Records Unit, room B099 of the main Department building, for our calculation methodology and results.

C. CALCULATION OF NORMAL VALUE BASED ON COMPARISON MARKET PRICES

We based home market prices on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in Trinidad and Tobago. We adjusted the starting price for inland freight pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, for comparisons made to EP sales, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (“COS”) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We made COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (credit expense) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit and warranty directly linked to sales transactions). No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411 of the Department’s regulations. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs.

D. LEVEL OF TRADE/CONSTRUCTED EXPORT PRICE OFFSET

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on

⁴ For the final determination of the investigation and final results of the first administrative review, we used cost databases based on CIL’s home market GAAP. See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago*, 67 FR 55788 (August 30, 2002) and *First Review*.

sales in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP sales, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. For CEP transactions, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP transactions, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. For CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP-offset provision).

In implementing these principles in this review, we obtained information from CIL about the marketing stages involved in the reported U.S. and home market sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by CIL for each channel of distribution. In identifying LOTs for EP and home market sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we considered only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses pursuant to section 772(d) of the Act.

In the home market, CIL reported sales to end-users as its only channel of distribution. In the U.S. market, CIL reported sales through two channels of distribution, one involving sales made directly by CIL to end-users and trading companies, and the second involving sales made by CIL's affiliated U.S. resellers to end-users. We have determined that the sales made by CIL directly to U.S. customers are EP sales and those made by CIL's affiliated U.S. resellers constitute CEP sales.

We found the home market and EP sales to be at the same LOT. CIL's EP sales and home market sales were both made primarily to end-users. In both cases, the selling functions performed by CIL were almost identical in both

markets. Other than freight & delivery arrangement, which was only provided for U.S. sales, in both markets CIL provided services such as: strategic and economic planning, sales forecasting, sales force development, solicitation of orders, technical advice, price negotiation, processing purchase orders, invoicing, extending credit, managing accounts receivable, and making arrangements for warranties related to sales.

CIL makes CEP sales to the United States through its affiliates, INA and Walker Wire. Sales through CIL's affiliates are normally made to unrelated end-users in the U.S. market. However, because in our LOT analysis for CEP sales we only consider the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of the expenses incurred by the U.S. affiliate, the record indicates that for CIL's CEP sales there are substantially fewer services performed than the sales in its home market. Therefore, we have determined that CIL's home market sales are made at a more advanced stage of the marketing process than the CEP sales to the affiliates and therefore are at a different LOT within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.412.

Accordingly, when we compared CEP sales to home market sales, we examined whether an LOT adjustment may be appropriate. As CIL sold at only one LOT in the home market, there is no basis to determine that there is a pattern of consistent price differences between LOTs. Further, we do not have information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns of CIL's sales of other similar products, and there are no other respondents or record evidence on which such an analysis could be based.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making an LOT adjustment and the LOT of CIL's home market sales is at a more advanced stage of marketing than the LOT of the CEP sales, we have made a CEP offset to CIL's NV in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. This offset is equal to the amount of indirect expenses incurred in the home market not exceeding the amount of the deductions made from the U.S. price in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of these preliminary results, we made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act, based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of U.S. sales, as obtained from the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Caribbean Ispat Limited	6.19

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to the parties of this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first working day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rate

The Department shall determine and CBP shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise. Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer-specific assessment rates calculated in the final results are above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.5 percent), the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. For assessment purposes, we calculated importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing the

amount by the total entered value of the sales to that importer.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales during the review period.

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the company listed above will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less than fair value ("LTFV") investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 11.40 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Wire Rod Orders.*

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 increase the subsequent assessment of the antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

These preliminary results of this administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 5, 2005.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-3690 Filed 7-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-351-828]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Brazil

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is fully extending the time limit for the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Brazil. The period of review is March 1, 2003, through February 29, 2004. This extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Helen Kramer or Kristin Najdi at (202) 482-0405 or (202) 482-8221, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 6, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Brazil covering the period March 1, 2003, through February 29, 2004 (70 FR 17406). The final results for the antidumping duty administrative review of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Brazil are currently due no later than August 4, 2005.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Agreement Act (the Act), requires the Department to issue the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an antidumping duty order for which a

review is requested and issue the final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 741(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend these deadlines to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively.

The Department has determined it is not practicable to complete this review within the originally anticipated time limit (*i.e.*, by August 4, 2005), in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, for the following reasons: (1) the cost verification of the affiliated importer located in the United States is scheduled to take place July 20-22, 2005; (2) there is insufficient time for the briefing schedule following the sales and cost verifications; and (3) a domestic interested party has requested a hearing, which must take place after the briefs are filed. Accordingly, the Department is fully extending the time limits for completion of the final results to no later than October 3, 2005.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with Section 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 6, 2005.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-3685 Filed 7-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-357-810]

Notice of Preliminary Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Oil Country Tubular Goods, Other Than Drill Pipe, From Argentina

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods from Argentina. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Siderca S.A.I.C. (Siderca). The Department is preliminarily rescinding this review based on record evidence indicating that the respondent had no entries of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). The POR is August 1, 2003, through July 31, 2004.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 12, 2005.