

recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the products to the government.

2. If approved, the action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the products to the government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the products proposed for addition to the Procurement List. Comments on this certification are invited.

Commenters should identify the statement(s) underlying the certification on which they are providing additional information.

(End of Certification)

The following product is proposed for addition to Procurement List for production by the nonprofit agencies listed:

*Product*

Tape, Baggage Inspection.

NSN: 7510–00–NIB–0673–2" (inches) wide by 110 yards long.

NPA: Cincinnati Association for the Blind, Cincinnati, OH.

Contracting Activity: Transportation Security Administration, Arlington, VA.

*Deletions*

*Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification*

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. If approved, the action may result in additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities.

2. If approved, the action may result in authorizing small entities to furnish the services to the government.

3. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) in connection with the services proposed for deletion from the Procurement List.

(End of Certification)

The following services are proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

*Services*

*Service Type/Location:* Dispatcher/Federal Building, 222 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, AK.

NPA: Portland Habilitation Center, Inc., Portland, OR.

Contracting Activity: General Services Administration.

*Service Type/Location:* Grounds Maintenance/Federal Aviation Administration Air Route Traffic, Auburn, WA.

NPA: None currently authorized.

Contracting Activity: Department of Transportation.

*Service Type/Location:* Janitorial/Custodial/Hill City Office and Shop, Hill City, SD.

NPA: Southern Hills Developmental Services, Inc., Hot Springs, SD.

Contracting Activity: Department of Interior, Reston, VA.

*Service Type/Location:* Janitorial/Custodial/U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge), Socorro, NM.

NPA: Tresco, Inc., Las Cruces, NM.

Contracting Activity: Department of Interior, Reston, VA.

**G. John Heyer,**

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. E5–4222 Filed 8–4–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Bureau of Industry and Security**

**Action Affecting Export Privileges; Pakland PME Corporation and Humayun Khan; Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges**

In the Matters of: Pakland PME Corporation, Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan, and, Humayun Khan, Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan, Respondents.

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulation (“EAR”),<sup>1</sup> the Bureau of Industry and Security (“BIS”), U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”), has requested that I renew for 180 days an Order temporarily denying export privileges of Pakland PME Corporation, (“Pakland”), Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan and, Humayun Khan, (“Khan”), Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Respondents”).

On January 31, 2005, I found that evidence presented by BIS demonstrated that the Respondents conspired to do acts that violated the

<sup>1</sup> The EAR are at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2005). The EAR are issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2401–2420 (2000)) (“EAA”). The EAA lapsed on August 21, 2001. However, the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 6, 2004 (69 FR 48763, August 10, 2004), has continued the EAR in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)).

EAR and did in fact commit numerous violations of the EAR by participating in the unlicensed export of triggered spark gaps and oscilloscopes, items controlled for nuclear non-proliferation reasons to Pakistan. I further found that such violations had been significant, deliberate and covert, and were likely to occur again, especially given the nature of the structure and relationships of the Respondents.

OEE has presented additional evidence that Khan has been indicted for his role in the illegal exports of triggered spark gaps and oscilloscopes to Pakistan. In addition, OEE has presented evidence that Khan and Pakland have refused to return to the United States an oscilloscope that was sent to Pakistan for demonstration purposes only. All parties to this TDO have been given notice of the request for renewal.

*It Is Therefore Ordered:*

First, that the Respondents, Pakland PME Corporation, (“Pakland”), Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan and, Humayun Kahn, (“Khan”), Unit 7&8, 2nd Floor, Mohammadi Plaza, Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area, F–6/4, Islamabad–44000, Pakistan (hereinafter collectively referred to as (“Respondents”), and their successors and assigns and when acting on behalf of any of the Respondents, their officers, employees, agents or representatives, (“Denied Persons”) may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as “item”) exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations (“EAR”), or in any other activity subject to the EAR including, but limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Person any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

*Third*, that after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to any of the Respondents by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

*Fourth*, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the EAR, the Respondents may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. The

Respondents may oppose a request to renew this Order by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be served on the Respondents and the Related Party, and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This order is effective on August 6, 2005, and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Entered this 1st day of August, 2005.

**Wendy L. Wysong**,

*Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 05-15477 Filed 8-4-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**A-570-863**

#### **Honey from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 5, 2005.

**SUMMARY:** In June 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") received two requests to conduct new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on honey from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). We have determined that these requests meet the statutory and regulatory requirements for the initiation of new shipper reviews.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Anya Naschak at (202) 482-6375 or Candice Kenney Weck at (202) 482-0938; AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Background**

The Department received timely requests from Shanghai Taiside Trading Co., Ltd. ("Shanghai Taiside") and Wuhan Shino-Food Trade Co., Ltd. ("Shino-Food") in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214 (c), for new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on honey from the PRC, which has a December annual anniversary month, and a June semi-annual anniversary month. Shanghai Taiside and Shino-Food identified themselves as producers

and exporters of honey. As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), and (iii)(A), Shanghai Taiside and Shino-Food certified that they did not export honey to the United States during the period of investigation ("POI"), and that they have never been affiliated with any exporter or producer which exported honey to the United States during the POI. Furthermore, the two companies have also certified that their export activities are not controlled by the central government of the PRC, satisfying the requirements of 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B). Pursuant to the Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), Shanghai Taiside and Shino-Food submitted documentation establishing the date on which the subject merchandise was first entered for consumption in the United States, the volume of that first shipment and any subsequent shipments, and the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

On July 14, 2005, the Department issued a pre-initiation supplemental questionnaire to Shanghai Taiside to clarify certain information submitted in their request to the Department for a new shipper review. In Shanghai Taiside's supplemental questionnaire response, dated July 18, 2005, Shanghai Taiside responded to the Department's request for clarification on its relationship to the importer of record, the merchandise under review, and entry documentation. Also, on July 26, 2005, Shanghai Taiside submitted comments on information obtained by the Department concerning their U.S. customer.

The Department conducted Customs database queries to confirm that Shanghai Taiside's and Shino-Food's shipments had officially entered the United States via assignment of an entry date in the Customs database by U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP"). In addition, the Department confirmed the existence of Shanghai Taiside and Shino-Food and their U.S. customers.

#### **Initiation of Review**

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), as amended, and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), and based on information on the record, we are initiating new shipper reviews for Shanghai Taiside and Shino-Food. See Memorandum to the File through James C. Doyle, "New Shipper Review Initiation Checklist," dated August 1, 2005. Although we found that Shanghai Taiside's U.S. customer had asserted in a trade show publication that it is a packing division of a Chinese exporter of honey, Shanghai Taiside asserts in its July 26,