Products from India, Indonesia and the People's Republic of China, 70 FR 58374 (October 6, 2005). The notice of initiation stated that we would make our preliminary determinations for these antidumping duty investigations no later than 140 days after the date of issuance of the initiation. Currently, the preliminary determinations are due February 16, 2006.

On January 23, 2006, the Association of American School Paper Suppliers, and its individual members (''Petitioner''), made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR §351.205(e) for a 30–day postponement of the preliminary determinations. Petitioner requested postponement of the preliminary determinations because it will provide the Department additional time to review submitted questionnaire responses and questionnaire responses not yet received by the Department.

Under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), if Petitioner makes a timely request for a postponement of the preliminary determination, the Department may postpone the preliminary determination under subsection (b)(1) until no later than the 190th day after the initiation of the investigation.

Therefore, for reasons identified by petitioner, we are postponing the preliminary determinations under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act by 30 days to March 18, 2006. Because March 18, 2006, falls on a Saturday, the preliminary determinations will be due by March 20, 2006, the next business day. Pursuant to 735(a) of the Act, the deadline for the final determinations will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determinations, or if extended, up to 135 days after the date of publication of the preliminary determinations in the **Federal Register**.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(i).

Dated: February 3, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–1883 Filed 2–9–06; 8:45 am]

Billing Code: 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–449–804]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia

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

SUMMARY: On October 7, 2005, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Latvia. The review covers one producer of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is September 1, 2003, through August 31, 2004. 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: February 10, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shane Subler at (202) 482–0189 or Constance Handley at (202) 482–0631; AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 7, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on rebar from Latvia. *See Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia*, 70 FR 58687 (October 7, 2005) (*Preliminary Results*). We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On November 14, 2005, we received a case brief from the sole respondent, Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs (LM). We received a rebuttal brief from the Rebar Trade Action Coalition (RTAC) and its individual members, the petitioners in the proceeding, on November 21, 2005. At the request of the respondent, we held a public hearing on December 16, 2005.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths, currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7214.20.00, 7228.30.8050, 7222.11.0050, 7222.30.0000, 7228.60.6000, 7228.20.1000, or any other tariff item number. Specifically excluded are plain rounds (*i.e.*, non–deformed or smooth bars) and rebar that has been further processed through bending or coating. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

The issues raised in the briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary (*Decision Memorandum*), dated February 3, 2006, 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 Room B–099 of the main Department building, and can also be accessed directly on the Web at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html. 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, we adjusted the calculation methodology used in the Preliminary Results. For the date of sale in the U.S. market, we used the date of final amendment to the contract addendum as the date of sale for all sales. For the home market imputed credit expense calculation, we used interest rates published by the Bank of Latvia for loans to domestic enterprises and households as a surrogate interest rate. For the U.S. imputed credit expense calculation, we used short–term interest rates published by the Federal Reserve for commercial and industrial loans as a surrogate interest rate. These 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 margin exists for the period of September 1, 2003, through August 31, 2004:

Producer	Weighted–Average Margin (Percentage)
Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs	5.24

Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department 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 rebar from Latvia 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 LM, the cash deposit rate will be 5.24 percent; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company–specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that producer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, 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 most recent final results in which that producer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 17.21 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: February 3, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

APPENDIX

Comment 1: Use of Monthly Cost Comparison Periods
Comment 2: Date of Sale
Comment 3: Home Market Interest Rate for Imputed Credit Expenses
Comment 4: U.S. Interest Rate for Imputed Credit Expenses
Comment 5: Treatment of Non–Dumped Sales

[FR Doc. E6–1882 Filed 2–9–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

International Trade Administration

[C–423–806, C–401–804, C–412–815]

Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary and Final Results of Full Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Countervailing Duty Orders

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 10, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Douthit or Dana Mermelstein, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5050 or (202) 482–1391, respectively.

Background

On November 1, 2005, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of its sunset reviews of the countervailing duty orders on cut–to-length carbon steel plate (''CTL steel plate'') from Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (''UK''). *See Initiation of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews,* 70 FR 65884 (November 1, 2005). On November 16, 2005, the domestic interested parties IPSCO Steel Inc., Mittal Steel USA ISG, Inc., Nucor Corporation, Oregon Steel Mills, Inc., the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, and AFL–CIO-CLC (''USW''), submitted letters indicating their intent to participate in the sunset reviews. On November 30, 2005 and December 1, 2005, domestic and respondent interested parties provided substantive responses as required under section 351.218 (d)(3)(i) of the Department's regulations. In all three cases, respondent interested parties (for Belgium, the Government of Belgium, the European Commission, Arcelor S.A., and Duferco Clabecq S.A.; for Sweden, the Government of Sweden, the European Commission, and SSAB Svenskt Stal; for the UK, the Government of the United Kingdom, the European Commission, Niagara LaSalle UK Limited, Spartan UK Ltd., and Corus Group, plc), included, in their substantive responses, arguments regarding the privatization or private–to-private changes in ownership which affected the respondent companies, and the effect of those transactions on previously bestowed subsidies.

On December 21, 2005, the Department determined that the participation of the respondent interested parties was adequate, and that it was appropriate to conduct full sunset reviews. *See* Memoranda to Steven J. Claeys: *Adequacy Determination; Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Belgium; Adequacy Determination; Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden; Adequacy Determination; Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from the United Kingdom*, dated December 21, 2005, and on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B 099 of the Department of Commerce building.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary and Final Results of Reviews

The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), provides for the completion of a full sunset review within 240 days