

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended), the Rural Utilities Service, an agency delivering the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development Utilities Programs, invites comments on this information collection for which approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will be requested.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by May 22, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard C. Annan, Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, USDA Rural Development, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., STOP 1522, Room 5818 South Building, Washington, DC 20250-1522. Telephone: (202) 720-0784. Fax: (202) 720-8435.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) regulation (5 CFR 1320) implementing provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) requires that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)). This notice identifies an information collection that RUS is submitting to OMB for reinstatement.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to: Richard C. Annan, Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, USDA Rural Development, STOP 1522, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20250-1522. FAX: (202) 720-8435.

Title: 7 CFR 1744-C, Advance and Disbursement of Funds—Telecommunications.

OMB Control Number: 0572-0023.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved information collection package.

Abstract: USDA Rural Development, through the Rural Utilities Service, manages the Telecommunications loan program in accordance with the Rural Electrification Act (RE Act) of 1936, 7 U.S.C. 901 et seq., as amended, and as prescribed by OMB Circular A-129, Policies for Federal Credit Programs and Non-Tax Receivables.

In addition, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 101-171) amended the RE Act to add Title VI, Rural Broadband Access, to provide loans and loan guarantees to fund the cost of construction, improvement, or acquisition of facilities and equipment for the provision of broadband service in eligible rural communities. USDA Rural Development therefore requires Telecommunications and Broadband borrowers to submit Form 481, Financial Requirement Statement. This form implements certain provisions of the standard Rural Utilities Service loan documents by setting forth requirements and procedures to be followed by borrowers in obtaining advances and making disbursements of loan funds.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response.

Respondents: Business or other for profit, Not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 177.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 6.3.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 1,223 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Joyce McNeil, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis at (202) 720-0812. FAX: (202) 720-8435. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 15, 2006.

James M. Andrew,
Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.
[FR Doc. E6-4169 Filed 3-22-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-804]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed-Circumstances Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a petition for an expedited changed-circumstances review from Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., and Koyo Corporation of U.S.A., the Department of Commerce is initiating a changed-circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan. We have preliminarily concluded that JTEKT Corporation is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., and, as a result, should be accorded the same treatment previously accorded to Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., with regard to the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edythe Artman at (202) 482-3931 or Richard Rimlinger at (202) 482-4477, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) published antidumping duty orders on ball bearings, cylindrical roller bearings, and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof from Japan on May 15, 1989. See *Antidumping Duty Orders: Ball Bearings, Cylindrical Roller Bearings, and Spherical Plain Bearings, and Parts Thereof from Japan*, 54 FR 20904 (May 15, 1989). The orders on cylindrical roller bearings and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof from Japan were revoked, effective January 1, 2000. See *Revocation of Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Bearings From Hungary, Japan, Romania, Sweden, France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom*, 65 FR 42667 (July 11, 2000). Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., and Koyo Corporation of U.S.A. (collectively Koyo) have participated in numerous administrative reviews of the order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan. On February 3, 2006, Koyo informed the Department that Koyo

Seiko Co., Ltd. (Koyo Seiko), had changed its name to JTEKT Corporation (JTEKT) and petitioned the Department to conduct a changed-circumstances review to confirm that JTEKT is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko for purposes of determining antidumping-duty liabilities subject to this order.¹ Koyo also requested that the Department conduct a changed-circumstances review on an expedited basis, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). We did not receive any other comments.

Scope of the Order

For a listing of scope determinations which pertain to the order on ball bearings and parts thereof, see the Scope Determination Memorandum (Scope Memorandum) from the Antifriction Bearings Team to Laurie Parkhill, dated March 2, 2006. The Scope Memorandum is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), main Commerce building, Room B-099, in the General Issues record (A-100-001) for the 2004/2005 administrative reviews of the orders on antifriction bearings.

Initiation of Changed-Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.216 (2005), 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. The information submitted by Koyo claiming that JTEKT is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko demonstrates changed circumstances sufficient to warrant such a review. See 19 CFR 351.216(d).

In accordance with the above-referenced regulation, the Department is initiating a changed-circumstances review to determine whether JTEKT is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko. In determining whether one company is the successor to another for purposes of applying the antidumping duty law, the Department examines a number of factors including, but not limited to, changes in management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer base. See *Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Although no single or even several of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive

indication of succession, generally the Department will consider one company to be a successor to another company if its resulting operation is similar to that of its predecessor. See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada; Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992), at Comment 1 (“generally, in the case of an asset acquisition, the Department will consider the acquiring company to be a successor to the company covered by the antidumping duty order, and thus subject to its duty deposit rate, if the resulting operation is essentially similar to that existing before the acquisition”). 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 the prior company, the Department will assign the new company the cash-deposit rate of its predecessor. *Id.*; *Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Administrative Review: Polychloroprene Rubber from Japan*, 67 FR 58 (January 2, 2002); see also *Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 63 FR 20572 (April 27, 1998), where the Department found successorship where the company only changed its name and did not change its operations. In its February 3, 2006, submission, Koyo provided information to demonstrate that JTEKT is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko. Koyo submitted a press release announcing the start of JTEKT due to the merger of Koyo Seiko and another company, Toyoda Machine Works, Ltd. (Toyoda), on January 1, 2006. See exhibit A of Koyo’s February 3, 2006, submission. Koyo also submitted the certification of JTEKT’s history that is recorded in the registration book maintained by the local government authority and shows the merger between Koyo Seiko and Toyoda. See exhibit B of the February 3, 2006, submission.

Additional information in Koyo’s February 3, 2006, submission shows that JTEKT’s management, production facilities, suppliers, and customer base are consistent with those of Koyo Seiko. With respect to management prior to and following the name change, the press release discloses that 21 of Koyo Seiko’s 28 officers and directors have retained their positions in the new company. The press release also shows that Koyo Seiko’s production facilities have been placed within a distinct bearings division of JTEKT and JTEKT’s corporate guide, that appears in exhibit

D of the February 3, 2006, submission, lists the four primary product lines of JTEKT, one of which is bearings. Furthermore, Koyo submitted information from JTEKT’s website that shows that Koyo Seiko’s production facilities are listed as domestic plants of JTEKT. See exhibit E of Koyo’s February 3, 2006, submission. Thus, based on the documentation provided by Koyo, we find that the use of Koyo Seiko’s production facilities has remained the same since the name change.

Koyo stated in its February 3, 2006, submission that, because Toyoda had not produced or sold bearing products, production and sale of subject merchandise would continue under JTEKT in the same manner as performed by Koyo Seiko and Koyo did not anticipate any changes in supplier relationships or customer base from that of Koyo Seiko. In exhibit F of its submission, Koyo provided copies of the letters that it sent to its customers at the time of the merger in order to document JTEKT’s intent to retain Koyo Seiko’s customers. In addition, Koyo submitted photographs of JTEKT’s packaging in order to show that Koyo’s trademark will continue to figure prominently in sales of bearings formerly produced by Koyo Seiko because of the strong reputation and goodwill associated with the Koyo brand. See exhibit G of the February 3, 2006, submission. Koyo observed that its trademark also appears in JTEKT’s corporate guide, as can be seen in exhibit D. Thus, based on the information provided in Koyo’s submission, we find that it is JTEKT’s intent to maintain the suppliers and customer base of Koyo Seiko.

Therefore, we conclude that Koyo’s petition for a changed-circumstances review demonstrates that no major changes have occurred with respect to Koyo Seiko’s management, production facilities, suppliers, or customer base as a result of its merger with Toyoda and name change to JTEKT.

When it concludes that expedited action is warranted, the Department may publish the notice of initiation and preliminary results for a changed-circumstances review concurrently. See 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). See also *Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 69 FR 30878 (June 1, 2004). Based on the information on the record, we have determined that expedition of this changed-circumstances review is warranted. In this case, we preliminarily find that JTEKT is the successor-in-interest to Koyo Seiko and, as such, is entitled to

¹ Koyo clarified in its February 3, 2006, submission that the name of Koyo Corporation of U.S.A. will remain unchanged at this time.

Koyo Seiko's cash-deposit rate with respect to entries of subject merchandise.

Should our final results remain the same as these preliminary results, effective the date of publication of the final results we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assign entries of merchandise produced or exported by JTEKT the antidumping duty cash-deposit rate applicable to Koyo Seiko.

Public Comment

Any interested party may request a hearing within 14 days of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 28 days after the date of publication of this notice or the first working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, which must be limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed not later than 21 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this changed-circumstances review are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument with an electronic version included. Consistent with 19 CFR 351.216(e), we will issue the final results of this changed-circumstances review no later than 270 days after the date on which this review was initiated or within 45 days of publication of these preliminary results if all parties agree to our preliminary finding.

We are issuing and publishing this initiation and preliminary results notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: March 16, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-4224 Filed 3-22-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-831]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews: Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katharine Huang, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone; (202) 482-1271.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce ("The Department") published the preliminary results of the administrative review and new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from the People's Republic of China covering the period November 1, 2003, through October 31, 2004, on November 18, 2005. See *Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Results of New Shipper Reviews*, 70 FR 69942 (November 18, 2005) ("*Preliminary Results*").

Extension of Time Limits for Final Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), and section 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations, the Department shall issue the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the antidumping duty order. The Act further provides that the Department shall issue the final results of review within 120 days after the date on which the notice of the preliminary results was published in the **Federal Register**. However, if the Department determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations allow the Department to extend the 245-day period to 365 days and the 120-day period to 180 days. We have determined that it is not practicable to complete

these reviews by March 18, 2006.¹ Several significant issues were raised in the briefs which warrant further analysis, including the "intermediate-product valuation methodology," which we applied in the *Preliminary Results*, and the surrogate value for garlic bulbs (*i.e.*, the intermediate product). For these reasons, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of these final results by 30 days until no later than Monday, April 17, 2006, which is 150 days from the date on which the notice of the *Preliminary Results* was published.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 16, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-4214 Filed 3-22-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-893]

Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 2006.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("Department") has determined that a request to conduct a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on frozen warmwater shrimp from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), received on February 22, 2006, meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for initiation. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(d), we are initiating a new shipper review for Hai Li Aquatic Co., Ltd. Zhao An, Fujian (also known as Haili Aquatic Co. Ltd. Zhaonan, Fujian) ("Hai Li"). The period of review ("POR") for this new shipper review is July 16, 2004, through January 31, 2006.¹

¹ As noted in the *Preliminary Results*, the two new shipper respondents and the petitioners agreed to waive the time limits applicable to the new shipper reviews and to permit the Department to conduct the new shipper reviews concurrently with the administrative review.

² The antidumping duty order for certain frozen warmwater shrimp from PRC was published on February 1, 2005. See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the People's Republic of*

Continued