starting price was not in accordance with law. *Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, 337 F.3d 1373, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The CAFC reversed the CIT's decision to the extent that it held the opposite on any of these issues. The Department filed its fourth remand redetermination on December 2, 2003 and changed its methodology according to the CAFC's reversal of the CIT's decision on U.S. starting price and the use of partial adverse facts available for Nippon's weight conversion factor. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States 99–08–00466* (December 2, 2003) (*Fourth Remand Redetermination*). On February 22, 2006, the CIT sustained the Department's *Fourth Remand Redetermination*. *See Nippon Steel Corporation v. United States*, SLIP OP. 06–23 (CIT February 22, 2006).

In addition to the court decisions discussed above, the Government of Japan (GOJ) appealed, among other issues, the Department's application of adverse facts available for Nippon's weight conversion factor to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The GOJ did not appeal the U.S. starting price issue to the WTO. In its report, the WTO Appellate Body ruled that the Department acted inconsistently with the Antidumping Agreement in applying ''facts available'' to Nippon with regard to the reported weight conversion factor and found that the Department should have used Nippon's untimely submitted, actual weight conversion factor. The Department implemented the WTO Appellate Body's findings in a Section 129 Determination. *See Notice of Determination Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreement Act: Antidumping Measures on Certain Hot–Rolled, Flat–Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from Japan*, 67 FR 71936, 71939 (December 3, 2002) (*129 Determination*). The effective date of the *129 Determination* is November 22, 2002.

Because the effective date of the *129 Determination* predates the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*, the *Fourth Remand Redetermination* includes an analysis of the effect of the 129 Determination on the antidumping duty margin. *See Fourth Remand Redetermination* at 2. Accordingly, the Department calculated two margins for Nippon in the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*. The first margin, 21.12 percent, reflects the use of the same adverse inference made in the original investigation with respect to the margins for Nippon's theoretical weight sales, but changes the starting price for U.S. sales from converted yen to reported U.S. dollars. This margin applies to Nippon's unreviewed entries made prior to November 22, 2002, the effective date of the *129 Determination*. The second margin, 19.95 percent, reflects the various changes made to the original investigation margin as a result of the *129 Determination* and includes the use of Nippon's actual reported weight conversion factor, but also reflects the use of the reported U.S. dollar as the U.S. starting price. This margin applies to Nippon's unreviewed entries made on or after the effective date of the *129 Determination*, November 22, 2002.

AMENDED FINAL DETERMINATION

Because no party appealed the CIT's February 22, 2006 decision, there is now a final and conclusive decision in the court proceeding and we are thus amending the *Final Determination* to reflect the results of the *Fourth Remand Redetermination*, which addresses the CAFC's ruling as well as the changes to the margin pursuant to the *129 Determination*. The recalculated margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
From February 19, 1999 through November 21, 2002.	
Nippon Steel Corporation	**21.12%**
On or after November 22, 2002.	
Nippon Steel Corporation	**19.95%**

Accordingly, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e) and effective as of the publication of this notice, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to terminate the suspension of liquidation and proceed with liquidation of all appropriate entries entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after February 19, 1999, and before November 22, 2002 (the effective date of the *129 Determination*) at the rate of 21.12 percent, and all entries entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after November 22, 2002 (the effective date of the *129 Determination*) at the rate of 19.95 percent.

CASH DEPOSIT REQUIREMENTS

The Department will direct CBP to require, on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, a cash deposit rate of 19.95 percent for the subject merchandise. This cash deposit requirement, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of an administrative review of this order.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 735(d) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: May 12, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–7603 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–856]

Synthetic Indigo from the People's Republic of China: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On May 2, 2005, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated and the International Trade Commission (''ITC'') instituted the sunset review of the antidumping duty (''AD'') order on synthetic indigo from the People's Republic of China (''the PRC'') pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). *See Notice of Initiation of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 70 FR 22632 (May 2, 2005) and *Institution of a Five-year Review concerning the Antidumping Duty Order on Synthetic Indigo from China*, 70 FR 22701 (May 2, 2005). Pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, the ITC determined that revocation of this AD order would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. *See Synthetic Indigo from China*, 71 FR 26109 (May 3, 2006). Therefore, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(1)(iii), the Department is revoking the AD order on synthetic indigo from the PRC.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hilary E. Sadler, Esq., Office 8 of AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4340.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope of the Order

The products subject to this order are the deep blue synthetic vat dye known

as synthetic indigo and those of its derivatives designated commercially as ''Vat Blue 1.'' Included are Vat Blue 1 (synthetic indigo), Color Index No. 73000, and its derivatives, pre–reduced indigo or indigo white (Color Index No. 73001) and solubilized indigo (Color Index No. 73002). The subject merchandise may be sold in any form (*e.g.*, powder, granular, paste, liquid, or solution) and in any strength. Synthetic indigo and its derivatives subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 3204.15.10.00, 3204.15.40.00 or 3204.15.80.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the order is dispositive.

Background

On June 19, 2000, the Department issued an AD order on synthetic indigo from the PRC. *See Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Synthetic Indigo from the People's Republic of China, 65 FR 37961, amended by Notice of Amendment of Antidumping Duty Order: Synthetic Indigo from the People's Republic of China*, 65 FR 39128 (June 23, 2000). Pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218, the Department initiated and the ITC instituted the sunset review of this order by publishing the notice of the initiation in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 22632 (May 2, 2005) and 70 FR 22701 (May 2, 2005)). As a result of its review, the Department found that revocation of the AD order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order to be revoked. *See Synthetic Indigo: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 70 FR 53165 (September 7, 2005). On March 23, 2006, the ITC determined that revocation of the AD order on synthetic indigo from the PRC would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Synthetic Indigo from China*, 71 FR 26109 (May 3, 2006) and USITC Publication 3846 (April 2006), Investigation No. 731–TA–851 (Review).

Determination to Revoke

As a result of the determination by the ITC that revocation of this AD order is not likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States, the Department is revoking the AD order on synthetic indigo from the PRC, pursuant to section 751(d) of the Act. Pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(2)(i), the effective date of revocation is June 19, 2005 (*i.e.*, the fifth anniversary of the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of the AD order). The Department will notify U.S. Customs and Border Protection to discontinue suspension of liquidation and collection of cash deposits on entries of the subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse on or after June 19, 2005, the effective date of revocation of the AD order. The Department will complete any pending administrative reviews of these findings or order and will conduct administrative reviews of subject merchandise entered prior to the effective date of revocation in response to appropriately filed requests for review.

This five-year sunset review and notice are in accordance with section 751(d)(2) and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 11, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–7602 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; Notice of Suspension of Extraordinary Challenge Committee

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of suspension of Extraordinary Challenge Committee to review the binational NAFTA Panel decisions of August 13, 2003; June 7, 2004; Second Remand of December 1, 2004; Third Remand of May 23, 2005; Fourth Remand of October 5, 2005; Fifth Remand of March 17, 2006; and Notice of Final Panel Action of March 28, 2006 in the matter of Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada, Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination, Secretariat File No. USA/CDA–2002–1904–03.

SUMMARY: On April 27, 2006, the Office of the United States Trade Representative filed a Request for an Extraordinary Challenge Committee to review decisions as stated above with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Committee review was requested of the final affirmative countervailing duty determination made by the International Trade Administration, respecting Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada. These determinations were published in the **Federal Register**. An agreement to suspend the proceedings was filed with the NAFTA Secretariat on May 11, 2006 on behalf of the United States and Canadian Governments. The NAFTA Secretariat Case Number ECC–2006–1904–01USA was assigned to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caratina L. Alston, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement (''Agreement'') establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* (''Rules''). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686).

A Request for an Extraordinary Challenge Committee was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on April 27, 2006, requesting panel review of the final affirmative countervailing duty determination as described above. An agreement to suspend the requested ECC was filed on May 11, 2006 on behalf of the United States and Canadian Governments.

Dated: May 12, 2006.

Caratina L. Alston,

U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. E6–7537 Filed 5–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–GT–P