

market gross unit price net of discounts. See *FET Calculation Memorandum*.

FET reported its U.S. credit expenses based on the New Taiwan Dollar denominated gross unit price. Because FET's U.S. sales were invoiced in U.S. dollars, we recalculated FET's U.S. credit expenses by applying the standard credit formula to FET's reported U.S. dollar denominated gross unit price. See *FET Calculation Memorandum*.

We calculated NV based on the price to unaffiliated customers. We deducted discounts, where applicable, from the gross unit price. We made adjustments for packing expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and 773(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Act. We also made adjustments, consistent with section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act, for inland freight from the plant to the customer. In addition, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale ("COS"), in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We made COS adjustments, where appropriate, by deducting direct selling expenses incurred on home market sales (i.e., credit expenses and warranties) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (i.e., credit expenses and other credit expenses).

Preliminary Results of the Review

We find that the following dumping margin exists for the period May 1, 2004, through April 30, 2005:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage
Far Eastern Textile Limited	3.13

Public Comment

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 42 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding 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.

The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review,

including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rates

Upon completion of the administrative review, the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

FET has indicated that it was not the importer of record for any of its sales to the United States during the POR. FET reported the name of its U.S. customer as the importer of record for all U.S. sales. As such, FET did not report the entered value for any of its U.S. sales. Accordingly, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates for the merchandise in question by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of those sales. To determine whether the duty assessment rates were *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we calculated importer-specific ad valorem ratios based on the estimated entered value.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.50 percent). The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to CBP.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the period of review produced by the respondent for which it did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of PSF from Taiwan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as

provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review (except no cash deposit will be required if its weighted-average margin is *de minimis*, i.e., less than 0.5 percent); (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less-than-fair-value investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received an individual rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will be 7.31 percent, the "all others" rate established in *PSF Orders*.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 31, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-8762 Filed 6-5-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-802]

Final Results of Five-Year Sunset Review of Suspended Antidumping Duty Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation

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

SUMMARY: On July 1, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated the second

sunset review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation ("Suspension Agreement") 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 38101 (July 1, 2005) ("*Sunset Initiation*"). On January 17, 2006, the Department determined that it would conduct a full sunset review of the Suspension Agreement. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the Suspension Agreement on uranium from the Russian Federation ("Russia") would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 6, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sally Gannon or Aishe Allen, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0162, or 482-0172, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope of the Review

According to the June 3, 1992, preliminary determination, the suspended investigation of uranium from Russia encompassed one class or kind of merchandise.¹ The merchandise included natural uranium in the form of uranium ores and concentrates; natural uranium metal and natural uranium compounds; alloys, dispersions (including cermets), ceramic products, and mixtures containing natural uranium or natural uranium compound; uranium enriched in U235 and its compounds; alloys dispersions (including cermets), ceramic products and mixtures containing uranium enriched in U235 or compounds or uranium enriched in U235; and any other forms of uranium within the same class or kind. The uranium subject to this investigation was provided for under subheadings 2612.10.00.00, 2844.10.10.00, 2844.10.20.10, 2844.10.20.25, 2844.10.20.50,

2844.10.20.55, 2844.10.50, 2844.20.00.10, 2844.20.00.20, 2844.20.00.30, and 2844.20.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS").² In addition, the Department preliminarily determined that HEU (uranium enriched to 20 percent or greater in the isotope uranium-235) is not within the scope of the investigation. On October 30, 1992, the Department issued a suspension of the antidumping duty investigation of uranium from Russia and an amendment of the preliminary determination.³ The notice amended the scope of the investigation to include HEU.⁴ Imports of uranium ores and concentrates, natural uranium compounds, and all other forms of enriched uranium were classifiable under HTSUS subheadings 2612.10.00, 2844.10.20, 2844.20.00, respectively. Imports of natural uranium metal and forms of natural uranium other than compounds were classifiable under HTSUS subheadings 2844.10.10 and 2844.10.50.⁵

In addition, Section III of the Suspension Agreement provides that uranium ore from Russia that is milled into U3O8 and/or converted into UF6 in another country prior to direct and/or indirect importation into the United States is considered uranium from Russia and is subject to the terms of the Suspension Agreement, regardless of any subsequent modification or blending.⁶ In addition, Section M.1 of the Suspension Agreement in no way prevents Russia from selling directly or indirectly any or all of the HEU in existence at the time of the signing of the agreement and/or LEU produced in Russia from HEU to the Department of Energy ("DOE"), its governmental successor, its contractors, or U.S. private parties acting in association with DOE or the USEC and in a manner not inconsistent with the Suspension Agreement between the United States and Russia concerning the disposition of HEU resulting from the

dismantlement of nuclear weapons in Russia.

There were three amendments to the Suspension Agreement on Russian uranium. In particular, the second amendment to the Suspension Agreement, published on November 4, 1996, provided for, among other things, the sale in the United States of the natural uranium feed associated with the Russian LEU derived from HEU and included within the scope of the Suspension Agreement Russian uranium which has been enriched in a third country prior to importation into the United States.⁷

On August 6, 1999, USEC, Inc. and its subsidiary, United States Enrichment Corporation (collectively, "USEC") requested that the Department issue a scope ruling to clarify that enriched uranium located in Kazakhstan at the time of the dissolution of the Soviet Union is within the scope of the Russian Suspension Agreement. Respondent interested parties filed an opposition to the scope request on August 27, 1999. That scope request is pending before the Department.

Statute and Regulations

This review is being conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations") and in CFR Part 351 (1999) in general.

Background

On April 3, 2006, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the Suspension Agreement pursuant to Section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act") (63 FR 16560) (*Preliminary Sunset Notice*). This notice was accompanied by the "Issues and Decision Memo for the Sunset Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation; Preliminary Results," from Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, (March 24, 2006), which can be found at <http://>

⁷ See *Amendments to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation*, 61 FR 56665 (November 4, 1996). According to the amendment, the latter modification remained in effect until October 3, 1998.

¹ The Department based its analysis of the comments on class or kind submitted during the proceeding and determined that the product under investigation constitutes a single class or kind of merchandise. The Department based its analysis on the "Diversified" criteria (see *Diversified Products Corp. v. United States*, 6 CIT 1555 (1983); see also *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan*; and *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value: Uranium from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Georgia, Moldova and Turkmenistan*, 57 FR 23380, 23382 (June 3, 1992).

² See *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan*; and *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value: Uranium from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Georgia, Moldova and Turkmenistan*, 57 FR 23380, 23381 (June 3, 1992).

³ See *Antidumping; Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan; Suspension of Investigations and Amendment of Preliminary Determinations*, 57 FR 49220 (October 30, 1992).

⁴ See *Id.* at 49235.

⁵ See *Id.*

⁶ See *Id.* at 49235.

ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/summary/russia/E6-4738-1.pdf. In our preliminary results, we found that revocation of the antidumping duty Suspension Agreement on uranium from Russia would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the weighted-average margin of 115.82 percent for all producers/exporters from Russia.

On April 17, 2006, we received case briefs on behalf of Power Resources, Inc. ("PRI") and Crow Butte Resources, Inc. ("Crow Butte"); USEC Inc. and United States Enrichment Corporation (collectively, "USEC"); the Ad Hoc Utilities Group ("AHUG"); and AO Techsnabexport ("Tenex").⁸ On April 24, 2006, we received rebuttal briefs on behalf of Power Resources and Crow Butte, USEC, and AHUG. On April 26, 2006, USEC requested that the Department reject AHUG's rebuttal brief because it contained new information not permissible under the Department's regulations. On May 24, 2006, the Department notified AHUG that it was returning AHUG's rebuttal brief because it contained information not timely filed under the regulations and offered AHUG the opportunity to redact the new information and to re-submit the brief to the Department within two days. On May 26, 2006, AHUG re-submitted its rebuttal brief; however it failed to redact all references to the new information that appeared in its May 24, 2006 rebuttal brief. We requested again that AHUG re-submit its rebuttal brief without the references to the new information, by the close-of-business on May 30, 2006. On, May 30, 2006, AHUG filed its rebuttal brief and redacted all new information. Additionally, on May 26, 2006, AHUG submitted a letter to the Department which also contained new and untimely filed information. On May 30, 2006, the Department notified AHUG that it was returning this additional May 26, 2006 letter because it contained information not timely filed under the Department's regulations. No interested party requested a hearing in this sunset review.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Sunset Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation; Final Results" from Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant

Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration (May 30, 2006) ("Final Results Decision Memorandum"), which is adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Final Results Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping, scope of the subject merchandise, and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail were the Suspension Agreement to be terminated. Parties may find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Final Results Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Final Results Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that termination of the Suspension Agreement on uranium from Russia would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margin:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Russia-Wide	115.82

This notice also serves as 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 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This sunset review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 30, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-8758 Filed 6-5-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-580-818]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Korea: Final Results of Expedited Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of the Countervailing Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On November 1, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of the second five-year sunset review of the countervailing duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea ("Korea"), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 70 FR 65884 (November 1, 2005) ("Second Sunset Review"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, and an inadequate response from respondent interested parties (in this case, no response), the Department has conducted an expedited sunset review of this order pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(B). As a result of this sunset review, the Department finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the level indicated in the "Final Results of Review" section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 6, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephanie Moore or Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3692 or (202) 482-5439, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The countervailing duty order which covers CORE from Korea, was published in the **Federal Register** on August 17, 1993. See *Countervailing Duty Orders and Amendments to Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from Korea*, 58 FR 43752 (August 17, 1993). On November 1, 2005, the Department initiated the second sunset review of the

⁸ We note that Tenex did not file either a waiver of intent to participate in this sunset review pursuant to Section 351.218(d)(2) of the Department's sunset regulations or a complete substantive response to the notice of initiation pursuant to Section 351.218(d)(3).