

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Tariff Act, based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the weighted-average dumping margins for the period August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2005 to be as follows:

Manufacturer / Exporter	Margin
INI Steel Company	1.91%
Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd.	0.00%

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within thirty days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date per 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. Rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit arguments in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument, and (3) a table of authorities. Further, we would appreciate it if parties submitting case briefs, rebuttal briefs, and written comments provided the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such argument on diskette. The Department will issue final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such case briefs, rebuttal briefs, and written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment

Upon completion of this review the Department will determine, and CBP will assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1) we have calculated importer-specific (or, where the importer was unknown, customer-specific) *ad valorem* assessment rates

for merchandise exported by INI and DSM which is subject to this review. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of the final results of this review. The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003 (68 FR 23954). 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 POR produced by INI and DSM for which they did not know their merchandise would be exported by another company to 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.

Revocation of the Order - Cash Deposits Not Required

On March 15, 2006, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) determined that the revocation of the antidumping duty orders on structural steel beams from Korea would not likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. Consequently, the Department has revoked this order, effective August 18, 2005. See *Revocation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders: Structural Steel Beams from Japan and South Korea*, 71 FR 15375 (March 28, 2006). Therefore, there will be no need to issue new cash deposit instructions for this administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: August 31, 2006.

David M. Spooner,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-14848 Filed 9-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-427-810]

Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty ("CVD") order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products ("CORE") from France for the period January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. We preliminarily find that the net subsidy rate for the company under review is *de minimis*. See the "Preliminary Results of Review" section of this notice, *infra*. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. (See the "Public Comment" section, *infra*).

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 17, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the CVD order on CORE from France. See *Countervailing Duty Order and Amendment to Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products from France*, 58 FR 43759 (August 17, 1993). On August 1, 2005, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this CVD order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 44085 (August 1, 2005). On August 31, 2005, we received a timely request for review from Duferco Coating S.A. and Sorral S.A. (collectively, "Duferco Sorral"), a French producer and exporter of subject merchandise, and from the United States Steel Corporation ("the petitioner").

On September 28, 2005, the Department initiated an administrative review of the CVD order on CORE from France, covering the period January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. See

Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part, 70 FR 56631 (September 28, 2005). On October 4, 2005, the Department issued a questionnaire to Duferco Sorral, the Government of France (“the GOF”), and the European Commission (“the EC”); we received their respective questionnaire responses on December 7, 2005, and December 13, 2005. On April 27, June 14, June 21, July 13, July 17, and August 4, 2006, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Duferco Sorral, the GOF, and the EC. We received supplemental questionnaire responses from Duferco Sorral on May 25, July 7, July 26, and August 9, 2006; from the GOF on May 25, July 7, July 26, and August 18, 2006; and from the EC on May 22, June 27, and July 20, 2006.

On April 17, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an extension of the deadline for the preliminary results. See *Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France and the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 71 FR 19714 (April 17, 2006).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. The only company subject to this review is Duferco Sorral. This review covers 18 programs.

Scope of the Order

This order covers cold-rolled (“cold-reduced”) carbon steel flat-rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) under item numbers

7210.30.0030, 7210.30.0060,
7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030,
7210.49.0090, 7210.61.0000,

7210.69.0000, 7210.70.6030,
7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090,
7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000,
7210.90.9000, 7212.20.0000,
7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090,
7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000,
7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000,
7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000,
7215.90.1000, 7215.90.3000,
7215.90.5000, 7217.20.1500,
7217.30.1530, 7217.30.1560,
7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030,
7217.90.5060, 7217.90.5090.

Included in this order are corrosion-resistant flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (i.e., products which have been “worked after rolling”) for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this order are flat-rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (“terne plate”), or both chromium and chromium oxides (“tin-free steel”), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded from this order are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded from this order are certain clad stainless flat-rolled products, which are three-layered corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat-rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat-rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%-60%-20% ratio.

These HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

Period of Review

The period for which we are measuring subsidies is January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004.

Background and Methodology Information

I. Background

A. Company History

Duferco Sorral¹ is wholly owned by Duferco Belgium S.A. (“Duferco Belgium”), a Belgian holding company which is part of the Duferco Group, a Swiss conglomerate. Duferco Sorral is affiliated with Duferco S.A., a Swiss

¹ Duferco is located in the Picardie region, which is the northern part of France. Sorral is located in the Alsace region, which is on the eastern border of France. There are 26 regions in France.

corporation that buys and sells steel products of the Duferco Group, including Duferco Sorral. For sales of CORE to the United States during the POR, Duferco Sorral sold the subject merchandise to Duferco S.A., which then resold the products to Duferco Steel, Inc., an affiliated U.S. sales company.

Duferco Belgium purchased Duferco (formerly known as Beator S.A. (“Beator”))² and Sorral from Arcelor S.A. in 2003. Arcelor was created through the merger of the French company Usinor S.A. (“Usinor”)³ with the Luxembourg company Arbed S.A. and the Spanish company Aceralia Corporacion Siderurgica S.A. The merger became effective in February 2002, upon approval of the EC. As a condition for the merger, the EC required the divestiture of certain holdings, including Usinor’s cold-rolling and electro-galvanizing facilities in Beator, France (i.e., Beator) and the hot-dipped galvanized and organic coating facilities in Strasbourg, France (i.e., Sorral).⁴ The purpose of the divestiture was to ensure that Usinor/Arcelor no longer controlled the facilities and could not hinder competition in the steel industry. According to the EC’s instructions, the purchaser of Beator and Sorral was to be a viable existing or potential competitor, independent of the parties, and having the incentive to maintain and develop the divested businesses as active competitive forces in competition with the seller.⁵ Arcelor proposed Duferco Belgium as a suitable purchaser for Beator and Sorral. In February 2003, the EC approved the private-to-private sale between Arcelor and Duferco Belgium.

B. Change-in-Ownership

² Beator S.A. was transformed into Duferco Coating S.A. on March 31, 2004, by the shareholders. This transformation was retroactive to October 1, 2003, the opening day of the company’s fiscal year.

³ Usinor, a formerly government-owned entity, was the only company reviewed in the underlying investigation. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from France*, 58 FR 37304 (July 9, 1993). Usinor was later privatized between 1995 and 1997. See *Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Section 129 Determination: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order*, dated October 24, 2003.

⁴ See “Non-Confidential Version of the Commitments to the European Commission: Case No. COMP/ECSC 1351 - Aceralia/Arbed/Usinor,” at 1-2, contained within the June 27, 2006, Memorandum to the File concerning the Placement of Public Documents on the Record of the Review. This public document is available on the public record in the Central Records Unit (“CRU”), located in the main Commerce Building in room B-099.

⁵ *Id.* at 4-5.

As explained in the "Company History" section above, Duferco Belgium purchased Beator and Sorral, previously Usinor facilities, from Arcelor. The Department has previously determined that Usinor received countervailable subsidies. See Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Section 129 Determination: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order, dated October 24, 2003. In this review, Duferco Sorral reported that Beator received subsidies over a 15-year Average Useful Life ("AUL").

For purposes of these preliminary results, we find that the benefits from any allocable, non-recurring, pre-sale subsidies to Beator and Sorral from the GOF and the EC are fully extinguished prior to the POR. Therefore, as this change in ownership could have no impact on any countervailable subsidy benefits in the POR, we are not making any findings in this review as to the nature or terms of this sale.

II. Subsidies Valuation Information

A. Allocation Period

Under 19 CFR 351.524(b), non-recurring subsidies are allocated over a period corresponding to the AUL of the renewable physical assets used to produce the subject merchandise. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(d)(2), there is a rebuttable presumption that the AUL will be taken from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service's 1977 Class Life Asset Depreciation Range System ("IRS Tables"), as updated by the Department of Treasury. For the subject merchandise, the IRS Tables prescribe an AUL of 15 years. No interested party has claimed that the AUL of 15 years is unreasonable.

Further, for non-recurring subsidies, we have applied the "0.5 percent expense test" described in 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2). Under this test, we compare the amount of subsidies approved under a given program in a particular year to sales (total sales or total export sales, as appropriate) for the same year. If the amount of subsidies is less than 0.5 percent of the relevant sales, then the benefits are allocated to the year of receipt rather than allocated over the AUL period.

Analysis of Programs

I. Program Preliminarily Determined Not To Confer Countervailable Benefits During the POR

A. European Regional Development Fund

The European Regional Development Fund ("ERDF") was created pursuant to

the authority in Article 130 of the Treaty of Rome to reduce regional disparities in socio-economic performance within the European Community. The ERDF program provides grants to companies located within regions that meet the criteria of Objective 1 (underdeveloped regions), Objective 2 (declining industrial regions), or Objective 5(b) (declining agricultural regions). Duferco Sorral reported that Beator was approved for an ERDF grant under Objective 2 in 1998 and 1999.⁶

In the *Pasta from Italy Investigation*, the Department determined that ERDF grants constitute a countervailable subsidy within the meaning of section 771(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Pasta from Italy*, 61 FR 30288, 30294 (June 14, 1996) ("*Pasta from Italy Investigation*"); see also *Certain Pasta from Italy: Final Results of the Seventh Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 70657 (December 7, 2004) ("*Pasta from Italy 7th Review*"), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at "European Regional Development Fund Grants" within "Programs Determined to Confer Subsidies During the POR" section. Specifically, the Department determined that the ERDF grants are a direct transfer of funds from the government bestowing a benefit in the amount of the grant within the meaning of section 771(5)(D)(i) of the Act. The ERDF grants were also found to be regionally specific within the meaning of section 771(5A)(D)(iv) of the Act. In the *Pasta from Italy Investigation*, we determined that the ERDF grants are non-recurring benefits. In this review, no new information was provided on this program that would warrant reconsideration of our determination that these grants confer a countervailable subsidy or cause us to depart from treating the grants as non-recurring.

Therefore, consistent with the *Pasta from Italy Investigation* and *Pasty from Italy 7th Review*, we are treating Beator's ERDF grants as non-recurring. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2), we have applied the "0.5 percent expense test."⁷ The calculations demonstrate that the total amount approved for each grant is less than 0.5 percent of Beator's relevant sales (*i.e.*, total sales) for the respective year in which each grant was approved.

⁶ See Duferco Sorral's December 7, 2005, questionnaire response at 12. See also the GOF's December 7, 2005, questionnaire response at "European Development Regional Fund" section.

⁷ For more information, see "Allocation Period," supra.

Because the amount of subsidies is less than 0.5 percent of the relevant sales, we have expensed the benefit from each ERDF grant in the year of receipt rather than allocate the benefits over the AUL period. See the August 31, 2006, Memorandum to the File concerning the Preliminary Calculations for the 2004 Administrative Review of Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France.⁸ Therefore, no benefit from the ERDF grants was conferred to Duferco Sorral during the POR.

II. Programs Preliminarily Determined Not To Be Countervailable

A. Worker Training Contracts⁹

B. Seine-Normandy Water Agency Assistance

The Seine-Normandy Water Agency ("SNWA"), a public institution with financial autonomy,¹⁰ is administered jointly by the Ministries of the Environment and Finance.¹¹ The mission of SNWA, one of six water agencies in France, is to reduce and prevent pollution of the Seine River. To that end, SNWA provides financial assistance in the form of grants and loans to companies located along the Seine for projects dedicated to protecting, increasing, and improving the water resources, attaining quality requirements, and protecting against flooding (collectively referred hereto as "pollution prevention program").¹² Pursuant to Article 14 and Article 14-1 of the Water Law of 1964, all polluting

⁸ A public version of the document is available on the public record in the CRU.

⁹ In prior cases, the Department found Worker Training Contracts not to be countervailable. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from France*, 64 FR 30774, 30782 (June 8, 1999) ("*Sheet and Strip from France*") at "Work/ Training Contracts." See also *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate from France*, 64 FR 73277, 73282 ("*CTL France*") at "Investment/ Operating Subsidies." If a program is determined to be non-countervailable in a previous proceeding, the Department will not normally reconsider such a determination in future proceedings absent evidence potentially contradicting that determination. We preliminarily find that there is no information on the record of the instant case, including this segment of the proceeding, that warrants a change to our earlier finding that this program is not specific and, therefore, not countervailable.

¹⁰ See Article L-213-5 of the Environment Code at Annex 1 contained in the GOF's May 25, 2006, questionnaire response.

¹¹ See Chapter 19 entitled "Seine-Normandy Basin, France" of UNESCO's study "The 1st World Water Development Report: Water for People, Water for Life," at footnote 17 on page 438, which is contained within the June 27, 2006, Memorandum to the File concerning "Placement of Public Documents on the Record of the Review."

¹² See the GOF's July 7, 2006, questionnaire response at Annex 2.

companies having plants located in the basin of the Seine River, regardless of their sector of activity, have the legal obligation to enter into the SNWA consortium and fund its activities through the payment of levies.¹³ Article 14–1 establishes that the levies are proportional to the quantity of polluting waste the company is likely to produce during the production cycle. Companies which are in arrears are ineligible to receive assistance for pollution reduction projects. Duferco Sorral reported that Beautor received grants and long-term loans from SNWA over a 15-year AUL, and that Duferco Sorral itself received a grant in 2004.

We analyzed whether the benefits provided by SNWA's pollution prevention program are specific "in law or fact" within the meaning of section 771(5A) of the Act. We preliminarily determine that, under section 771(5A)(D)(ii) of the Act, the program is not *de jure* specific according to the criteria for determining which companies are eligible for benefits. These criteria are set forth in the Water Act of 1964 and companion legislation.

We next examined whether the pollution prevention assistance distributed by SNWA is *de facto* specific. Pursuant to section 771(5A)(D)(iii) of the Act, a subsidy is *de facto* specific if one or more of the following factors exists: (1) the number of enterprises, industries, or groups which use a subsidy is limited; (2) there is predominant use of a subsidy by an enterprise, industry, or group; (3) an enterprise, industry, or group receives a disproportionately large amount of the subsidy; or (4) the manner in which the authority providing a subsidy has exercised discretion indicates that an enterprise, industry, or group is favored over others.

For the Picardie region,¹⁴ where Beautor/Duferco is located, the GOF reported the number of companies which received assistance from SNWA for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004. With the exception of 2003, in which 47 companies received assistance, 60 companies or more were recipients of assistance provided by SNWA in each of the other years.¹⁵ The GOF also reported that no applicant was rejected. The amount of assistance provided to the steel industry ranged from a high of 8.5 percent in 2001 to a

low of 0.4 percent in 2003.¹⁶ During the POR, steel companies received assistance of € 69,000 for surface treatment, which was approximately 2.0 percent of the assistance provided by SNWA to companies in the Picardie region.¹⁷ For 2004, the industrial groups located in the eight regions that compose SNWA's territory received pollution assistance totaling € 48.6 million, of which € 25.8 million was loans and € 22.8 million was grants.¹⁸ Economic activity along the Seine River is diverse, consisting of the agro-food, automobile, chemical, metallurgy, oil refining, and paper industries in addition to farming and wine-production.¹⁹

On this basis of these facts, we preliminarily find that the pollution prevention program is not limited based on the number of users nor is Duferco Sorral or the steel industry a predominant or disproportionate recipient of the total funding. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine that this program is not specific and, therefore, we do not reach the issue of whether there is a financial contribution or benefit. Therefore, this program does not confer countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 771(5) of the Act.²⁰

III. Programs Preliminarily Determined Not To Be Used

We preliminarily determine that Duferco Sorral did not apply for or receive benefits under these programs during the POR:

- A. Investment Subsidies
- B. Long-Term Loans from Fonds de Developpement Economique et Social and Caisse Francaise de Developpement Industriel
- C. Assistance from Delegation a l'Amenagement du Territoire et a l'Action Regionale

¹⁶ See the GOF's July 26, 2006, questionnaire response for 2001 at Annex 1, and July 7, 2006, questionnaire response for 2004 at Annex 1.

¹⁷ See the GOF's May 25, 2006, questionnaire response "Assistance provided by the Seine-Normandy Water Agency" section and Annex 2.

¹⁸ See August 10, 2006, Memorandum to the File concerning "Placement of Public Documents on the Record of the Review – Seine-Normandy Water Agency's Annual Report."

¹⁹ See Chapter 19 entitled "Seine-Normandy Basin, France" of UNESCO's study "The 1st World Water Development Report: Water for People, Water for Life," at page 432, which is contained within the June 27, 2006, Memorandum to the File concerning "Placement of Public Documents on the Record of the Review."

²⁰ Even if we were preliminarily to determine that the program was specific for years prior to 2001, the grants which Beautor received would have been expensed in the year of receipt with no benefits allocable to the POR and the benefit provided by the long-term loans is less than 0.005 percent of Duferco Sorral's total sales for the POR.

D. Financing from the Caisse des Depots et Consignations
E. Preferential Loans from Local Economic (Regional) Development Agencies

F. Regional Development Incentives
G. European Coal and Steel Community Article 54 Loans
H. European Social Fund
I. ECSC Article 56 Conversion Loans, Interest Rebates, and Restructuring Grants

J. Export Financing
K. Grants from the River Dock Agency
L. Loans from the Ministry of Research & Industry
M. New Community Investment Loans

N. Tax Subsidies under Article 39
O. Youthstart.

Preliminary Results of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4)(i), we have calculated a subsidy rate for Duferco Sorral for calendar year 2004. We preliminarily determine that the net countervailable subsidy rate is 0.00 percent *ad valorem*.

If the final results of this review remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") within 15 days of publication of the final results of this review, to liquidate without regard to countervailing duties all shipments of subject merchandise produced by Duferco Sorral entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. The Department will also instruct CBP not to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties on all shipments of the subject merchandise produced by Duferco Sorral, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

We will also instruct CBP to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company. Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by this order are those established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding. *See Certain Steel Products from France: Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Determination of Countervailing Duty Investigation*, 64 FR 67561 (December 2, 1999). These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested.

¹³ See the GOF's May 25, 2006, questionnaire response at Annex 1 for Article 14 and 14-1.

¹⁴ Picardie is one of the 26 regions of France and one of the eight regions in SNWA's territory.

¹⁵ See the GOF's July 26, 2006, questionnaire response at "Assistance provided by the Seine-Normandy Water Agency" section.

Public Comment

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(b), the Department will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within five days after the date of the public announcement of this notice. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309, interested parties may submit written comments in response to these preliminary results. Unless otherwise indicated by the Department, case briefs must be submitted within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, must be submitted no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs, unless otherwise specified by the Department. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties submitting case and/or rebuttal briefs are requested to provide to the Department copies of the public version on disk. Case and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f). Also, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, interested parties may request a public hearing on arguments to be raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Unless the Secretary specifies otherwise, the hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the date for submission of rebuttal briefs, that is, 37 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results.

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii), are due. See 19 CFR 351.305(b)(3). The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of arguments made in any case or rebuttal briefs.

This administrative review is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 31, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-14847 Filed 9-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[C-489-806]

Certain Pasta from Turkey: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On June 9, 2006, the U.S. Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta from Turkey for the period January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. See *Certain Pasta From Turkey: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 33439 (June 9, 2006) ("*Preliminary Results*"). We preliminarily found that Gidasa Sabanci Gida Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. ("Gidasa") did not receive countervailable subsidies during the period of review. We did not receive any comments on our preliminary results, and we have made no revisions.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey Twyman or Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3534 and (202) 482-0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On July 24, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the countervailing duty order on certain pasta from Turkey. See *Notice of Countervailing Duty Order: Certain Pasta from Turkey*, 61 FR 38546 (July 24, 1996). On June 9, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta from Turkey for the period January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004. See *Preliminary Results*. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review of the order covers Gidasa, a producer and exporter of subject merchandise.

In the *Preliminary Results*, we invited interested parties to submit briefs or request a hearing. The Department did not conduct a hearing in this review because none was requested, and no briefs were received.

Scope of Order

Covered by the order are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds (2.27 kilograms) or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastases, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this order is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons or polyethylene or polypropylene bags, of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the order are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under subheading 1902.19.20 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Scope Ruling

To date, the Department has issued the following scope ruling:

On October 26, 1998, the Department self-initiated a scope inquiry to determine whether a package weighing over five pounds as a result of allowable industry tolerances may be within the scope of the countervailing duty order. On May 24, 1999, we issued a final scope ruling finding that, effective October 26, 1998, pasta in packages weighing or labeled up to (and including) five pounds four ounces is within the scope of the countervailing duty order. See Memorandum from John Brinkmann to Richard Moreland, dated May 24, 1999, which is on file in the Central Records Unit ("CRU") in Room B-099 of the main Commerce building.

Period of Review

The period of review ("POR") for which we are measuring subsidies is from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004.

Final Results of Review

As noted above, the Department received no comments concerning the preliminary results; consistent with the preliminary results, we find that Gidasa did not receive countervailable subsidies during the POR. As there have been no changes or comments from the preliminary results we are not attaching a Decision Memorandum to this **Federal Register** notice. For further details of the