

product, we relied on rates derived from the financial statements of Pidilite Industries, Ltd., an Indian producer of comparable merchandise. We applied these ratios to Hanchem's costs (determined as noted above) for materials, labor, and energy. See Factor Valuation Memorandum and Preliminary Calculation Memorandum.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the 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

The weighted-average dumping margin is as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percentage
Tianjin Hanchem International Trading Co., Ltd.	0.00

Disclosure

The Department will disclose calculations performed for these preliminary results to the parties within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will generally be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. See 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Further, parties submitting written comments should provide the Department with an additional copy of those comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any comments, and at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rates

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all

appropriate entries. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate, where applicable, the importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of the dumping margins calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those same sales. We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis*.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For Hanchem, the cash deposit rate will be that established in the final results of this review (except, if the rate is zero or *de minimis*, no cash deposit will be required); (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 217.94 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporters that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next 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 these preliminary results of review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.221(b).

Dated: November 1, 2006.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-18787 Filed 11-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-274-804)

Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On December 1, 2005, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and alloy steel wire rod ("wire rod") from Trinidad and Tobago for the period of review ("POR") October 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005.

We preliminarily determine that during the POR, Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited ("MSPL") and its affiliates Mittal Steel North America Inc. ("MSNA") and Mittal Walker Wire Inc. (collectively "Mittal") did not make sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value ("NV") (*i.e.*, sales were made at *de minimis* dumping margins). If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to liquidate appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments in this segment of the proceeding should also submit with them: (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the comments. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an electronic version of the public version of any such comments on diskette.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis McClure or Stephanie Moore, 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) 482-5973 or (202) 482-3692, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago; see *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 (“*Wire Rod Orders*”). On October 3, 2005, we published in the **Federal Register** the *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 57558.

We received timely requests for review from petitioners¹, and Mittal², in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2). On December 1, 2005, we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period October 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005, naming Mittal as the respondent. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Deferral of Administrative Reviews*, 70 FR 72107 (December 1, 2005). On December 21, 2005, we sent a questionnaire to Mittal.³

Mittal submitted its responses to section A of the Department’s questionnaire on February 10, 2006, and to sections B through E on February 21, 2006. On March 2, 6, and 14, 2006, the petitioners submitted comments on Mittal’s questionnaire response.

On March 16, 2006, the Department issued a section A through C supplemental questionnaire to Mittal. We received the responses to the supplemental questionnaire on April 24, and May 1, 2006. We issued a second supplemental questionnaire for sections A and D on April 17, 2006. We received the response to the second supplemental questionnaire on May 22,

2006. On May 30, 2006, the petitioners submitted comments on the April 24, 2006, supplemental sales questionnaire response. On June 21, 2006, we issued a third supplemental questionnaire to Mittal. We received the response to the third supplemental questionnaire on July 12, 2006.

On September 15, 2006, we met with the petitioners regarding these preliminary results. See *Ex Parte Meeting Memos from Stephanie Moore to the File* dated September 15, 2006, and October 4, 2006. On September 18, 2006, we issued an additional questionnaire to Mittal. Mittal submitted its response on October 4, 2006.

On October 10, 2006, the Department received a reconciliation of Mittal’s home market and U.S. sales database to its income statements. On October 16, 2006, the petitioners submitted comments with regard to the preliminary results.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than

0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis - that is, the direction of rolling - of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003. *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire*

¹ The petitioners are ISG Georgetown Inc. (formerly Georgetown Steel Company), Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc. (formerly Co-Steel Raritan, Inc.), Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc.

² On July 6, 2005, we found that Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited is the successor-in-interest to CIL. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 38871.

³ Section A: Organization, Accounting Practices, Markets and Merchandise

Section B: Comparison Market Sales

Section C: Sales to the United States

Section D: Cost of Production and Constructed Value

Section E: Cost of Further Manufacture or Assembly Performed in the United States

Rod from Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review, 68 FR 64079, 64081 (November 12, 2003).

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products under review are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, and 7227.90.6059 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the Scope of the Order section, above, and sold in Trinidad and Tobago during the POR are considered to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We have relied on eight criteria to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to comparison market sales of the foreign like product: grade range, carbon content range, surface quality, deoxidation, maximum total residual content, heat treatment, diameter range, and coating. These characteristics have

been weighted by the Department where appropriate. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed above. Furthermore, pursuant to section 771(16) of the Act, we did not use the wire rod which was not identified as prime on MSPL’s price list for matching purposes. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 69512 (November 16, 2005) (“*Second Review*”) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago were made in the United States at less than NV, we compared the export price (“EP”) or constructed export price (“CEP”) to the NV, as described in the “Export Price and Constructed Export Price” and “Normal Value” sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used, as appropriate, EP or CEP, in accordance with sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act. We calculated EP when the merchandise was sold by the producer or exporter outside the United States directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and when CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts on the record. We calculated CEP for those sales where a person in the United States, affiliated with the foreign exporter or acting for the account of the exporter, made the sale to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States of the subject merchandise. We based EP and CEP on the packed prices charged to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States and the applicable terms of sale. When appropriate, we reduced these prices to reflect discounts and increased the prices to reflect billing adjustments.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, for movement expenses including inland freight, international freight, demurrage expenses, marine insurance, survey fees, U.S. customs

duties and various U.S. movement expenses from arrival to delivery.

For CEP, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, when appropriate, we deducted from the starting price those selling expenses that were incurred in selling the subject merchandise in the United States, including direct selling expenses (cost of credit, warranty, and further manufacturing). In addition, we deducted indirect selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States. These expenses include certain indirect selling expenses incurred by affiliated U.S. distributors. We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and (f) of the Act. Furthermore, we recalculated MSNA’s credit expense and inventory carrying costs as we did in the final results of the first and second administrative reviews. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 12648 (March 15, 2005) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6; and *Second Review* and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Markets

To determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Mittal’s volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, because Mittal had an aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product that was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

In the most recently completed segment of the proceeding in which Mittal participated, the Department found that the respondent made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise and excluded such sales from the calculation of NV. See *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago*, 70 FR 39990, 39993 (July 12, 2005) and *Second Review* at 69512. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, the

Department determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Mittal made steel wire rod sales in Trinidad and Tobago at prices below the cost of production ("COP") in this administrative review. As a result, we initiated a COP inquiry for Mittal.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated a weighted-average COP based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses ("SG&A"), packing expenses, and interest expense.

2. Test of Comparison Market Prices

As required under section 773(b)(2) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the per-unit price of the comparison market sales of the foreign like product, to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices were sufficient to permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We determined the net comparison market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses and packing expenses which were excluded from COP for comparison purposes.

3. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in "substantial quantities." See section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. Further, the sales were made within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, because we examined below-cost sales occurring during the entire POR. In such cases, because we compared prices to POR-average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of this administrative review, we disregarded below-cost sales of a given product and used the remaining sales as the basis for

determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. See *Preliminary Calculation Memorandum for Mittal*, dated October 31, 2006, on file in the Central Records Unit, room B099 of the main Department building, for our calculation methodology and results.

C. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

We based home market prices on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in Trinidad and Tobago. We adjusted the starting price for inland freight pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, for comparisons made to EP sales, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale ("COS") pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We made COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (credit expense) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit and warranty directly linked to sales transactions). No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs.

D. Level of Trade/Constructed Export Price Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level-of-trade ("LOT") as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP sales, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. For CEP transactions, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP transactions, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent

price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. For CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP-offset provision).

In the investigation and previous two reviews, Mittal reported services similar to this review, such as strategic and economic planning, sales forecasting, sales force development, solicitation of orders, technical advice, price negotiation, processing purchase orders, invoicing, extending credit, freight and delivery arrangements, managing accounts receivable, and making arrangements for warranties related to sales. In the final results of the second review, we noted that in our LOT analysis for CEP sales we only consider the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of the expenses incurred for the U.S. economic activity and the record indicates that for Mittal's CEP sales there are substantially fewer services performed than the sales in its home market. Therefore, we determined that Mittal's home market sales were made at a more advanced stage of the marketing process than the CEP sales to the affiliates and therefore are at a different LOT within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.412. For the final results of the second review, we explained in Comment 3 that we disagreed with Mittal's characterization of the level of activity reported for certain services, but on balance we agreed with Mittal's CEP offset claim. See *Second Review* and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 3.

In analyzing this issue in this review, we obtained information from Mittal about the marketing stages involved in the reported U.S. and home market sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by Mittal for each channel of distribution. In identifying LOTs for EP and home market sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we considered only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses pursuant to section 772(d) of the Act.

In the home market, Mittal reported sales to end-users as its only channel of distribution. In the U.S. market, Mittal reported sales through two channels of distribution, one involving sales made directly by Mittal to an unaffiliated

trading company, and the second involving sales made by Mittal's affiliated U.S. resellers to trading companies, OEMs, distributors, and end-users. We have determined that the sales made by Mittal directly to U.S. customers are EP sales and those made by Mittal's affiliated U.S. resellers constitute CEP sales. Furthermore, we have found that U.S. sales and home market sales were made at the same LOT, whereas in the previous review we found that there were more selling functions with a greater level of activity in the home market. Accordingly, we did not find it necessary to make a LOT adjustment or CEP offset. For further explanation of our LOT analysis see the *Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum for Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited* from Dennis McClure and Stephanie Moore to the file dated October 31, 2006.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of these preliminary results, we made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act, based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of U.S. sales, as obtained from the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted-Average Margin
Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited	0.06% (i.e., <i>de minimis</i>)

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to the parties of this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 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 working day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument

(1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results. See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rate

The Department shall determine and CBP shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise. Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer-specific assessment rates calculated in the final results are above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.5 percent), the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. For assessment purposes, we calculated importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing the amount by the total entered value of the sales to that importer. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

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) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the period of review produced by companies included in these final results of reviews for which the reviewed companies did not know that the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (e.g., a reseller, trading company, or exporter) 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 intermediary involved in the transaction. See *Assessment Policy Notice* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included

in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales during the review period.

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the company listed above will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less than fair value ("LTFV") investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and, (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 11.40 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Wire Rod Orders*.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 increase the subsequent assessment of the antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

These preliminary results of this administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 31, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-18784 Filed 11-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A-489-807

Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Final Results and Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part

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

SUMMARY: On May 5, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Turkey (71 FR 26455). This review covers 14 producers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is April 1, 2004, through March 31, 2005. We are rescinding the review with respect to 19 companies because either: 1) these companies had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR; or 2) the questionnaires sent to these companies were returned to the Department because of undeliverable addresses.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 7, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irina Itkin or Alice Gibbons, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482-0656 and (202) 482-0498, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This review covers the following 14 producers/exporters: Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. and Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (collectively "Colakoglu"); Diler Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S., Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Turizm Ticaret A.S., and Diler Dis Ticaret A.S.

(collectively "Diler"); Ege Metal Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Ege Metal); Ekinciler Demir ve Celik Sanayi A.S. and Ekinciler Dis Ticaret A.S. (collectively "Ekinciler"); Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas); Ilhanlar Rolling and Textile Industries, Ltd., Sti. and Ilhanlar Group (collectively "Ilhanlar"); Intermet A.S. (Intermet); Iskenderun Iron & Steel Works Co. (Iskenderun); Koc Dis Ticaret A.S. (Koc); Nurmet Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Nurmet); Nursan Celik Sanayi ve Haddecilik A.S. (Nursan); Sozer Steel Works (Sozer); Ucel Haddecilik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Ucel); and the Yolbulan Group (Yolbulanlar Nak. ve Ticaret A.S., Yolbulan Metal Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. and Yolbulan Dis Ticaret Ltd. Sti.).

On May 5, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on rebar from Turkey. See *Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey; Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 26455 (May 5, 2006) (*Preliminary Results*).

Prior to the preliminary results, the following companies informed the Department that they had no shipments to the United States during the POR: Buyurgan Group Steel Division and Metalenerji A.S. (Buyurgan), Cag Celik Demir ve Celik Endustrisi A.S. (Cag Celik), Cebitas Demir Celik Endustrisi A.S. (Cebitas), Cemtas Celik Makina Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Cemtas), Demirsan Haddecilik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Demirsan), DHT Metal (DHT), Efesan Demir Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. and Efe Demir Celik (Efesan), Ege Celik Endustrisi Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Ege Celik), Izmir Demir Celik Sanayi A.S. (Izmir), Kaptan Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S. (Kaptan), Kardemir - Karabuk Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Kardemir), Kurum Demir Sanayi ve Ticaret Metalenerji A.S. (Kurum), Tosyali Demir Celik Sanayi A.S. (Tosyali), and Yesilyurt Demir Celik/Yesilyurt Demir Cekme San ve Tic Ltd. Sirketi (Yesilyurt). We reviewed U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data and confirmed that there were no entries of subject merchandise from any of these companies. See the Memorandum to the File from Brianne Riker entitled, "Placing Customs Entry Documents on the Record of the 2004-2005 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey," dated May 2, 2005. Consequently, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are rescinding our review for Buyurgan,

Cebitas, Cemtas, Demirsan, DHT, Efesan, Ege Celik, Izmir, Kaptan, Kardemir, Kurum, Tosyali, and Yesilyurt. For further discussion, see the "Partial Rescission of Review" section of this notice, below.

The antidumping duty questionnaires sent to Akmisa Foreign Trade Ltd. Co. (Akmisa), Cukurova Celik Endustrisi A.S. (Cukurova), Metas Izmir Metalurji Fabrikasi Turk A.S. (Metas), Sivas Demir Celik Isletmeleri A.S. (Sivas), and ST Steel Industry and Foreign Trade Ltd. Sti. (ST Steel) were returned to the Department because of undeliverable addresses. Subsequently, we contacted the petitioners in this review and requested that they provide alternate addresses for these companies; however, they were unable to do so.

Consequently, we are also rescinding our review with respect to these companies. For further discussion, see the "Partial Rescission of Review" section of this notice.

In addition, we are reversing our preliminary decision to base the margin for Kroman Celik Sanayi A.S. (Kroman) on adverse facts available (AFA) because we find Kroman's explanation as to why it did not respond to the questionnaire (*i.e.*, because it did not receive it) plausible. As a result, we are also rescinding the review for Kroman. For further discussion, see the "Partial Rescission of Review" section of this notice and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (Decision Memo) at *Comment 22*.

Finally, in April 2006, it came to our attention that one of Diler's affiliated rebar producers, Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Yazici), changed its corporate structure prior to the initiation of this review and is now doing business under the name Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Turizm Ticaret A.S. (Yazici Turizm). As a result, we solicited information on this change from Diler. Diler supplied this information in April 2006. After analyzing this information, we find that Yazici Turizm is the successor-in-interest to Yazici. For further discussion, see the "Successor-in-Interest" section of this notice, below.

We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. In June and July 2006, we received case briefs from the petitioners (*i.e.*, Gerdau AmeriSteel Corporation, Commercial Metals Company (SMI Steel Group), and Nucor Corporation), Colakoglu, Habas, and Kroman, and we received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners, Colakoglu, Diler, Ekinciler, and Habas.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance