benefits of innovations flow, at least in part, to buyers, are there ways to identify the flow of innovations across firms and sectors?

3. *Identification of firm-specific data items that could enable comparisons and aggregation.* Current corporate innovation measurement appears to be done primarily on either a project or a portfolio basis. Are these measurement practices sufficiently widespread and uniform to make data collection on either of these bases practical? Is it possible or necessary to collect information on company culture, incentive structures, and organizational change? If customer satisfaction is an important measure of an innovative firm, how can that be captured? How important is it to distinguish between types of innovation (*i.e.* radical versus incremental)?

What data would be needed to differentiate the characteristics of innovative firms within industry sectors from non-innovative firms? What are the most important measures of the underlying process of how innovation and productivity advances are initiated or stimulated? Could/should an understanding of innovation from the consumer perspective be developed?

Could data items from SEC filings be used to enhance understanding of innovation in public companies? Are there proxies for relative innovative success (e.g. percent of total revenue attributable to new—or significantly improved to the point where they could be considered new—products, services, or processes introduced within the last two years into markets where a firm has a growing market share) that would provide insight into relative innovative strength? Is two years long enough?

4. *Identification of specific ''holes'' in the current data collection system that limit our ability to measure innovation.* Some specific types of data holes were identified during the meeting, including lack of data on firm formation, intellectual property licensing costs as a type of purchased input, and insufficient product detail. What should be the prioritized list of specific data items needed to fill the holes?

Limitations on our ability to link and coordinate across various data sets were also mentioned as a hole or deficiency of our current data collection system. Are there cost-effective ways of building on existing data sets to develop more information on innovation drivers and their link to success? How could data sharing and cooperation among federal agencies be improved insofar as such agencies maintain data series related to the measurement of innovation? Could existing private and/or foreign data be combined with existing official statistical series in order to better measure innovation? Are there changes that could be made to make such combinations possible or easier?

To assist the Advisory Committee in evaluating and comparing specific ideas for new or improved innovation measurement, comments on proposals for new or improved innovation measurement should provide the following information:

1. Description of proposal. Proposals for new or improved innovation measurement should include the following:

- Specific description of the proposed change.
- Identification of the specific Committee category to which the proposal applies.
- Rationale for the proposed change.
- Data description, sources and method of collection.
- Approximate cost and burden estimate.

2. Impact of proposal on innovation measurement. Proposals should include:

- Description of how proposal improves measurement of innovation as defined by the Advisory Committee.
- Description of the particular elements of innovation measurement that are improved by the proposal.
- Description of how the proposal addresses the issues and questions raised by the Committee.
- Description of how the new or improved measure would provide appropriate signals of changes in business behavior for the purpose of informing policy debates.

Page Limit—Submissions should be limited to a maximum length of 10 pages. Identification and Cover Sheet—Each page of the submission should be clearly marked with the submitter's name (and organization, if applicable), date of submission, and contact information (if the submitter chooses to provide it). Each submission should be clearly marked as originating from one of the following categories of submitters: Individuals, Businesses, Government, Academia, or Organizations and Associations.

All comments must be submitted to the address indicated in this notice. The Department requires that all comments be submitted in written form.

The Department encourages interested persons who wish to comment to do so at the earliest possible time. The period for submission of comments will close on May 11, 2007. The Department will consider all comments received before the close of the comment period. Comments received after the end of the comment period will be considered if possible, but their consideration cannot be assured. The Department will not accept comments accompanied by a request that part or all of the material be treated confidentially because of its business proprietary nature or for any other reason. All comments submitted in response to this notice will be a matter of public record. They will be available for public inspection and copying and posted on the Advisory Committee's Web site at *http://www.innovationmetrics.gov*.

Dated: April 9, 2007.

Elizabeth (E.R.) Anderson,

Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

[FR Doc. 07–1827 Filed 4–12–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A–533–809)

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India: Notice of Final Results of New Shipper Review

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

SUMMARY: On January 31, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges from India. See *Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review*, 72 FR 4483 (January 31, 2007) (*Preliminary Results*). This new shipper review covers Kunj Forgings, Pvt., Ltd. (Kunj), a manufacturer and exporter of the subject merchandise. The period of review is February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006.

We did not receive any comments from parties, and we have not made any changes to our analysis. The final weighted–average dumping margin for Kunj is thus unchanged from our preliminary results of review, and is shown in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2924 or (202) 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 31, 2007, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of new shipper review of forged stainless steel flanges from India for the period February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006. See *Preliminary Results*. No party commented on the preliminary results.

Scope of the Antidumping Duty Order

The products covered by this order are certain forged stainless steel flanges, both finished and not finished, generally manufactured to specification ASTM A–182, and made in alloys such as 304, 304L, 316, and 316L. The scope includes five general types of flanges. They are weld–neck, used for butt–weld line connection; threaded, used for threaded line connections; slip–on and lap joint, used with stub–ends/butt–weld line connections; socket weld, used to fit pipe into a machined recession; and blind, used to seal off a line. The sizes of the flanges within the scope range generally from one to six inches; however, all sizes of the above–described merchandise are included in the scope. Specifically excluded from the scope of this order are cast stainless steel flanges. Cast stainless steel flanges generally are manufactured to specification ASTM A–351. The flanges subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7307.21.1000 and 7307.21.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive of whether or not the merchandise is covered by the scope of the order.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

As noted above, no parties commented on the preliminary results. The Department is making no changes to its preliminary analysis.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that a weighted–average dumping margin of 1.52 percent exists for Kunj for the period February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006.

Assessment Rates

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to section 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated importer–specific duty assessment rates (or, when the importer was unknown by the respondent, customer–specific duty assessment rates) on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales observations involving each importer (or customer, when appropriate) to the total entered value of the examined sales observations for that importer (or customer, when appropriate). We intend to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

The Department clarified its ''automatic assessment'' regulation on May 6, 2003. This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in these final results of review for which the reviewed companies did not know the 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 an intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. For a discussion of this clarification, see *Notice of Policy Concerning Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of new shipper review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for Kunj (*i.e.*, the subject merchandise both manufactured and exported by Kunj) will be 1.52 percent; (2) the cash deposit rate for exporters who received a rate in a prior segment of the proceeding will continue to be the rate assigned in that segment of the proceeding; (3) the cash deposit rate for entries of subject merchandise exported by Kunj but not manufactured by Kunj will continue to be the ''All Others'' rate (*i.e.*, 162.14 percent) or the rate applicable to the manufacturer, if so established; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, or a prior segment of the proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 162.14 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the less–than-fair–value investigation. *See Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India*; 59 FR 5994 (February 9, 1994). These cash deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review. There are no changes to the rates applicable to any other companies under this antidumping duty order.

Notification of Interested Parties

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

This notice also is 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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: April 9, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–7082 Filed 4–12–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–570–504

Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

SUMMARY: On March 28, 2007, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** a notice announcing the initiation of a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the People's Republic of China (''PRC'') for Hangzhou Fashion Living Co., Ltd (''Fashion Living''). *See Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Review*, 72 FR 14,521 (March 28, 2007) (''*Fashion Living Initiation*''). The period of review