

category”), and the level of selling expenses for each sale.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, in identifying levels of trade for EP and comparison market sales, we consider the starting prices before any adjustments. See *Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States, et. al.*, 243 F. 3d 1301, 1314–1315 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (affirming this methodology).

When the Department is unable to match U.S. EP sales to sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP, the Department may compare the U.S. sale to sales at a different LOT in the comparison market. In comparing EP sales to a different LOT in the comparison market, where available data make it practical, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

IRCT reported one LOT in the home market and one LOT in the U.S. market. IRCT reported making sales only to end-users in the home market. In the United States, IRCT reported that it made sales only to a trading company. We examined the information IRCT reported regarding its marketing process for making the reported comparison market and U.S. sales, including the type and level of selling activities performed and customer categories. Specifically, we considered the extent to which the sales process, freight services, warehouse/inventory maintenance, and warranty services varied with respect to the different customer categories (*i.e.*, distributors and end-users). Based on our analysis, we found that the single LOT in the United States is identical to the single LOT in the comparison market. Thus, we preliminarily find that a LOT adjustment for IRCT is not warranted.

C. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

We calculated NV based on the delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. In accordance with section 773(a)(6)(b)(ii) of the Act, we made deductions for inland freight and inland insurance. Furthermore, where appropriate, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (“COS”) in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(c)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 by deducting direct selling expenses incurred on comparison market sales (credit expenses), and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit expenses). We deducted inventory carrying costs incurred on comparison market sales, and added

freight and delivery, inventory and warehousing, and quality assurance/warranty services.

U.S. inventory carrying cost. We deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily find that the following dumping margin exists for the period July 1, 2005, through May 3, 2006.

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Margin (Percentage)
Inorama Chemicals (Thailand) Ltd.	* 0.39

* This is a *de minimis* rate.

Assessment Rates

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department calculates an assessment rate for each importer (or customer) of the subject merchandise. Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer (or customer)-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. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.50 percent).

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

Cash Deposit Rates

On March 5, 2006, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(1)(ii), the Department revoked the antidumping duty order on furfuryl alcohol from Thailand (*see Furfuryl Alcohol from Thailand; Final Results of the Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order and Revocation of the Order*, 72 FR 9729 (March 5, 2006)). The effective date of the revocation is May 4, 2007. As a result of this action, we do not intend to issue cash deposit instructions.

Public Comment

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). A

hearing, if requested, will be 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first business day thereafter. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. 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 five days after submission of case briefs. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments 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.

The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearing, no later than 120 days after publication of these preliminary results.

Notification to Interested Parties

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 results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 25, 2007.

David M. Spooner,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 07–3764 Filed 8–1–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–891]

Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Review

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

DATES: Effective Date: August 2, 2007.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the “Department”) has determined that the request for a new shipper review of

the antidumping duty order on hand trucks and certain parts thereof ("Hand Trucks") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), received July 2, 2007, meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for initiation. The period of review ("POR") of this new shipper review is December 1, 2006, through May 31, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Quigley or Robert Bolling, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4551 or (202) 482-3434, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The notice announcing the antidumping duty order on hand trucks from the PRC was published on December 2, 2004. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China*, 69 FR 70122 (December 2, 2004). On July 2, 2007, we received a new shipper review request from New-Tec Integration (Xiamen) Co., Ltd. ("New-Tec"). New-Tec certified that it is both the producer and exporter of the subject merchandise upon which the respective request for a new shipper review is based.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act"), and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), New-Tec certified that it did not export hand trucks to the United States during the period of investigation ("POI"). In addition, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(II) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(A), New-Tec certified that, since the initiation of the investigation, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported hand trucks to the United States during the POI, including those not individually examined during the investigation. As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B), New-Tec also certified that its export activities were not controlled by the central government of the PRC.

In addition to the certifications described above, New-Tec submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) the date on which it first shipped hand trucks for export to the United States; (2) the volume of its first shipment; and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

Initiation of New Shipper Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we find

that the request submitted by New-Tec meets the threshold requirements for initiation of a new shipper review for shipments of hand trucks from the PRC produced and exported by New-Tec.

The POR is December 1, 2006, through May 31, 2007. See 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(B). We intend to issue preliminary results of this review no later than 180 days from the date of initiation, and final results no later than 90 days from the date the preliminary results are issued. See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

It is the Department's usual practice, in cases involving non-market economies, to require that a company seeking to establish eligibility for an antidumping duty rate separate from the country-wide rate provide evidence of *de jure* and *de facto* absence of government control over the company's export activities. Accordingly, we will issue a questionnaire to New-Tec, including a separate-rate section. The review will proceed if the response provides sufficient indication that New-Tec is not subject to either *de jure* or *de facto* government control with respect to its exports of hand trucks. However, if New-Tec does not demonstrate its eligibility for a separate rate, it will be deemed not separate from other companies that exported during the POI, and its new shipper review will be rescinded.

On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (H.R. 4) was signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4 temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in a new shipper review. Therefore, the posting of a bond or other security under section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of hand trucks produced by and exported by New-Tec must continue to post cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise (*i.e.*, hand trucks) at the PRC-wide entity rate of 383.6 percent.

Interested parties that need access to proprietary information in this new shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: July 26, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-14923 Filed 8-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-823, A-834-807, A-307-820]

Silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela: Final Results of Expedited Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: On April 2, 2007, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of the first five-year sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Initiation of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 72 FR 15652 (April 2, 2007) ("*Notice of Initiation*"). On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, and inadequate responses from respondent interested parties, the Department has conducted expedited sunset reviews of these orders pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C). As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the "Final Results of Review" section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 2, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Douthit or Dara Iserson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5050, or (202) 482-4052, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela were published in the **Federal Register** on May 23, 2002. See *Notice of Amended*