

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the companies included in these preliminary results for which the reviewed companies did not know their merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the "All Others" rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company or companies involved in the transaction.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for Hylsa in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins by the total net value for this 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publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the companies listed above will be the rates 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 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 20.11 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico*, 67 FR 55800 (August 30, 2002).

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) 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.

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

Dated: October 31, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-21870 Filed 11-6-07; 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: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On July 6, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the antidumping duty (AD) administrative review on carbon and alloy steel wire rod (wire rod) from Trinidad and Tobago. This review covers one producer of subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. *See Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 36955 (July 6, 2007) (*Preliminary Results*). Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results do not differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the *Final Results of Review* section.

DATES: Effective Dates: November 7, 2007.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 6, 2007, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the AD order on wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago. *See Preliminary Results*. This review covers imports of wire rod from Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited and its affiliates Mittal Steel North America (MSNA) and Walker Wire (Ispat) Inc. (collectively Mittal) during the POR, October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*.

On August 6, 2007, we received a case brief from the petitioners: ISG Georgetown Inc., Gerdau Ameristeel U.S. Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc. On August 10, 2007, we extended Mittal's deadline for submitting its rebuttal brief. On August 13, 2007, we received Mittal's rebuttal brief.

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. See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire 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.

Analysis of Comments Received

The sole issue raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary (*Decision Memorandum*), which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issue concerns the “Methodology for Calculating Imputed Expenses for CEP Sales.” The *Decision Memorandum* is

on file in the Central Records Unit in Room B–099 of the main Commerce building, and can also be accessed directly on the Web at <http://www.ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

As noted above, there have been no changes from the *Preliminary Results*. However, we have attached a Decision Memorandum to this **Federal Register** notice addressing the methodology used to calculate imputed credit expenses. For further details of the issues addressed in this proceeding, see the *Preliminary Results*.

As a result of this review, we find that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006:

Producer/ manufacturer	Weighted-average margin
Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited.	0.40% (<i>i.e.</i> , <i>de minimis</i>)

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, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department intends 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 (68 FR 23954). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by Mittal where Mittal did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the “All Others” rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon 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 of these final results, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) For Mittal no cash deposit will be required; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the most recent company-specific rate established in the final determination or final results; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the LTFV investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the producer of the subject merchandise for the most recent period; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the LTFV investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 11.40 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the investigation. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago*, 67 FR 55788 (August 30, 2002). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

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 presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). 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 terms of an APO is a violation that is subject to sanction.

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

Dated: November 1, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-21871 Filed 11-6-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-845]

Notice of Amended Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Glycine From India

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 7, 2007.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this amended preliminary determination is to clarify an inadvertent error in the preliminary determination we issued on October 26, 2007, that imports of glycine from India are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Callen or Richard Rimlinger, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution

Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0180 and (202) 482-4477, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

We initiated an antidumping investigation on glycine from India. See *Glycine from India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations*, 72 FR 20816 (April 26, 2007). On October 26, 2007, we issued our preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value (not yet published). We stated in our October 26, 2007, preliminary determination that we used total facts available, including an adverse inference, for one firm, Nutracare International/Salvi Chemical Industries (Salvi), which did not respond to our quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaire and, therefore, withheld requested information and significantly impeded this proceeding pursuant to section 776(a) of the Act. We stated further that, because it did not cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability, in reaching our preliminary determination we applied total adverse facts available to Salvi pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act.

There were nine firms in addition to Salvi which did not respond to our Q&V questionnaire and, to clarify our inadvertent error of omission of these firms, we are amending our preliminary determination. The firms which failed to respond to our request for information and for which we are applying adverse facts available in accordance with sections 776(a) and 776(b) of the Act are as follows: Abhiyan Media Pvt. Ltd., Ashok Alco-Chem, Ltd., Bimal Pharma, Pvt., Ltd., Euro Asian Industrial Co., EPIC Enzymes Pharmaceuticals & Industrial, Indian Chemical Industries, Kumar Industries, Sisco Research Laboratories Pvt. Ltd, and Sealink International, Inc.

Amended Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2006:

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Paras Intermediates Ltd.	0.00
Abhiyan Media Pvt. Ltd.	121.62
Advanced Exports/Aico Laboratories	121.62
Ashok Alco-Chem, Ltd.	121.62
Bimal Pharma, Pvt., Ltd.	121.62
Euro Asian Industrial Co.	121.62
EPIC Enzymes Pharmaceuticals & Industrial	121.62
Indian Chemical Industries	121.62
Kumar Industries	121.62