

appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision. In the event the CIT's ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, upheld by the CAFC, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to revise the cash deposit rate covering the subject merchandise.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 16, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-22863 Filed 11-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-836]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Rescind Administrative Review in Part

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate products from the Republic of Korea. This review covers three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is February 1, 2006, through January 31, 2007.

The Department has preliminarily determined that certain companies subject to this review made U.S. sales at prices less than normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results of review. We will issue the final results of review no later than 120 days from the publication date of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 23, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyn Johnson or Minoo Hatten, 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) 482-5287 and (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 10, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate products (steel plate) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). See *Notice of Amendment of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan and the Republic of Korea*, 65 FR 6585 (February 10, 2000). On February 2, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 72 FR 5007 (February 2, 2007). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), on February 26, 2007, Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd. (DSM), a producer/exporter, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of its sales and entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR. Additionally, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on February 28, 2007, a domestic producer and interested party, Nucor Corporation (Nucor), requested that the Department conduct a review of DSM, Tae Chang Steel Co., Ltd. (TC Steel), and DSEC Co., Ltd., a subsidiary of Daewoo Shipbuilding & Marine Engineering (DSEC). On March 28, 2007, the Department initiated an administrative review of DSM. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 72 FR 14516 (March 28, 2007). Because the Department inadvertently omitted the names of TC Steel and DSEC from the initiation notice that was published on March 28, 2007, on April 27, 2007, the Department initiated an administrative review of TC Steel and DSEC. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 72 FR 20986 (April 27, 2007). On November 6, 2007, we extended the due date for the preliminary results of review by 15 days to November 15, 2007. See *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 62625 (November 6, 2007).

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the antidumping duty order are certain hot-rolled carbon-quality steel: (1) Universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a nominal or actual thickness of not less than 4 mm, which are cut-to-length (not in coils) and without patterns in relief), of iron or non-alloy-quality steel; and (2) flat-rolled products, hot-rolled, of a nominal or actual thickness of 4.75 mm or more and of a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness, and which are cut-to-length (not in coils). Steel products included in the scope of the order are of rectangular, square, circular, or other shape and of rectangular or non-rectangular cross-section where such non-rectangular 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. Steel products that meet the noted physical characteristics that are painted, varnished, or coated with plastic or other non-metallic substances are included within this scope. Also, specifically included in the scope of the order are high strength, low alloy (HSLA) steels. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, titanium, vanadium, and molybdenum. Steel products included in this scope, regardless of Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions, are products in which: (1) Iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements, (2) the carbon content is two percent or less, by weight, and (3) none of the elements listed below is equal to or exceeds the quantity, by weight, respectively indicated: 1.80 percent of manganese, or 1.50 percent of silicon, or 1.00 percent of copper, or 0.50 percent of aluminum, or 1.25 percent of chromium, or 0.30 percent of cobalt, or 0.40 percent of lead, or 1.25 percent of nickel, or 0.30 percent of tungsten, or 0.10 percent of molybdenum, or 0.10 percent of niobium, or 0.41 percent of titanium, or 0.15 percent of vanadium, or 0.15 percent zirconium. All products that meet the written physical description, and in which the chemistry quantities do not equal or exceed any one of the levels listed above, are within the scope

of the order unless otherwise specifically excluded. The following products are specifically excluded from the order: (1) Products clad, plated, or coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastic or other non-metallic substances; (2) SAE grades (formerly AISI grades) of series 2300 and above; (3) products made to ASTM A710 and A736 or their proprietary equivalents; (4) abrasion-resistant steels (*i.e.*, USS AR 400, USS AR 500); (5) products made to ASTM A202, A225, A514 grade S, A517 grade S, or their proprietary equivalents; (6) ball bearing steels; (7) tool steels; and (8) silicon manganese steel or silicon electric steel. Imports of steel plate are currently classified in the HTSUS under subheadings 7208.40.3030, 7208.40.3060, 7208.51.0030, 7208.51.0045, 7208.51.0060, 7208.52.0000, 7208.53.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.13.0000, 7211.14.0030, 7211.14.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7225.40.3050, 7225.40.7000, 7225.50.6000, 7225.99.0090, 7226.91.5000, 7226.91.7000, 7226.91.8000, and 7226.99.0000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the merchandise covered by the order is dispositive.

Intent To Rescind the Administrative Review in Part

We examined CBP data and did not find entries of subject merchandise from DSEC during the POR. See Letter to DSEC Co., Ltd., dated October 10, 2007, and accompanying enclosure. Further, DSEC stated that it did not have any sales to the United States which resulted in suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR. See Letter from DSEC Co., Ltd., dated November 2, 2007.

Section 751(a) of the Act instructs the Department that, when conducting administrative reviews, it is to determine the dumping margin for entries during the relevant period. Further, according to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department may rescind an administrative review in whole or only with respect to a particular exporter or producer if it concludes that, during the POR, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise, as the case may be. The Department has interpreted the statutory and regulatory language as requiring "that there be entries during the period of review upon which to assess antidumping duties." See *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin*

from Japan: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 70 FR 44088 (August 1, 2005). In *Allegheny Ludlum Corp. v. United States*, 346 F.3d 1368, 1372 (CAFC 2003), the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit upheld the Department's practice of rescinding annual reviews when there are no entries of subject merchandise during the POR. See also *Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Taiwan: Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 63067, 63068 (November 7, 2003) (stating that "the Department's interpretation of its statute and regulations, as affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, supports not conducting an administrative review when the evidence on the record indicates that respondents had no entries of subject merchandise during the POR"). Because there were no entries of subject merchandise during the POR from DSEC, we preliminarily find that there were no imports from DSEC during the POR and, as a result, we intend to rescind the administrative review with respect to DSEC. If we continue to find at the time of our final results of administrative review that there were no entries of subject merchandise from DSEC, we will rescind our review of DSEC.

Use of Adverse Facts Available

For the reasons discussed below, we determine that the use of adverse facts available is appropriate for the preliminary results with respect to TC Steel.

A. Use of Facts Available

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that, if an interested party withholds information requested by the administering authority, fails to provide such information by the deadlines for submission of the information and in the form or manner requested, significantly impedes a proceeding under this title, or provides such information but the information cannot be verified as provided in section 782(i), the administering authority shall use facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination.

On April 20, 2007, the Department transmitted its questionnaire to TC Steel via Federal Express. We confirmed that TC Steel signed for and received the questionnaire on April 23, 2007. TC Steel did not respond to section A of our questionnaire by the due date, May 14, 2007. On May 18, 2007, we sent a letter via facsimile to Mr. Jae-sung Yoo, chairperson of TC Steel, asking the company to inform us as to whether it

had submitted or intended to submit a response to our questionnaire or whether TC Steel and its affiliates did not have any U.S. sales or shipments during the review period. TC Steel received the letter on the same day, but it did not respond to the letter by the specified due date, May 29, 2007. See Memorandum to The File from Yang Jin Chun concerning the non-response of Tae Chang Steel Co., Ltd., dated July 27, 2007. Because TC Steel did not provide a response to the Department's questionnaire, TC Steel failed to provide any information to the Department within the meaning of section 776(a)(2) of the Act. As a result, the Department is unable to calculate a margin for TC Steel and, therefore, must rely entirely on facts available.

B. Application of Adverse Inferences for Facts Available

In selecting from among the facts otherwise available, section 776(b) of the Act provides that, if the administering authority finds that an interested party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information from the administering authority, in reaching the applicable determination under this title, the administering authority may use an inference adverse to the interests of that party in selecting from among the facts otherwise available. See, *e.g.*, *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Certain Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Line Pipe From Mexico*, 69 FR 59892, 59896-97 (October 6, 2004); see also *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, Postponement of Final Determination, and Affirmative Preliminary Determination of Critical Circumstances in Part: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand From Mexico*, 68 FR 42378, 42380-82 (July 17, 2003).

Adverse inferences are appropriate "to ensure that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully." See *Statement of Administrative Action* accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H. Doc. No. 103-316, at 870 (1994) (SAA). Furthermore, "affirmative evidence of bad faith, or willfulness, on the part of a respondent is not required before the Department may make an adverse inference." See *Antidumping Duties, Countervailing Duties, Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27340 (May 19, 1997).

Because TC Steel did not respond to our questionnaire despite multiple opportunities, we preliminarily find

that TC Steel failed to cooperate to the best of its ability and that the use of an adverse inference is appropriate. See section 776(b) of the Act and *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Circular Seamless Stainless Steel Hollow Products from Japan*, 65 FR 42985, 42986 (July 12, 2000) (where the Department applied total adverse facts available because the respondents failed to respond to the antidumping questionnaire).

C. Selection of Information Used as Facts Available

Where the Department applies an adverse facts-available rate because a respondent failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to rely on information derived from the petition, a final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. See also 19 CFR 351.308(c) and the SAA at 870. In this case, we have assigned to TC Steel the highest product-specific margin, 32.70 percent, which we have calculated in this review based on the data reported by a respondent. We have selected this rate because we have never reviewed TC Steel in a prior segment of this proceeding and we do not have any additional information about this company. Moreover, this rate is sufficiently high as to reasonably assure that TC Steel does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate. Finally, given that this information was reported to the Department in the instant segment of the proceeding, there is no basis to doubt this information's reliability and relevance as applied in this segment to TC Steel. See generally the SAA at 870 (discussing the need to corroborate information used as facts available when that information was reported to the Department in a prior segment of an AD/CVD proceeding).

DSM

A. Affiliation

Consistent with the Department's determination in the 2004–2005 administrative review of the order, the Department continues to find that DSM and Dongkuk Industries Co., Ltd. (DKI) are affiliated.¹ The evidence on the

¹ See *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results and Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 67428, 67429 (November 7, 2005), unchanged in *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 13080 (March 14, 2006) (*Steel Plate 2004–2005*).

record indicates that the same familial relationships that formed the basis of the Department's determination in the 2004–2005 administrative review² continue today. Because of the business-proprietary nature of this discussion, the entire analysis for this current review may be found in the Department's Preliminary Analysis Memorandum for DSM dated November 15, 2007. Furthermore, although DSM identified DKI as an unaffiliated entity in its original questionnaire response, DSM stated later that there have not been any changes in the ownership or control of DSM and DKI during the POR that would affect the Department's 2004–2005 analysis of affiliation between the two companies. See DSM's July 5, 2007, Supplemental Questionnaire Response at 2. For all of these reasons, the Department preliminarily determines that DSM and DKI are under common control of a family grouping and, thus, are affiliated pursuant to section 771(33) of the Act.

B. Overrun Sales

DSM reported home-market sales of "overrun" merchandise (*i.e.*, sales of a greater quantity of steel plate than the customer ordered due to overproduction). Section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act provides that normal value shall be based on the price at which the foreign like product is first sold, *inter alia*, in the ordinary course of trade. Section 771(15) of the Act defines "ordinary course of trade" as the "conditions and practices which, for a reasonable time prior to the exportation of the subject merchandise, have been normal in the trade under consideration with respect to merchandise of the same class or kind." In past cases, the Department has examined certain factors to determine whether "overrun" sales are in the ordinary course of trade. See, *e.g.*, *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From Brazil*, 64 FR 38756, 38770 (July 19, 1999). These factors include the following: (1) Whether the merchandise is "off-quality" or produced according to unusual specifications; (2) the comparative volume of sales and the number of buyers in the home market; (3) the average quantity of an overrun sale compared to the average quantity of a commercial sale; and (4) price and profit differentials in the home market.

² See Memorandum to Holly Kuga from Malcolm Burke concerning the affiliation analysis for Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd., dated October 31, 2005.

Id. Based on our analysis of these factors and the terms of sale, we preliminarily determine that DSM's overrun sales are outside the ordinary course of trade. Because our analysis makes use of business-proprietary information, we have included the analysis in a separate memorandum. See Memorandum to Laurie Parkhill from Lyn Johnson concerning DSM's Sales Outside the Ordinary Course of Trade dated November 15, 2007.

Fair-Value Comparison

To determine whether DSM's sales of the subject merchandise from Korea to the United States were at prices below normal value, we compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the normal value as described in the "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. Therefore, pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the CEP of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weighted-average normal value of the foreign like product where there were sales made in the ordinary course of trade.

Product Comparison

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products covered by the "scope of the order" section above produced and sold by DSM in the comparison market during the POR to be foreign like product for the purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales of subject merchandise. Specifically, in making our comparisons, we used the following methodology. If an identical comparison-market model was reported, we made comparisons to weighted-average comparison-market prices that were based on all sales which passed the cost-of-production (COP) test of the identical product during the relevant or contemporary month. We calculated the weighted-average comparison-market prices on a level of trade-specific basis. If there were no contemporaneous sales of an identical model, we identified the most similar comparison-market model. To determine the most similar model, we matched the foreign like product based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondent in the following order of importance: painted, quality, specification, heat treatments, thickness, width, patterns in relief, and descaling.

Constructed Export Price

The Department based the price of DSM's U.S. sales of subject merchandise on CEP, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold, before importation, by a U.S.-based

seller affiliated with the producer to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, which includes direct selling expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we also deducted those indirect selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States and the profit allocated to expenses deducted under section 772(d)(1) in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we computed profit based on the total revenues realized on sales in both the U.S. and comparison markets, less all expenses associated with those sales. We then allocated profit to expenses incurred with respect to U.S. economic activity based on the ratio of total U.S. expenses to total expenses for both the U.S. and comparison markets.

Normal Value

A. Home-Market Viability

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(c) of the Act, in order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales of steel plate in the comparison market to serve as a viable basis for calculating the normal value, we compared the volume of the respondent's home-market sales of the foreign like product to its volume of the U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. DSM's quantity of sales in the home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market.

Based on this comparison of the aggregate quantities sold in the comparison market (*i.e.*, Korea) and to the United States and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country did not permit a proper comparison, we preliminarily determine that the quantity of the foreign like product sold by the respondent in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a)(1) of the Act. Thus, we determine that DSM's home market was viable during the POR. *Id.* Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value for the respondent on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the exporting country in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales.

B. Cost-of-Production Analysis

In the most recently completed administrative review, the Department determined that DSM sold the foreign like product at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise and, as a result, excluded such sales from the calculation of normal value. See *Steel Plate 2004–2005*, 70 FR at 67431. Therefore, in this review, we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that DSM's sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of normal value may have been made at prices below COP as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act and, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we have conducted a COP investigation of DSM's sales in the comparison market.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and labor employed in producing the foreign like product, the selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and all costs and expenses incidental to packing the merchandise. In our COP analysis, we used the comparison-market sales and COP information provided by DSM in its questionnaire response.

After calculating the COP, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we tested whether comparison-market sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and whether such prices permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. See section 773(b)(2) of the Act. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported comparison-market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, when less than 20 percent of DSM's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. When 20 percent or more of DSM's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time pursuant to sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act and because, based on comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the POR, we determined that these sales were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section

773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Based on this test, we disregarded below-cost sales.

C. Arm's-Length Test

The Department may calculate normal value based on a sale to an affiliated party only if it is satisfied that the price to the affiliated party is comparable to the price at which sales are made to parties not affiliated with the exporter or producer, *i.e.*, sales at arm's-length prices. See 19 CFR 351.403(c). For affiliated-party sales, we excluded from our analysis sales to affiliated customers for consumption in the comparison market that we determined not to be at arm's-length prices. To test whether these sales were made at arm's-length prices, the Department compared the prices of sales of comparable merchandise to affiliated and unaffiliated customers, net of all rebates, movement charges, direct selling expenses, and packing. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.403(c) and in accordance with our practice, when the prices charged to an affiliated party were, on average, between 98 and 102 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated parties for merchandise comparable to that sold to the affiliated party, we determined that the sales to the affiliated party were at arm's-length prices. See *Antidumping Proceedings: Affiliated Party Sales in the Ordinary Course of Trade*, 67 FR 69186 (November 15, 2002) (explaining the Department's practice). We included in our calculations of normal value those sales to affiliated parties that were made at arm's-length prices.

D. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We based normal value on comparison-market sales to unaffiliated purchasers and sales to affiliated customers that passed the arm's-length test. DSM's comparison-market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory, or delivered prices. When applicable, we made adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411 and for differences in circumstances of sale in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments by deducting comparison-market direct selling expenses from normal value.

Level of Trade

To the extent practicable, we determine normal value for sales at the

same level of trade as CEP sales. See section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412. When there are no sales at the same level of trade, we compare CEP sales to comparison-market sales at a different level of trade. The normal-value level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market.

To determine whether comparison-market sales are at a different level of trade than U.S. sales for DSM in this review we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. Based on our analysis, we have preliminarily determined that there is one level of trade in the United States and one level of trade in the home market and that the U.S. level of trade is at a less advanced stage than the home-market level of trade. Therefore, we have compared U.S. sales to home-market sales at different levels of trade.

Because there is only one level of trade in the home market, we were unable to calculate a level-of-trade adjustment based on DSM's home-market sales of the foreign like product and we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For DSM's CEP sales, to the extent possible, we determined normal value at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP-offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. The CEP-offset adjustment to normal value is subject to the so-called offset cap, which is calculated as the sum of home-market indirect selling expenses up to the amount of U.S. indirect selling expenses deducted from CEP.

For a detailed description of our level-of-trade analysis for DSM in these preliminary results, see the Preliminary Analysis Memorandum for DSM dated November 15, 2007.

Currency Conversion

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.415, we converted amounts expressed in foreign currencies into U.S. dollar amounts based on the exchanged rates in effect on the dates of the relevant U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period February 1, 2006, through January 31, 2007:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd.	2.25
TC Steel	32.70

Disclosure and Public Comment

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties in this review within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. If a hearing is requested, the Department will notify interested parties of the hearing schedule.

Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results of this review. The Department will consider case briefs filed by interested parties within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Also, interested parties may file rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs. The Department will consider rebuttal briefs filed not later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue, a brief summary of the argument, and a table of authorities cited. Further, we request that parties submitting written comments provide the Department with a diskette containing an electronic copy of the public version of such comments.

We intend to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of issues raised in the written comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results in the **Federal Register**.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate for these preliminary results of review. We divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for the importer. We will instruct CBP to assess the importer-specific rate uniformly, as appropriate, on all entries of subject merchandise made by the relevant importer during the POR. See 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department will issue instructions to CBP 15 days after the 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 of Antidumping Duties*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by DSM for which DSM did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries of DSM-produced merchandise 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 *Assessment of Antidumping Duties*.

Because we are relying on total adverse facts available to establish TC Steel's dumping margin, we preliminarily determine to instruct CBP to apply a dumping margin of 32.70 percent to all entries of subject merchandise during the POR that were produced and/or exported by TC Steel.

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of steel plate from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash-deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of this review; (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 period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer has its own rate, the cash-deposit rate will be 0.98 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation,³ adjusted for the export-subsidy rate in the companion countervailing duty investigation.⁴ These deposit

³ See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products from Korea*, 64 FR 73196, 73214 (December 29, 1999).

⁴ See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate From the Republic of Korea*, 64 FR 73176, 731818-86 (December 29, 1999), as amended in *Notice of Amended Final Determinations: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate From India and the Republic of Korea*, 65 FR 6587, 6588 (February 10, 2000).

requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

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

Dated: November 15, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-22869 Filed 11-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-916]

Postponement of Preliminary Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Laminated Woven Sacks From the People's Republic of China

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 23, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine Bertrand or Javier Barrientos, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-3207 or (202) 482-2243, respectively.

Postponement of Preliminary Determination

On July 18, 2007, the Department of Commerce ("Department") initiated the antidumping duty investigation of laminated woven sacks from the People's Republic of China. *See Laminated Woven Sacks from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 71 FR 40833 (July 25, 2007). The notice of initiation stated that the Department would make its preliminary determination for this antidumping duty investigation no later than 140 days

after the date of issuance of the initiation.

On November 9, 2007, the Laminated Woven Sacks Committee and its individual members, Bancroft Bags, Inc., Coating Excellence International, LLC, Hood Packaging Corporation, Mid-America Packaging, LLC, and Polytex Fibers Corporation (collectively, "Petitioners") made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e) for a fifty-day postponement of the preliminary determination, until January 24, 2008. Petitioners requested postponement of the preliminary determination to allow the Department additional time in which to review the complex questionnaire responses and issue requests for clarification and additional information.

For the reasons identified by the Petitioners, and because there are no compelling reasons to deny the request, the Department is postponing the preliminary determination under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), by fifty days to January 24, 2008. The deadline for the final determination will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determination, unless extended.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1).

Dated: November 14, 2007.

David Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-22862 Filed 11-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-412-822]

Stainless Steel Bar From the United Kingdom: Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Revocation of Order, in Part

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 23, 2007.

SUMMARY: On October 11, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review for a partial revocation of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from the United Kingdom with respect to SAF 2507 grade stainless steel bar. *See Stainless Steel Bar from the United*

Kingdom: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Intent to Revoke Order in Part, 72 FR 57911 (October 11, 2007) (*Initiation and Preliminary Results*). We received no comments from interested parties objecting to the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*. Thus, we determine that changed circumstances exist to warrant revocation of the order, in part.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kate Johnson or Rebecca Trainor, 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) 482-4929 or (202) 482-4007, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 7, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from the United Kingdom. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Bar from the United Kingdom*, 67 FR 10381 (March 7, 2002). On August 27, 2007, Swagelok Company (Swagelok), an interested party, requested that the Department initiate a changed circumstances review to exclude SAF 2507 grade stainless steel bar from the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from the United Kingdom. On September 18, 2007, the Domestic Industry¹ submitted a letter affirming that it does not object to the exclusion of the product identified in Swagelok's August 27, 2007, request for a changed circumstances review. On September 21, 2007, the Domestic Industry submitted a statement affirming that its members account for substantially all of the U.S. production of stainless steel bar, exceeding 85 percent of total domestic production. On September 25, 2007, Sandvik Bioline, a U.K. producer of stainless steel bar, provided a technical description of the stainless steel bar product Swagelok requested to be excluded from the scope of the antidumping duty order.²

On October 11, 2007, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review for a partial

¹ Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division of Crucible Materials Corp., Electralloy Corp., North American Stainless, Universal Stainless & Alloy Products, Inc., and Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc.

² Sandvik Bioline is the producer of the product which is the subject of Swagelok's changed circumstances review request.