

plant's shipments will be exported. On its domestic sales, SEH-A would be able to choose the duty rates during customs entry procedures that apply to finished semiconductor-grade silicon ingots and wafers (duty-free) for the foreign inputs noted above. SEH-A also plans to realize logistical benefits through the use of weekly customs entry procedures. Customs duties also could possibly be deferred or reduced on foreign status production equipment. The request indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is January 12, 2009. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to January 26, 2009.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations: U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, 2601 Fourth Ave., Suite 320, Seattle, Washington 98121. Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2111, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20230.

For further information, contact Elizabeth Whiteman at Elizabeth_Whiteman@ita.doc.gov or (202) 482-0473.

Dated: November 3, 2008.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-26838 Filed 11-10-08; 8:45 am]

Billing Code: 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-830]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico

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

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Ternium Mexico, S.A. de C.V. (Ternium), a producer of steel wire rod, and Hylsa S.A. de C.V. (Hylsa), a service company that provides services to Ternium on a contract basis, and pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3), the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review of the antidumping order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. This review will determine whether Ternium is the successor-in-interest to Hylsa.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 12, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jolanta Lawska, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-8362.

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on wire rod from Mexico; *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 (October 29, 2002) (*Wire Rod Order*). On September 3, 2008, Ternium filed a request for a changed circumstances review of the *Wire Rod Order*, claiming that Hylsa, the respondent in the original investigation, has changed its name to Ternium. Ternium has requested that the Department determine whether it is the successor-in-interest to Hylsa, in accordance with section 751(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216. In addition, Ternium submitted documentation in support of its claim. In response to Ternium's request, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review of this order.

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; (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods; and (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.

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 the 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 subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030,

7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.¹

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of a request from an interested party or receipt of information concerning an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. On September 3, 2008, Ternium submitted its request for a changed circumstances review. With its request, Ternium submitted certain information related to its claim that Hylsa changed its name to Ternium, including information describing the acquisition of Hylsa by Ternium Luxembourg and changes in Hylsa’s operating and corporate structure immediately following that acquisition. Based on the information Ternium submitted, the Department has determined that changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review exist. See 19 CFR 351.216(d). In antidumping duty changed circumstances reviews involving a successor-in-interest determination, the Department typically examines several factors including, but not limited to: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. See *Brass Sheet and Strip From Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) and *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 22847 (May 3, 2005) (*Plate from Romania*), unchanged in the *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Romania*, 70 FR 35624 (June 21, 2005). While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily be dispositive, the Department generally will consider the new company to be the successor to the predecessor company if the resulting operations are essentially the same as those of the predecessor company. See, e.g., *Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel:*

¹ Effective January 1, 2006, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reclassified certain HTSUS numbers related to the subject merchandise. See http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tariff/chapters_current/toc.html.

Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994), and *Plate From Romania*, 70 FR 22847. Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor. See, e.g., *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999). Although Ternium submitted documentation related to its name change and some limited information regarding the four factors that the Department considers in its successor-in-interest analysis, it did not provide complete supporting documentation for the four elements listed above. Accordingly, the Department has determined that it would be inappropriate to expedite this action by combining the preliminary results of review with this notice of initiation, as permitted on 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). Therefore, the Department is not issuing the preliminary results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review at this time.

The Department will issue questionnaires requesting additional information for the review and will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of the preliminary results of the antidumping duty changed circumstances review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(2) and (4), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i). This notice will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based and a description of any action proposed. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4)(ii), interested parties will have an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), the Department will issue the final results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review not later than 270 days after the date on which the review is initiated.

During the course of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review, deposit requirements for the subject merchandise exported and manufactured by Ternium will continue to be the rate established in the final results of the last administrative review for all other manufacturers and exporters not previously reviewed. See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico: Notice of Final*

Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 73 FR 13532 (March 13, 2008). The cash deposit will be altered, if warranted, pursuant only to the final results of this review.

This notice of initiation is in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.216(b) and (d), and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1).

Dated: November 6, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-26954 Filed 11-7-08; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-816]

Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limits for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Robinson at (202) 482-3797, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 25, 2007, the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Korea, covering the period August 1, 2006, to July 31, 2007. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 54428 (September 25, 2007). On September 9, 2008, the Department published the preliminary results of this review. See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Republic of Korea: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 52267 (September 9, 2008). The final results of this review are currently due no later than January 7, 2009.

Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (AAct@), requires

the Department to issue the final results of a review within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within that time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the final results to a maximum of 180 days. See also 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit because several technical issues have arisen. These issues include: (1) Whether to add a separate field to differentiate laminated products from painted products based on the physical, cost, and price differences of the two, and therefore to modify the Department's model-match methodology; (2) whether to recalculate the general and administrative and financial ratios; and (3) whether to exclude gains and losses on currency forward contracts. These issues require additional analyses of certain information. Therefore, the Department is fully extending the final results. The final results are now due not later than March 8, 2009. As this day falls on a Sunday, the final results are due March 9, 2009. See *Notice of Clarification: Application of "Next Business Day" Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant of the Tariff Act of 1930, As Amended*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005).

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: November 4, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-26837 Filed 11-10-08; 8:45 am]

Billing Code: 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-421-811]

Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From the Netherlands: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests from respondent Akzo Nobel Functional Chemicals, B.V. ("Akzo Nobel") and Aqualon Company ("Petitioner"), the Department of Commerce ("Department") initiated an

administrative review of the antidumping duty order on purified carboxymethylcellulose ("CMC") from the Netherlands. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 73 FR 50308 (August 26, 2008) ("*Initiation Notice*"). This administrative review covers the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008. Due to the withdrawal of the requests for the administrative review by both parties, we are rescinding this review with respect to Akzo Nobel.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Bailey or Angelica Mendoza, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0193 or (202) 482-3019, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on purified CMC from the Netherlands on July 11, 2005. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands and Sweden*, 70 FR 39734 (July 11, 2005). The Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, on July 11, 2008. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 73 FR 39948 (July 11, 2008). On July 14, 2008, Petitioner timely requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of sales of merchandise by Akzo Nobel and CP Kelco B.V. covered by the order. On July 31, 2008, Akzo Nobel timely requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of its sales of merchandise covered by the order. In response to both requests, the Department initiated the antidumping duty administrative review on purified CMC from the Netherlands on August 26, 2008. See *Initiation Notice*.

Akzo Nobel timely withdrew its request for review on October 9, 2008. Petitioner timely withdrew its request for review of sales by Akzo Nobel on October 10, 2008. See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Partial Rescission of the Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative