

There may also be postage costs and recordkeeping costs associated with this collection. The USPTO expects that approximately 50 percent of the responses for this collection will be submitted by mail and 50 percent will be submitted electronically. The USPTO estimates that the postage cost for a mailed submission will be from 44 cents to \$4.95, depending on the size of the submission, and that approximately 2,558 mailed submissions will be received per year, for a total postage cost of approximately \$8,565 per year.

When submitting the information in this collection to the USPTO electronically, the applicant is strongly urged to retain a copy of the acknowledgment receipt as evidence that the submission was received by the USPTO on the date noted. The USPTO estimates that it will take 5 seconds (0.001 hours) to print and retain a copy of the acknowledgment receipt and that approximately 2,566 responses per year will be submitted electronically, for a total of approximately 3 hours per year for printing this receipt. Using the paraprofessional rate of \$100 per hour, the USPTO estimates that the recordkeeping cost associated with this collection will be approximately \$300 per year.

The total non-hour respondent cost burden for this collection in the form of filing fees, postage costs, and recordkeeping costs is approximately \$5,577,265 per year.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, e.g., the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group.

[FR Doc. E9-19027 Filed 8-7-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Texas at Austin, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscopes

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, as amended by Pub. L. 106-36; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Room 3705, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 09-038. *Applicant:* University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78758. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, Czech Republic. *Intended Use:* See notice at 74 FR 32890, July 9, 2009.

Docket Number: 09-039. *Applicant:* National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT 59840. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, Czech Republic. *Intended Use:* See notice at 74 FR 32890, July 9, 2009.

Docket Number: 09-040. *Applicant:* Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, the Netherlands. *Intended Use:* See notice at 74 FR 32890, July 9, 2009.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were ordered. *Reasons:* Each foreign instrument is an electron microscope and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring an electron microscope. We know of no electron microscope, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States at the time of order of each instrument.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

Gregory Campbell,

Acting Director, Subsidies Enforcement Office, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-19087 Filed 8-7-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

National Renewable Energy Laboratory, et al.; Notice of Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, as amended by Pub. L. 106-36; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Room 3705, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. We know of no instruments of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as these are intended to be used, that were being manufactured in the United States at the time of its order.

Docket Number: 09-032. *Applicant:* National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO 80401. *Instrument:* MicroTime 200 Single Molecule Fluorescence Lifetime Imaging System. *Manufacturer:* PicoQuant GmbH, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 74 FR 33207, July 10, 2009. *Reasons:* This instrument will be used in biomass characterization. The instrument will be capable of doing Fluorescence Lifetime Imaging, measuring Fluorescence Resonance Energy Transfer and Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy for single fluorescent molecules. No domestic sources make devices with similar capabilities.

Docket Number: 09-034. *Applicant:* University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30605. *Instrument:* Gasification Unit. *Manufacturer:* Termoquip Energia Alternative LTDA, Brazil. *Intended Use:* See notice at 74 FR 32207, July 10, 2009. *Reasons:* This instrument will be used to turn biomass into syngas, which is composed of hydrogen and carbon monoxide that can be catalytically upgraded to liquid fuel, chemicals and energy. No domestic sources make devices with similar capabilities.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

Gregory Campbell,

*Acting Director, Subsidies Enforcement
Office, Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E9-19093 Filed 8-7-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-819]

Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On April 6, 2009, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the Russian Federation. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters, PSC VSMPO-AVISMA Corporation (AVISMA) and Solikamsk Magnesium Works (SMW). The period of review (POR) is April 1, 2007, through March 31, 2008.

Based on our analysis of the comments received we have made no changes in the margin for AVISMA. Therefore, the final results do not differ from the preliminary results. The final margin for AVISMA is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 10, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hermes Pinilla 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) 482-3477 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 6, 2009, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the Russian Federation. See *Magnesium Metal From the Russian Federation: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Rescind in Part*, 74 FR 15435 (April 6, 2009) (*Preliminary Results*).

We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. At the request of certain parties, we held a

public hearing on June 10, 2009. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order is magnesium metal (also referred to as magnesium), which includes primary and secondary pure and alloy magnesium metal, regardless of chemistry, raw material source, form, shape, or size. Magnesium is a metal or alloy containing by weight primarily the element magnesium. Primary magnesium is produced by decomposing raw materials into magnesium metal. Secondary magnesium is produced by recycling magnesium-based scrap into magnesium metal. The magnesium covered by the order includes blends of primary and secondary magnesium.

The subject merchandise includes the following pure and alloy magnesium metal products made from primary and/or secondary magnesium, including, without limitation, magnesium cast into ingots, slabs, rounds, billets, and other shapes, and magnesium ground, chipped, crushed, or machined into raspings, granules, turnings, chips, powder, briquettes, and other shapes: (1) Products that contain at least 99.95 percent magnesium, by weight (generally referred to as "ultra-pure" magnesium); (2) products that contain less than 99.95 percent but not less than 99.8 percent magnesium, by weight (generally referred to as "pure" magnesium); and (3) chemical combinations of magnesium and other material(s) in which the magnesium content is 50 percent or greater, but less than 99.8 percent, by weight, whether or not conforming to an "ASTM Specification for Magnesium Alloy".

The scope of the order excludes (1) magnesium that is in liquid or molten form and (2) mixtures containing 90 percent or less magnesium in granular or powder form by weight and one or more of certain non-magnesium granular materials to make magnesium-based reagent mixtures, including lime, calcium metal, calcium silicon, calcium carbide, calcium carbonate, carbon, slag coagulants, fluorspar, nepheline syenite, feldspar, alumina (Al₂O₃), calcium aluminate, soda ash, hydrocarbons, graphite, coke, silicon, rare earth metals/mischmetal, cryolite, silica/fly ash, magnesium oxide, periclase, ferroalloys, dolomite lime, and colemanite.¹

¹ This second exclusion for magnesium-based reagent mixtures is based on the exclusion for

The merchandise subject to the order is currently classifiable under items 8104.11.00, 8104.19.00, 8104.30.00, and 8104.90.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise covered by the order is dispositive.

Rescission of Review in Part

On June 20, 2008, SMW submitted a letter indicating that it made no sales to the United States during the POR. We did not receive comments on SMW's submission. We confirmed SMW's claim of no shipments by reviewing U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) documentation. See Memorandum from International Trade Compliance Analyst to the File dated March 24, 2009. Because we find that SMW had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR, we are rescinding the administrative review with respect to SMW pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Analysis of the Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review of the order on magnesium metal from the Russian Federation are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" from John M. Andersen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary, dated August 4, 2009 (Decision Memo), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded is in the Decision Memo and attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Decision Memo, which is a public document, is on file in the Central Records Unit, main Department of Commerce building, Room 1117, and is accessible on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Use of Adverse Facts Available

For the final results, we continue to find that, by ending its participation in the review and requesting removal of its

reagent mixtures in the 2000-2001 investigations of magnesium from China, Israel, and Russia. See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium in Granular Form From the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 49345 (September 27, 2001), *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium From Israel*, 66 FR 49349 (September 27, 2001), and *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value: Pure Magnesium From the Russian Federation*, 66 FR 49347 (September 27, 2001). These mixtures are not magnesium alloys because they are not chemically combined in liquid form and cast into the same ingot.