Official Paul Matter; Willamette National Forest, Detroit Ranger District, HC 73 Box 320, Mill City, OR 97360; (503) 854–3366.

Dated: September 4, 2007.

Scott G. Fitzwilliams,

Acting Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 07–4411 Filed 9–7–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A–580–816)

Certain Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests from petitioners,[1] the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting the thirteenth administrative review of the antidumping order on corrosion–resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from Korea. This review covers three manufacturers and exporters (collectively, the respondents) of the subject merchandise: Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd., (Dongbu); Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO); and Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union). The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2005, through July 31, 2006. We preliminarily determine that during the POR, Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). In addition, we are preliminary rescinding this review with respect to Pohang Iron & Steel Company, Ltd. (POSCO) and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS) (collectively, the POSCO Group), as a result of petitioners timely withdrawal of its review request. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 10, 2007

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jolanta Lawska or George McMahon (Union), Preeti Tolani (Dongbu), and Victoria Cho or Christopher Hargett (HYSCO), 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) 482–8362, (202) 482–1167, (202) 482–0395, (202) 482–5075 and (202) 482–4161, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping order on CORE from Korea. *See Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Cold–Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea*, 58 FR 44159 (August 19, 1993) (Orders on Certain Steel from Korea). On August 1, 2006, we published in the **Federal Register** the *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 71 FR 43441 (August 1, 2006). On August 31, 2006, respondents and petitioners requested a review of Dongbu, HYSCO, the POSCO Group, and Union. The Department initiated this review on September 29, 2006. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 71 FR 57465 (September 29, 2006).

During the most recently completed segments of the proceeding in which Dongbu, HYSCO, the POSCO Group, and Union participated, the Department disregarded sales below the cost of production (COP) that failed the cost test.[2] Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales by these companies of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review were made at prices below the COP. We instructed Dongbu, HYSCO, the POSCO Group, and Union to respond to sections A–D of the initial questionnaire,[3] which we issued on September 13, 2006.

On December 28, 2006, the petitioners timely withdrew their request for an administrative review of the POSCO Group. Thus, we are preliminary rescinding the request for review of the antidumping order for the POSCO Group.

On April 19, 2007, the Department published a notice extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results of the thirteenth administrative review from May 3, 2007, to August 31, 2007. *See Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Extension of Time Limits for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 19688 (April 19, 2007).

Rescission of Administrative Review for the POSCO Group

As provided in 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), ''[t]he Secretary will rescind an administrative review under this section, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review.'' The petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the instant administrative review and no other party requested an administrative review of the POSCO Group. Therefore, the Department is rescinding the administrative review with respect to the POSCO Group.

Dongbu

On November 10, 2006, Dongbu submitted its section A response to the initial questionnaire. On November 20, 2006, Dongbu submitted its sections B–D response to the initial questionnaire. On February 9, 2007, Dongbu submitted its supplemental questionnaire responses for sections A–C. Dongbu submitted its responses to the Department's three section D supplemental questionnaires on March 12, 2007, March 26, 2007, and April 19, 2007, respectively.

Union

On November 13, 2006, Union submitted its section A response to the initial questionnaire. On November 20, 2006, Union submitted its sections B–C response to the initial questionnaire. Union submitted its responses to the Department's three section A–C supplemental questionnaires on February 2, 2007, April 16, 2007 and June 1, 2007, respectively.

[1] Petitioners are the United States Steel Corporation (U.S. Steel) and Mittal Steel USA ISG, Inc. (Mittal Steel USA).

[2] *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 53370, 53375 (September 11, 2006) (*Preliminary Results of the 12th Review of CORE from Korea); Notice of Final Results of the Twelfth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea*, 72 FR 13086 (March 20, 2007) and accompanying *Issues and Decisions Memorandum; and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea; Notice of Amended Final Results of the Twelfth Administrative Review*, 72 FR 20815 (April 26, 2007).

[3] Section A: Organization, Accounting Practices, Markets and Merchandise
Section B: Comparison Market Sales
Section C: Sales to the United States
Section D: Cost of Production and Constructed Value

HYSCO

On November 3, 2006, HYSCO submitted its section A response to the Department's initial questionnaire. On November 22, 2006, HYSCO submitted its section B–D response to the Department's initial questionnaire. HYSCO submitted its responses to the Department's three section A–D supplemental questionnaires on January 29, 2007, February 20, 2007, and May 24, 2007, respectively.

Verification

The Department conducted the sales verification of Dongbu and HYSCO, from June 18 through 29, 2007, and Union from July 23 through 27, 2007, in Seoul, South Korea. The Department conducted the cost verification of HYSCO in Seoul, South Korea, from July 31 through August 4, 2007. The Department will conduct the cost verification of Dongbu and Union in Seoul, South Korea, after these preliminary results.

Period of Review

The POR covered by this review is August 1, 2005, through July 31, 2006.

Scope of the Order

This order covers flat–rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion–resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron–based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7210.30.0030, 7210.30.0060, 7210.41.0000, 7210.49.0030, 7210.49.0090, 7210.49.0091, 7210.49.0095, 7210.61.0000, 7210.69.0000, 7210.70.6030, 7210.70.6060, 7210.70.6090, 7210.90.1000, 7210.90.6000, 7210.90.9000, 7212.20.0000, 7212.30.1030, 7212.30.1090, 7212.30.3000, 7212.30.5000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7212.60.0000, 7215.90.1000, 7215.90.3000, 7215.90.5000, 7217.20.1500, 7217.30.1530, 7217.30.1560, 7217.90.1000, 7217.90.5030, 7217.90.5060, and 7217.90.5090. Included in the order are flat–rolled products of non–rectangular cross–section where such cross–section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process including products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges (i.e., products which have been ''worked after rolling''). Excluded from this order are flat–rolled steel products either plated or coated with tin, lead, chromium, chromium oxides, both tin and lead (''terne plate''), or both chromium and chromium oxides (''tin–free steel''), whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. Also excluded from this order are clad products in straight lengths of 0.1875 inch or more in composite thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness. Also excluded from this order are certain clad stainless flat–rolled products, which are three–layered corrosion–resistant carbon steel flat–rolled products less than 4.75 millimeters in composite thickness that consist of a carbon steel flat–rolled product clad on both sides with stainless steel in a 20%–60%–20% ratio.

These HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all CORE products produced by the respondents, covered by the scope of the order, and sold in the home market during the POR to be foreign like products for the purpose of determining appropriate product comparisons to CORE sold in the United States.

Where there were no sales in the ordinary course of trade of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in Appendix V of the Department's antidumping questionnaire. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the Appendix V physical characteristics reported by each respondent. Where sales were made in the home market on a different weight basis from the U.S. market (theoretical versus actual weight), we converted all quantities to the same weight basis, using the conversion factors supplied by the respondents, before making our fair–value comparisons.

Normal Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of CORE by the respondents to the United States were made at less than NV, we compared the Export Price (EP) or Constructed Export Price (CEP) to the NV, as described in the ''Export Price/ Constructed Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted–average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price/Constructed Export Price

We calculated the price of U.S. sales based on CEP, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, which defines the term ''constructed export price'' as ''the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter, as adjusted under subsections (c) and (d)'' of this section. In contrast, section 772(a) of the Act defines ''export price'' as ''the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of the subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States, as adjusted under subsection (c)'' of this section.

In determining whether to classify U.S. sales as either EP or CEP sales, the Department must examine the totality of the circumstances surrounding the U.S. sales process, and assess where the reviewed sales or agreements of sale were made for purposes of section 772(b) of the Act. In the instant case, the record establishes that the sales were made in the United States after importation. Dongbu's, HYSCO's, and Union's affiliates in the United States (1) took title to the subject merchandise and (2) invoiced and received payment from the unaffiliated U.S. customers for their sales of the subject merchandise to those U.S. customers. Thus, the Department has determined that these U.S. sales should be classified as CEP transactions under section 772(b) of the Act.

For Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union, we calculated CEP based on packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the United

States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight, foreign inland insurance, foreign brokerage and handling, international freight, marine insurance, U.S. warehousing expenses, U.S. wharfage, U.S. inland freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, loading expenses, other U.S. transportation expenses, U.S. customs duties, commissions, credit expenses, letter of credit expenses, warranty expenses, other direct selling expenses, inventory carrying costs incurred in the United States, and other indirect selling expenses in the country of manufacture and the United States associated with economic activity in the United States. Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we made an adjustment for CEP profit. Where appropriate, we added interest revenue to the gross unit price.

Consistent with the Department's normal practice, for Union we added the reported duty drawback to the gross unit price. We did so in accordance with the Department's long–standing test, which requires that: (1) the import duty and rebate be directly linked to, and dependent upon, one another; and (2) the company claiming the adjustment demonstrate that there were sufficient imports of imported raw materials to account for the duty drawback received on the exports of the manufactured product.

HYSCO's Sales of Subject Merchandise that were Further Manufactured and Sold as Non–Subject Merchandise in the United States

In its Section A questionnaire response and on September 27, 2006, HYSCO requested that the Department exclude certain POR sales of subject merchandise imported by its wholly owned U.S. subsidiary, HYSCO America Company (HAC), that were further manufactured after importation and sold as non–subject merchandise in the United States, citing ''the extreme difficulty in calculating CEP for these sales through HAC.'' The Department issued several supplemental questionnaires to HYSCO regarding these HAC CEP sales.

Section 772(e) of the Act provides that when the value added in the United States by an affiliated party is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, the Department shall use one of the following prices to determine CEP if there is a sufficient quantity of sales to provide a reasonable basis of comparison and the use of such sales is appropriate: (1) The price of identical subject merchandise sold by the exporter or producer to an unaffiliated person; or (2) The price of other subject merchandise sold by the exporter or producer to an unaffiliated person.

Our analysis showed that the value added by the affiliated party to the subject merchandise after importation in the United States was significantly greater than the 65 percent threshold we use in determining whether the value added in the United States by an affiliated party substantially exceeds the value of the subject merchandise. *See* 19 CFR 351.402 (c)(2). We then considered whether there were sales of identical subject merchandise or other subject merchandise sold in sufficient quantities by the exporter or producer to an unaffiliated person that could provide a reasonable basis of comparison. In addition to the sales to HAC that were further manufactured, HYSCO also had CEP sales of similar, but not identical, subject merchandise to unaffiliated customers in the United States in back–to-back transactions through another HYSCO affiliate in the United States, Hyundai HYSCO USA (''HHU'').

Decisions as to the appropriate methodology for determining CEP for sales involving further manufacturing generally must be made on a case–by-case basis. In this instance, the quantity of sales of identical or other subject merchandise to an unaffiliated person is relatively small. However, another reasonable method for determining CEP for the HAC CEP sales is not evident. In this case, the value added after importation is very large and the further manufacturing very complex. Therefore, similar to our practice in other cases, see, e.g., *Certain Hot–Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 72 FR 28676 (May 22, 2007), we relied on HYSCO's other sales of similar merchandise to unaffiliated parties in the United States as the basis for calculating CEP on HYSCO's sales through HAC. Although we have relied on a relatively small quantity of sales, as under the circumstances here this is the most reasonable methodology, we will continue to assess whether such quantities provide an adequate basis for our dumping analysis in other cases. Therefore, in this and future reviews we will reexamine the appropriate methodology to use when presented with similar circumstances.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product sold 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) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

Where appropriate, we deducted rebates, discounts, inland freight (offset, where applicable, by freight revenue), inland insurance, and packing. Additionally, we made adjustments to NV, where appropriate, for credit expenses, warranty expenses, post–sale warehousing, and differences in weight basis. We also made adjustments, where appropriate, for home market indirect selling expenses and inventory carrying costs to offset U.S. commissions.

We also increased NV by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act. We made adjustments to NV for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

For purposes of calculating NV, section 771(16) of the Act defines ''foreign like product'' as merchandise which is either (1) identical or (2) similar to the merchandise sold in the United States. When there are no identical products sold in the home market, the products which are most similar to the product sold in the United States are identified. For the non–identical or most similar products which are identified based on the Department's product matching criteria, an adjustment is made to the home market sales price to account for the actual physical differences between the products sold in the United States and the home market or third country market. See 19 CFR 351.411 and section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we determined NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the CEP sales, to the extent practicable. When there were no sales at the same LOT, we compared U.S. sales to comparison market sales at a different LOT.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.412, to determine whether CEP sales and NV sales were at different LOTs, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated (or arm's–length) customers. If the comparison market

sales are at a different LOT and the differences affect price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between sales at different LOTs in the country in which NV is determined, we will make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. For CEP sales, if the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the CEP LOT and the data available do not provide an appropriate basis to determine an LOT adjustment, we will grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732–33 (November 19, 1997).

We did not make an LOT adjustment under 19 CFR 351.412(e) because, as there was only one home market LOT for each respondent, we were unable to identify a pattern of consistent price differences attributable to differences in LOTs (*see* 19 CFR 351.412(d)). Under 19 CFR 351.412(f), we are preliminarily granting a CEP offset for Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union because the NV for each company is at a more advanced LOT than the LOT for their U.S. CEP sales.

For a detailed description of our LOT methodology and a summary of company–specific LOT findings for these preliminary results, *see* the August 31, 2007, *Calculation Memorandum for Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd.; Calculation Memorandum for Hyundai HYSCO*; and *Calculation Memorandum for Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.*, of which the public versions are on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Import Administration, Washington, DC, HCHB Building, Room B–099.

Cost of Production

A. Calculation of COP

We are investigating COP for Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union because during the most recently completed segments of the proceeding in which Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union participated, the Department found and disregarded sales that failed the cost test. We calculated a company–specific COP for Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union based on the sum of each respondent's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home–market selling expenses, selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A), and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We relied on Dongbu's, HYSCO's, and Union's information as submitted.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of the respondents' cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for general and administrative (G&A) expenses and interest expenses. We relied on the COP information provided by Dongbu in its questionnaire responses, except for the following instances where the information was not appropriately quantified or valued:

1. We adjusted Dongbu's reported cost of manufacturing (COM) to appropriately value the claimed scrap offset.
2. We revised the reported G&A expense ratio to exclude certain items of exchange gains and losses. In addition, we adjusted the denominator used to calculate the G&A expense ratio for the adjustment made above.

For further discussion of these adjustments, *see* the Memorandum to Neal Halper entitled, *Cost of Production and Constructed Value Adjustments for the Preliminary Results—Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd.*, dated August 30, 2007.

B. Test of Home–Market Prices

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, as required under sections 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act, we compared the weighted–average COP figures to home market sales of the foreign like product and we examined whether (1) within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities, and (2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product–specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices (not including VAT), less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we may disregard below–COP sales in the determination of NV if these sales have been made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and were not at prices which permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP for at least six months of the POR, we determined that sales of that model were made in ''substantial quantities'' within an extended period of time, in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act. Where prices of a respondent's sales of a given product were below the per–unit COP at the time of sale and below the weighted–average per–unit costs for the POR, we determined that sales were not at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. In such cases, we disregarded the below–cost sales in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent'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 we determined that the below–cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.''

We tested and identified below–cost home market sales for Dongbu, HYSCO, and Union. We disregarded individual below–cost sales of a given product and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. *See* the August 31, 2007, *Calculation Memorandum for Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd.; Calculation Memorandum for Hyundai HYSCO*; and *Calculation Memorandum for Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.*

Arm's–Length Sales

Dongbu and HYSCO also reported that they made sales in the home market to affiliated parties. The Department calculates NV 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 producer or exporter, *i.e.*, sales at arm's length. *See* 19 CFR 351.403(c).

To test whether these sales were made at arm's length, we compared the starting prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, discounts and packing. In accordance with the Department's current practice, if the prices charged to an affiliated party were, on average, between 98 and 102 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated parties for merchandise identical or most similar to that sold to the affiliated party, we considered the sales to be at arm's–length prices. *See Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative: Ninth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy*, 71 FR 45017, 45020 (August 8, 2006);

19 CFR 351.403(c). Conversely, where we found sales to the affiliated party that did not pass the arm's–length test, all sales to that affiliated party have been excluded from the NV calculation.

See Antidumping Proceedings: Affiliated Party Sales in the Ordinary Course of Trade, 67 69186, 69187 (November 15, 2002).

Currency Conversion

For purposes of these preliminary results, we made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act, based on the official exchange rates published by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily find that the following weighted–average dumping margins exist:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted–Average Margin
Dongbu	4.96 %
HYSCO	0.51 %
Union	4.35 %

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to the parties of this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs are limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments and may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing the case briefs or comments. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties submitting arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: 1) a statement of the issue, 2) a brief summary of the argument, and 3) a table of authorities. Case and rebuttal briefs and comments must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f). Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on a diskette.

An interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, ordinarily will be held two days after the due date of the rebuttal briefs. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, if requested, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rate

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of this 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 Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in these final results of review for which the reviewed companies did not know that the merchandise they sold to the intermediary (*e.g.*, a reseller, trading company, or exporter) 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 intermediary involved in the transaction. *See Assessment Policy Notice* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that 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 CORE for Korea 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 these reviews, 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 these or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 17.70 percent, the ''All Others'' rate established in the LTFV. *See Orders on Certain Steel from Korea*. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

Dated: August 31, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–17756 Filed 9–7–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–570–886

Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bag Committee,[1] which represents domestic producers of polyethylene retail carrier bags, and individual requests from certain manufacturers/exporters of subject merchandise located in the People's Republic of China (''PRC''), the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene retail carrier bags (''PRCBs'') from the PRC. The

[1] Consisting of Hilex Poly Company, LLC and the Superbag Corporation (collectively, ''the petitioners'').