On January 5, 2006, the Department issued a letter to the respondent, IFP Corp., to solicit this information. IFP Corp. responded on January 11, 2006. On February 6, 2006, the Department issued a memorandum expressing its intent to rescind the new shipper review. *See* memorandum from Constance Handley, Program Manager to Susan H. Kuhbach, Director, Office 1, re: New Shipper Review: Intent to rescind the Review of International Forest Products Corporation (*Rescission Memo*). On February 24, 2006, the Department received comments from IFP Corp.

Analysis of Comments Received

In the *Rescission Memo*, the Department expressed its intent to rescind the review, because IFP Corp., the company from which the request for review had been received, was not the first party in the chain of distribution with knowledge that the merchandise was destined for the United States. Information provided by the producer, Terrace Lumber Company (Terrace), indicated that it had knowledge that the merchandise was destined for the United States. IFP Corp. does not dispute that Terrace was aware that its lumber was destined for the United States. However, it argues that the review request was intended to be for Terrace as well as for IFP.

According to IFP Corp., the request was made ''on behalf'' of IFP Corp. because, by agreement with Terrace, IFP Corp. was responsible for paying the legal fees incurred in participating in the review. IFP Corp. maintains that it clearly identified Terrace as the producer and as one of the two requesters on the front of the petition and in the supporting documents. IFP Corp. distinguishes this case from *Pasta from Italy* and *Garlic from the PRC*[1] in that in those cases, no request was made to review the producer's sales. Finally, IFP Corp. argues that Terrace's only sales are to IFP Corp., and therefore, the only sales of Terrace's which could be reviewed are sales to IFP and the only post–tariff sales to U.S. customers for review are from IFP.

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), provides that the Department will conduct a new shipper review if it receives a request from an exporter or producer of the subject merchandise. We disagree with IFP Corp.'s contention that the request for this review was received from both IFP Corp. and Terrace. The letter submitted to the Department states ''On behalf of International Forest Products Corporation, we submit the attached request for new shipper review . . .'' In the same paragraph it goes on to state ''IFP {Corp.} requests a new shipper review. . .'' Although Terrace is identified as the producer in the request, nowhere in the document does it specifically state that a review is being requested for Terrace. On the cover page to the request, and on page 4, IFP Corp. is clearly identified as the ''exporter and requester'' and Terrace as the ''producer.'' In addition, the request specifically identifies IFP Corp.'s first sale of Terrace–produced lumber to IFP Corp.'s customer and provides an invoice for that sale, further indicating that IFP Corp. was requesting a review of its sales to its customers. Section 751(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Act and the Department's regulations at 351.214(b) specify that an exporter may request a new shipper review. IFP Corp. made the request for this review, and the Department initiated a review based on that request from IFP Corp. However, the relevant sale for the purposes of conducting an antidumping duty review, is the sale from Terrace to IFP Corp., not the sale from IFP Corp. to its customer. Therefore, IFP Corp. does not qualify for a new shipper review and, accordingly, we are rescinding the review at this time.

Rescission of New Shipper Review

For the reasons stated in the *Rescission Memo* and as outlined above, and pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(f), we are rescinding this new shipper review.

Notification

Bonding is no longer permitted to fulfill security requirements for shipments of certain softwood lumber products from Canada produced and exported by IFP Corp., entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States on or after the publication of this rescission notice in the **Federal Register**.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO material or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanctions.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(f)(3).

Dated: April 13, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–5949 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

[1] *See Certain Pasta From Italy: Termination of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 66602 (December 19, 1997); *see also Fresh Garlic from the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Termination of Administrative Review.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–821]

Notice of Correction to Notice of Intent to Rescind Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot–Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from India

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 20, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Preeti Tolani, 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: 202–482–0395.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

CORRECTION:

On March 28, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its intent to rescind the countervailing duty administrative review of certain hot–rolled carbon steel flat products from India, covering the period of January 1, 2005, through December 31, 2005. *See Notice of Intent to Rescind Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot–Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from India*, 71 FR 15379 (March 28, 2006) (*HRC Intent to Rescind*). Subsequent to the publication of the intent to rescind, we identified an inadvertent error in the **Federal Register**. The case number associated with the *HRC Intent to Rescind* is incorrect. The correct case number is C–533–821. This notice is to serve as a correction to the case number. The determination in the *HRC Intent to Rescind* is correct and remains unchanged.

This correction is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: April 12, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Acting Assistant Secretaryfor Impo Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–5948 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 041306F]

Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; General Provisions for Domestic Fisheries; Application for Exempted Fishing Permits

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries, Northeast Region, NMFS (Assistant Regional Administrator), has made a preliminary determination that an Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP) application submitted by the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES), contains all of the required information and warrants further consideration. The Assistant Regional Administrator has made a preliminary determination that the activities authorized under this EFP would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Northeast (NE) Multispecies and Monkfish Fishery Management Plans (FMPs). However, further review and consultation may be necessary before a final determination is made to issue an EFP. Therefore, NMFS announces that the Assistant Regional Administrator proposes to recommend that an EFP be issued that would allow one commercial fishing vessel to conduct fishing operations that are otherwise restricted by the regulations governing the fisheries of the Northeastern United States. The EFP, which would enable researchers to study the biology of large monkfish, would grant exemptions from the NE Multispecies FMP as follows: Western Gulf of Maine (GOM) Closure Area; GOM Rolling Closure Areas I and II; and monkfish effort control measures.

Regulations under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act require publication of this notification to provide interested parties the opportunity to comment on applications for proposed EFPs.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 5, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to Patricia A. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, NMFS, NE Regional Office, 1 Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope ''Comments on UMES monkfish EFP, DA6–096.'' Comments may also be sent via fax to 978–281–9135. Comments may also be submitted via e-mail to the following address: *DA6–096@noaa.gov*. Include in the subject line of the e-mail ''Comments on UMES monkfish EFP.''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Potts, Fishery Management Specialist, 978–281–9341.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An application for an EFP was submitted on March 22, 2006, by Andrea K. Johnson, Research Assistant Professor at UMES, for a project funded under the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils' Monkfish Research Set-Aside (RSA) Program. The primary goal of this study is to provide information on the biology of large monkfish that can be used to enhance the management of this species.

The project is scheduled to be conducted for one year (May 2006–April 2007) and would collect large monkfish from three industry collaborators fishing using 57.5 Monkfish Days-At-Sea (DAS) awarded to the project through the RSA Program. Monkfish gillnet vessels fishing off of Maryland, Delaware, New York, and Rhode Island would collect large monkfish as part of otherwise normal fishing activities and do not require an EFP. One vessel would fish inside the eastern edge of the Western GOM Closure Area from August 2006 through April 2007. The approximate location where fishing would take place is 42°30′ N latitude, 70°00′ W longitude. This is east of the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary and would require exemption from the gear restrictions of the Western GOM Closure Area at 50 CFR 648.81(e) as well as from the restrictions of Rolling Closure Areas I and II at § 648.81(f) that will be in effect during March and April 2007. It is expected that this location would provide access to large monkfish and would avoid gear interactions between these gillnets and trawls. The applicant is also requesting exemption from the Monkfish effort control measures at § 648.92(b)(2) in order to create sufficient incentive for a commercial vessel to participate in this experiment. This would exempt the vessel from the need to use a NE Multispecies DAS concurrent with a Monkfish DAS for these trips.

The vessel would make 28 trips using gillnets that are 13–inch stretch mesh with 24 gauge web and are 12 meshes deep. Each net is 300 feet long by 3 feet high and 150 nets will be used with an average soak time of 72 hours. Ten fish per week (360 monkfish total) will be donated to the research project during the months of August 2006–April 2007. This project is specifically interested in large monkfish, so donated fish will be the largest from each trip of at least 90 cm total length. Additional catch, within applicable size and possession limits, will be sold to help offset the costs of the research. As a consequence of the exemption from the need to use a NE Multispecies DAS, the vessel will not keep any regulated groundfish. Since these trips will use very large mesh nets, the bycatch of regulated groundfish is expected to be minimal.

The applicant may request minor modifications and extensions to the EFP throughout the year. EFP modifications and extensions may be granted without further notice if they are deemed essential to facilitate completion of the proposed research and have minimal impacts that do not change the scope or impact of the initially approved EFP request. Any fishing activity conducted outside the scope of the exempted fishing activity would be prohibited.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: April 13, 2006.

James P. Burgess,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. E6–5902 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 041306B]

New England Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting.

SUMMARY: The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) is scheduling a public meeting of its Sea Scallop Survey Advisory Panel in May, 2006, to consider actions affecting New England fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Recommendations from this group will be brought to the full Council for formal consideration and action, if appropriate.

DATES: This meeting will be held on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 9 a.m.