States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

III. After notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Subilia by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

IV. This Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

V. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until November 18, 2015.

VI. In accordance with Part 756 of the Regulations, Subilia may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of Part 756 of the Regulations.

VII. A copy of this Order shall be delivered to Subilia. This Order shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 12, 2007.

Eileen M. Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 07–1333 Filed 3–19–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–816]

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

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

SUMMARY: On September 11, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review for certain corrosion–resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). *See Certain Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 53370 (September 11, 2006) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise: Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union); Pohang Iron & Steel Company, Ltd. (POSCO) and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS) (collectively, the POSCO Group); Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO); and Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd. (Dongbu) (collectively, respondents). The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2004, through July 31, 2005.

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. For our final results, we have found that during the POR, Union and Dongbu sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). We have also found that HYSCO and the POSCO Group did not make sales of the subject merchandise at less than NV (*i.e.*, they have a zero or *de minimis* dumping margin).

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 20, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jolanta Lawska (Union), Preeti Tolani (Dongbu), Victoria Cho (the POSCO Group), and Joy Zhang (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) 482–0395, (202) 482–5075, and (202) 482–1168, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 11, 2006, the Department published the *Preliminary Results*. On January 3, 2007, the Department published the notice of extension of final results of the antidumping administrative review of CORE from Korea, extending the date for these final results to March 12, 2007. *See Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea: Extension of Time Limits for the Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 72 FR 102 (January 3, 2007).

Comments from Interested Parties

We invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. On October 20, 2006, Mittal Steel USA ISG, Inc. (Mittal) and United States Steel Corporation (US Steel) filed case briefs concerning all respondents and all respondents filed a case brief.[1] On October 31, 2006, Mittal filed a rebuttal brief concerning all respondents and U.S. Steel filed rebuttal briefs concerning Union, Dongbu, and POSCO. On October 31, 2006, all respondents filed a rebuttal brief.

Scope of the Order

This order covers cold–rolled (cold–reduced) carbon steel 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, 7210.61.0000, 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,

[1] The Nucor Corporation, a domestic interested party, did not submit a case brief or a rebuttal brief.

7217.90.5060, 7217.90.5090. Included in this order are corrosion–resistant flat–rolled products of non–rectangular cross-section where such 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. 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.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal brief by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised, and to which we have responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn.* The paper copy and electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted–average margins exist:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted–Average Margin
Dongbu	2.07 %
Union	1.45 %
The POSCO Group	0.35 % (de minimis)
HYSCO	0.09 % (de minimis)

Assessment

The Department will determine, and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated importer–specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of these final results.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of CORE from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) for companies covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies other than those covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the company–specific rate established 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 producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the subject merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 17.70 percent, the ''All Others'' rate established in the less–than-fair–value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the presumption that reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping and/or countervailing duties reimbursed.

Administrative Protective Order

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

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 12, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

APPENDIX I

List of Comments in the Accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum

A. General Issues

Comment 1: Model–Match Methodology and Laminated Products
Comment 2: Treatment of CEP Offset
Comment 3: Adjustments to U.S. Prices for Duty Drawback Paid in Korea
Comment 4: Treatment of Indirect Selling Expenses incurred in Korea
Comment 5: Treatment of Production Yields

B. Company–Specific Issues

Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd.

Comment 6: Treatment of All Sales Entered During the POR in Dongbu's Margin Calculation

Hyundai HYSCO

Comment 7: Cash Deposit Rate for HYSCO

Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd.

Comment 8: DINDIRSU Calculation
Comment 9: Treatment of Union's Indirect Selling Expense Ratio
Comment 10: Treatment of Union's Calculation of DKA's Short Term Interest Rate
Comment 11: Treatment of Union's Overrun Sales in the Home Market
Comment 12: Treatment of Union's Home Market Sales of Non–Prime Merchandise in the Calculation of Normal Value
Comment 13: Ministerial Error with respect to QTYCVNU Field

Comment 14: Ministerial Error Regarding Union's Home Market Credit Expenses

Pohang Iron & Steel Company, Ltd. and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd.

Comment 15: Treatment of the POSCO's Group Home Market Credit Expenses on Freight billed to its Customers
Comment 16: The Department's Calculation of the POSCO Group's Sales Database Affecting Certain Conversion Factors
Comment 17: Treatment of the POSCO Group's Short–Term Interest Rate Used for U.S. Credit Expenses
Comment 18: Treatment of the POSCO Group's of Overun Sales in the Home Market
Comment 19: The Department's Calculation of the POSCO Group's Certain Merchandise Sales in the Home Market
Comment 20: Treatment of the POSCO Group's Cash Deposit Instructions
Comment 21: Treatment of POSAM's (Pohang Steel America Corp.) Indirect Selling Expenses

[FR Doc. E7–5041 Filed 3–19–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–808]

Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty New–Shipper Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 20, 2007.

SUMMARY: On December 29, 2006, the Department of Commerce received a request to conduct a new–shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod from India. In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.214(d), we are initiating a new–shipper review of Sunflag Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., the exporter and producer that requested the new–shipper review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine Cartsos or Minoo Hatten at (202) 482–1757 or (202) 482–1690, respectively, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The notice announcing the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod from India was published on December 1, 1993. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India*, 58 FR 63335 (December 1, 1993). On December 29, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a timely request for a new–shipper review of the order from Sunflag Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (Sunflag). See section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(c). Sunflag is both the Indian producer and exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States on which its request for a new–shipper review is based. As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i) and (iii)(A), Sunflag certified that it is a producer and exporter of the subject merchandise, that it did not export stainless steel wire rod to the United States during the period of investigation (POI) (July 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992), and that, since the initiation of the investigation, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer that exported stainless steel wire rod to the United States during the POI.[1]

In addition, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), the company submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise for export to the United States; (2) the volume of its first shipment and its subsequent shipment;[2] and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

On January 31, 2007, the Department postponed its decision regarding whether to initiate the new–shipper review because, based upon its routine examination of Customs and Border Protection entry data, it was not clear whether the merchandise exported by Sunflag to the United States qualified as subject merchandise. See Memorandum from Catherine Cartsos through Minoo Hatten to the File, New–Shipper Review of Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India: Customs and Border Protection Entry Data, dated January 31, 2007. Under 19 CFR 351.302(b), the Department may extend any time limit established by its regulations for good cause unless expressly precluded by the statute. See Letter from Laurie Parkhill to Mr. M.D. Ghumare, General Manager of Exports for Sunflag, dated January 31, 2007. The status of the Sunflag entries is no longer at issue because the Department has determined that the merchandise exported by Sunflag to the United States qualifies as subject merchandise. See Memorandum from Catherine Cartsos through Minoo Hatten to the File, New–Shipper Review of Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India: Customs and Border Protection Entry Data and Documents, dated March 13, 2007.

Initiation of New–Shipper Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2) and (d)(1), we find that Sunflag's request meets the threshold requirements for initiation of a new–shipper review. See March 13, 2007, Memorandum to the File through Laurie Parkhill, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, from the team regarding the new–shipper review initiation checklist. Accordingly, we are initiating a new–shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod from India for shipments produced and exported by Sunflag. The period of review is December 1, 2005, through November 30, 2006. See 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(A). We intend to issue the preliminary results of this new–shipper review no later than 180 days after initiation of this review. See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i). We intend to issue the final results of this review no later than 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results are issued. See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i). On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (H.R. 4) was signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4 temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct Customs and Border Protection to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in new–shipper reviews. Therefore, the posting of a bond under section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(e) in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of subject merchandise manufactured and exported by Sunflag must continue to pay a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise at the current all–others rate of 48.80 percent.

Interested parties that need access to proprietary information in this new–shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.214(d), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

[1] See Sunflag's Request for New Shipper Review, dated December 29, 2006.

[2] In its December 29, 2006, Request for New Shipper Review, Sunflag provided information on its subsequent shipment.