

- Failed to ensure grantees' compliance with critical financial and audit reporting requirements.

- Failed to ensure efficient capital utilization by grantees. Under EDA's regulations, if an RLF grantee fails to satisfy its capital utilization requirement as set out in its RLF plan for two consecutive reporting periods, EDA can require the grantee to sequester "excess funds" in a separate interest-bearing account and remit the interest earned on these funds to the U.S. Treasury. (Under 13 CFR 307.16, "capital utilization rate" is the amount of RLF capital as currently loaned out or committed to be loaned out as a percentage of the RLF's capital base and "excess funds" is the difference between the actual percentage of RLF capital loaned and the applicable capital utilization percentage.)

- EDA's failure to require sequestration of excess funds on a consistent basis has resulted in lower capital utilization rates and lower remittances to the U.S. Treasury than would be commensurate with adequate oversight of the program.

- Did not use single audits as a tool for managing the RLF program. Under OMB Circular A-133, single audits are required of most RLF grantees.

The OIG recommended that EDA develop an Action Plan to rectify these deficiencies and a "standard grantee reporting and monitoring system that provides the critical information EDA needs to manage the RLF program and protect its assets." The OIG also recommended that EDA "ensure that all RLF grant recipients undergo required single audits and file reports with the Federal Audit Clearinghouse."

EDA agreed to implement the recommendations. As part of its implementation, EDA committed to reviewing the RLF reporting forms to: (a) Ensure all information needed to manage the RLF program and protect EDA assets is collected, (b) ensure that the form is suitably integrated into an automated RLF reporting, tracking, monitoring, and management system, and (c) to the extent possible, minimize the paperwork burden on RLF grantees.

In addition, EDA will update its regulations to reflect these changes to the RLF program and to ensure effective management of federal funds.

Through this review, EDA determined the following:

- The use of both annual and semi-annual reports is sub-optimal. In terms of providing valuable information to EDA for program monitoring purposes, the ED-209A is not as useful as the ED-209S. Also, the lack of identical fields on the two reporting forms makes it

difficult, if not impossible, to report on the status of the portfolio as a whole. Having different RLF grantees fill out either the ED-209A or the ED-209S effectively separates RLF grantees into two groups, with two different sets of reporting requirements and reporting dates, which contributes to the large number of missing or late reports highlighted by the OIG. For these reasons EDA has determined that all RLF grantees will report semi-annually using Form ED-209S.

- The fact that neither of the current reporting forms collects grantee EIN numbers makes it difficult, if not impossible, for EDA to determine whether a grantee has filed its single audit report with the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. Searching by EIN number is the most reliable way to locate single audit reports in the Clearinghouse database.

- EDA needs to begin collecting e-mail addresses to facilitate communication with grantees.

- Many of the fields of the current RLF reporting forms are duplicative, and therefore contribute to reporting inconsistencies and errors. Some fields should not change from reporting period to reporting period (e.g., amount of EDA investment assistance provided), but are still requested each and every time. Many others are calculated fields, for example the "RLF income" field (line B.8 of the current ED-209S) is calculated as interest earned plus earnings from accounts plus fees earned (lines B.5, B.6, and B.7). The use of a hardcopy form with a large number of fields that must be calculated by the grantee has led to a significant amount of mathematical errors.

EDA addressed the issues highlighted above by creating a web-based grantee reporting system that eliminates all duplicative and calculable fields. This system is designed to allow grantees, if they so choose, to upload data directly from their accounting software into the Web-based system, thus eliminating time-consuming data entry.

Alternatively, grantees have the option of manually entering data into the Web-based system. All grantees will be provided with a unique user id and password, and the system will meet all NIST information technology security controls. All grantees will be required to report on a semi-annual basis and to provide e-mail contact information, as well as EIN and DUNS numbers. This system is expected to "go live" at the beginning of fiscal year 2009.

II. Method of Collection

The report will be submitted electronically.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0610-0095.
Form Number: ED-209 (replaces ED-209S and ED-209A).

Type of Review: Regular submission.
Affected Public: Not for-profit institutions; state, local or tribal government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,168.

Estimated Time per Response: 3 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,504.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

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, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: March 11, 2008.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E8-5216 Filed 3-14-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-24-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-822]

Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 17, 2008

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maryanne Burke or Robert James, 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) 482–5604 and (202) 482–0649, respectively.

SUMMARY: On February 11, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico covering the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006. *See Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 7710 (February 11, 2008) (*Final Results*). We are amending the *Final Results* to correct a ministerial error in the calculation of the assessment rate applicable to entries of the respondent in this proceeding, ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. and Mexinox USA, Inc. (collectively, Mexinox), pursuant to section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act) and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 11, 2008, the Department received from Mexinox a timely allegation of a ministerial error pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(1). Mexinox alleges that the Department miscalculated the assessment rate in the final results. Mexinox states the Department did not include the reported customs value related to certain material which entered the United States for consumption but was returned to Mexico after further-processing in the United States. Mexinox states the Department explained its intention to include the customs value of this material in the denominator of the assessment rate in its memorandum “Analysis of Data Submitted by ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico (A–201–822).” Mexinox further notes it paid antidumping duty cash deposits on this material without a sale having been made to an unaffiliated U.S. customer. However, Mexinox contends the Department did not, in fact, incorporate the customs value at issue in calculating the assessment rate. Petitioners did not comment on the alleged ministerial error.

Amended Final Results of Review

A ministerial error as defined in section 751(h) of the Tariff Act, “includes errors in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from

inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the administering authority considers ministerial.” *See also* 19 CFR 351.224(f). After analyzing Mexinox’s allegation, we have determined, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), that the Department made a ministerial error in the final results by inadvertently excluding the customs value at issue from our assessment rate calculation. Therefore, we are amending the final results of administrative review of stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico for the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 to include the customs value at issue. The weighted-average percentage margin for Mexinox remains unchanged at 2.31 percent. Therefore, there is no need to issue new cash deposit instructions for these amended final results of this administrative review. We intend to issue appropriate assessment instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection 41 days after publication of these amended final results.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

Dated: March 10, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–5299 Filed 3–14–08; 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: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the “Department”) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene retail carrier bags (“PRCB”) from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) covering the period August 1, 2005, through July 30, 2006. On September 10, 2007, we published our preliminary results. *See Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial*

Rescission of Review, 72 FR 51588 (“*Preliminary Results*”). We invited interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes to our margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 17, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zev Primor or Maisha Cryor, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4114 or (202) 482–5831, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 10, 2007, the Department published the Preliminary Results. The mandatory respondents in this case are Dongguan Nozawa Plastics Products Co., Ltd., and United Power Packaging, Ltd. (collectively, “Nozawa”), and Rally Plastics Co., Ltd. (“Rally”). Additionally, this review covers a PRC exporter and its wholly-owned producer that are requesting a separate rate, Chun Hing Plastic Packaging Mfy. Ltd., and Chun Yip Plastic Bag Factory (collectively, “Chun Hing”). On September 4, 2007, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to Rally requesting that it address deficiencies in its factors of production (“FOP”) allocation methodology. Rally submitted a response to this questionnaire on October 1, 2007. Nozawa, Rally, and the petitioners¹ submitted case briefs on November 1, 2007, and rebuttal briefs on November 7, 2007. In addition, Rally submitted a request for a hearing on October 10, 2007, but withdrew the request on November 13, 2007.

Period of Review

The period of review (“POR”) for this administrative review is August 1, 2005, through July 31, 2006.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order is PRCBs, which may be referred to as t-shirt sacks, merchandise bags, grocery bags, or checkout bags. The subject merchandise is defined as non-sealable sacks and bags with handles (including drawstrings), without zippers or integral extruded closures, with or without gussets, with or without printing, of polyethylene film having a thickness no

¹ The petitioners are Hilex Poly Co., LLC, and the Superbag Corporation.