

in this administrative review. See the July 29, 2008, Memorandum from The Team to James Maeder, Office Director, titled "2007 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China: Selection of Respondents for Individual Review."

In July and August 2008, several companies, including Longkou Haimeng, timely withdrew their requests for review. We partially rescinded the review with respect to these companies. See *Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 53193 (September 15, 2008).

Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination in an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order or finding for which a review is requested. If it is not practicable to complete the review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend this deadline to a maximum of 365 days. The deadline for the preliminary results of this review is currently December 31, 2008.

In this review, the interested parties have not submitted publicly available information (PAI) for consideration in valuing the factors of production in the preliminary results. Moreover, we have requested and received documentation from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for certain entries made by exporter/producer combinations which are also included in this review to determine whether those entries are non-subject merchandise. Therefore, the Department requires additional time to obtain updated PAI and analyze the entry data from CBP. Thus, it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is partially extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results from 245 days to 306 days, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) the Act. The preliminary results are now due no later than March 2, 2009. The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: December 11, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. E8-30111 Filed 12-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-122-840)

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On July 10, 2008, the Department of Commerce (Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Canada. See *Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada*, 73 FR 39646 (July 10, 2008) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers the period October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007, for Ivaco Rolling Mills 2004 L.P. and Sivaco Ontario, a division of Sivaco Wire Group 2004 L.P. (referred to collectively as Ivaco).

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 18, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Bezirgianian 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) 482-1131 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 10, 2008, the Department published the preliminary results of this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Canada. See *Preliminary Results*, 73 FR 39646. Ivaco submitted its case brief on August 11, 2008, and petitioners, ISG Georgetown Inc., Gerdau Ameristeel U.S. Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel Mills, submitted their rebuttal brief on August 18, 2008. No hearing was requested. The Department extended the deadline for completion of the final results by 35 days, to December 12, 2008. See *Carbon*

and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 73 FR 63134 (October 23, 2008).

Period of Review

The period of review is October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (i.e., products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. Grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

Grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in

cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod.

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to

certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope. The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum from Gary Taverman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, dated December 11, 2008 (Decision Memorandum), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memorandum (and, for the level of trade issue, in a separate proprietary document referenced in the Decision Memorandum), is attached to this notice as an appendix. Parties can find a discussion of all public issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit in room 1117 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly via the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not made any changes to the calculations in our preliminary results.

Final Results of Review

We determine the following weighted-average percentage margin exists for the period October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted Average Margin
Ivaco Rolling Mills 2004 L.P. / Sivaco Ontario, a division of Sivaco Wire Group 2004 L.P.	2.33 percent

Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise covered by the review. Upon issuance of the final results of this review, for the importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results that is above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.50 percent), we will issue assessment instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. Pursuant to 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 41 days after the date of publication of these final results of 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). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the period of review produced by Ivaco for which Ivaco did not know the merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the 8.11 percent all-others rate if there is no company-specific rate for an intermediary involved in the transaction. See *id.*

Cash Deposit Requirements

The Department has revoked this order, effective October 29, 2007. See *Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order on Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada*, 73 FR 44223 (July 30, 2008). Therefore, there is no need to issue new cash deposit instructions for this administrative review.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a final 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 Department’s presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative

protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return or 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. This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 11, 2008.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Policy and Negotiations.

Appendix Issues and Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: Level of Trade

Comment 2: Offsetting for U.S. Sales that Exceed Normal Value

[FR Doc. E8-30090 Filed 12-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-588-046)

Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Determination To Revoke Antidumping Duty Finding, in Part

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

SUMMARY: On September 29, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review with intent to revoke, in part, the antidumping duty (AD) finding on polychloroprene rubber from Japan. *See Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Finding, in Part*, 73 FR 56548 (September 29, 2008) (*Initiation and Preliminary Results*). On October 27, 2008, the **Federal Register** corrected certain errors it made in publishing the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*. *See Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty*

Finding, in Part, 73 FR 63687 (October 27, 2008) (*Initiation Correction*).

In the *Initiation and Preliminary Results* and *Initiation Correction*, the Department invited interested parties to comment on the *Initiation and Preliminary Results* and no comments were received. Accordingly, we are now revoking this AD finding, in part, with regard to certain polychloroprene rubber products from Japan, as described in the "Scope of Changed Circumstances Review" section of this notice, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no further interest in the relief provided by the AD finding with respect to the imports of such products.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 18, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Summer Avery, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4052.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 4, 2008, the Department received a request on behalf of the petitioner, DuPont Performance Elastomers L.L.C. (DPE),¹ for revocation, in part, of the AD finding on polychloroprene rubber from Japan pursuant to sections 751(b)(1) and 782(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). DPE requested partial revocation of the AD finding with respect to certain polychloroprene rubber products, listed below in the section entitled "Scope of Changed Circumstances Review." In its August 4, 2008 submission, DPE stated that it no longer has any interest in antidumping relief from imports of such polychloroprene rubber from Japan. On September 29, 2008, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review with intent to revoke, in part, the AD finding on polychloroprene rubber from Japan. *See Initiation and Preliminary Results*. In preparing the notice for publication, the **Federal Register** made a number of substantive errors during its technical preparation of the *Initiation and*

¹ DPE is the sole petitioner in this antidumping proceeding. *See Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Finding*, 69 FR 64276 (November 4, 2004). DPE has been the sole U.S. producer of polychloroprene rubber since 1998, when Bayer Group closed its polychloroprene rubber plant in Houston, Texas. *See Polychloroprene Rubber from Japan*, Inv. No. AA-1921-129 (Second Review), U.S. ITC Pub. 3786 (June 2005), at 4-5.

Preliminary Results for publication. On October 27, 2008, the **Federal Register** published corrections of these errors. *See Initiation Correction*. The Department provided interested parties with a deadline to submit written comments no later than 30 days after the date of the *Initiation Correction*. The Department did not receive any comments from interested parties.

Scope of Changed Circumstances Review

The merchandise subject to DPE's request and covered by this changed circumstances review is polychloroprene rubber from Japan with aqueous dispersions of 2-chlorobutadiene-1,3 homopolymers, where the polymer content of the dispersion is between 55 weight percent and 61 weight percent and the dispersed homopolymer contains less than 10 weight percent of a tetrahydrofuran-insoluble fraction. This changed circumstances review covers polychloroprene rubber from Japan meeting the specifications as described above. Effective upon publication of these final results of changed circumstances review in the **Federal Register**, the amended scope of the AD finding will read as identified in the "Scope of the Finding (As Amended By These Final Results of Changed Circumstances)" section below.

Scope of the Finding (As Amended By These Final Results of Changed Circumstances)

The merchandise covered are shipments of polychloroprene rubber, an oil resistant synthetic rubber also known as polymerized chlorobutadiene or neoprene, currently classifiable under items 4002.41.00, 4002.49.00, and 4003.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purpose, the Department's written description of the scope remains dispositive.

The following types of polychloroprene rubber from Japan are excluded from the scope: (1) aqueous dispersions of polychloroprenes that are dipolymers of chloroprene and methacrylic acid, where the dispersion has a pH of 8 or lower (this category is limited to aqueous dispersions of these polymers and does not include aqueous dispersions of these polychloroprenes that contain comonomers other than methacrylic acid); (2) aqueous dispersions of polychloroprenes that are dipolymers of chloroprene and 2,3-dichlorobutadiene-1,3 modified with xanthogen disulfides, where the