

*Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request a Review*, 70 FR 16799 (April 1, 2005). The Department received timely requests for review from Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. and Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (collectively "Colakoglu"); Diler Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S., Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S., and Diler Dis Ticaret A.S. (collectively "Diler"); Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas); and ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi A.S. (ICDAS), foreign producers/exporters in this proceeding. The Department also received a timely request for review from Nucor Corporation and Gerdau Ameristeel Corporation, domestic producers of rebar and interested parties in this proceeding, covering 34 producers/exporters of rebar from Turkey, including the producers/exporters referenced above. On May 27, 2005, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on rebar from Turkey. See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 30694 (May 27, 2005). The Department released the antidumping questionnaire in May and August 2005 to the 34 producers/exporters for which an administrative review was requested. Colakoglu, Diler, Ekinciler Demir ve Celik Sanayi A.S. and Ekinciler Dis Ticaret A.S., and Habas responded to the Department's questionnaire in August 2005 and ICDAS responded to the Department's questionnaire in October 2005. The preliminary results for this proceeding are due no later than May 1, 2006.

#### Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar. Deformed rebar is currently classifiable in the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) under item numbers 7213.10.000 and 7214.20.000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### Determination To Rescind, in Part

On November 8, 2005, the Department published its final results for the April

1, 2003, though March 31, 2004, administrative review and found that ICDAS met the requirements of revocation as described in 19 CFR 351.222. See *Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Final Results, Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part, and Determination To Revoke in Part*, 70 FR 67665 (Nov. 8, 2005). Due to ICDAS' revocation in that review, we are rescinding the April 1, 2004, through March 31, 2005, administrative review with respect to ICDAS because there is no statutory or regulatory basis to conduct an administrative review for a producer/exporter that has met the requirements of revocation.

Dated: January 12, 2006.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-652 Filed 1-20-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration, North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews

**AGENCY:** NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision of panel.

**SUMMARY:** On January 17, 2006 the binational panel issued its decision in the review of the determination on remand made by the International Trade Commission, respecting Magnesium from Canada Full Sunset Review of AD and CVD Orders, Secretariat File No. USA-CDA-2000-1904-09. The binational panel affirmed in part and remanded in part to the International Trade Commission. Copies of the panel decision are available from the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Caratina L. Alston, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-5438.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final

determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686). The panel review in this matter has been conducted in accordance with these Rules. *Panel Decision:* The panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the International Trade Commission's determination on remand respecting Magnesium from Canada. The panel remand in part to the Commission and instructed the Commission as follows: Analyze the price, volume and impact of revocation of the countervailing duty order on alloy magnesium to show how the record supports the Commission's conclusions, providing a reasoned explanation based on all of the evidence on the record to support a decision that revocation of the countervailing duty order on imports of alloy magnesium from Canada would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic alloy magnesium industry within the reasonably foreseeable future due to underselling by Magnola. The Commission must provide further reasoned analysis supported by substantial evidence on the record, including any factual evidence not referred to in its Views on Remand, as to the conclusion that Magnola would enter the market by underselling in order to establish export volumes that would be significant in relation to anticipated demand increases. The Commission is directed to respond to this Order within sixty (60) days of receipt.

Dated: January 17, 2006.

**Caratina L. Alston,**

*U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*

[FR Doc. E6-655 Filed 1-20-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Application for Commission in the NOAA Officer Corps

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).