

parties have provided an adequate response to a notice of initiation where the Department receives complete substantive responses from respondent interested parties accounting, on average, for more than 50 percent, by volume, or value, if appropriate, of the total exports of the subject merchandise to the United States over the five calendar years preceding the year of publication of the notice of initiation. On September 20, 2006, the Department found that Mittal Steel accounted for more than 50 percent of exports by volume of the subject merchandise from Ukraine to the United States, dependent upon it demonstrating that it exported to the United States during the period. See Memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach, Director, from Damian Felton entitled, "Adequacy Determination in Antidumping Duty Sunset Review of Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Ukraine," (September 20, 2006).

In its substantive response, Mittal Steel also notified the Department of a name change that occurred in November 2005. Prior to this date, the company was named "Krivorozhstal" Steel Works. In November 2005, with Mittal Steel's purchase of the company, the name became Mittal Steel Kryviy Rih.

On September 28, 2006, the Department sent a letter to Mittal Steel requesting proof of order date, invoice date, quantity, value, shipment date, and payment date for its reported shipments. The Department also requested that Mittal Steel confirm that the merchandise was included in the scope of the order. On October 20, 2006, Mittal Steel submitted the requested documentation.

Because the Department has no evidence contradicting Mittal Steel's claim that it is the successor to "Krivorozhstal" Steel Works, which made the 2001 shipments, we are equating Mittal and "Krivorozhstal" Steel Works solely for the purpose of determining whether the respondent interested party submitted an adequate response to our notice of initiation. Based on its response to our request for supporting documentation, the Department determines that Mittal Steel has demonstrated that it represents more than 50 percent of the total exports of subject merchandise from Ukraine to the United States during this five-year sunset review period (2001–2005). Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2)(i), the Department is conducting a full sunset review of this antidumping duty order.

The final results in the full sunset review of this antidumping duty order are due on or before March 29, 2007.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths, currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") under item numbers 7214.20.00, 7228.30.8050, 7222.11.0050, 7222.30.0000, 7228.60.6000, 7228.20.1000, or any other tariff item number. Specifically excluded are plain rounds (*i.e.*, non-deformed or smooth bars) and rebar that has been further processed through bending or coating. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Ukraine; Preliminary Results," from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration (November 20, 2006) ("Decision Memo"), which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail if the antidumping duty order were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memo, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Preliminary Results of Review

The Department preliminarily determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Ukraine is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average margin:

Manufacturers/producers/exporters	Weighted-average margin (percent)
All Others Rate, including Mittal Steel Kryviy Rih and "Krivorozhstal" Steel Works ²	41.69

² As of February 1, 2006, Ukraine graduated to market economy status. See *Final Results of Inquiry Into Ukraine's Status as a Non-Market Economy Country*, 71 FR 9520 (February 24, 2006). As a result, the Ukraine wide rate is now the All Others rate. Mittal Steel is considered part of the all others rate because a successor-in-interest determination has not been made. See, *e.g.*, *Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Belgium, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom and Carbon Steel Plate from Taiwan; Second Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders and Antidumping Finding; Final Results*, 71 FR 11577, 11579 (March 8, 2006) (explaining that Duferco is subject to the all others rate because the Department had not yet conducted a changed circumstances review to determine the successor-in-interest to Forges de Clabecq, S.A.).

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 50 days after the date of publication of this notice, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 5 days after the case briefs, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(d)(1). Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after rebuttal briefs are due, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d)(1). The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such briefs, no later than March 29, 2007.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Date: November 20, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration
[FR Doc. E6–20011 Filed 11–24–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–449–804]

Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Latvia; Preliminary Results of the Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On August 1, 2006, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Latvia. On the basis of the notice of intent to participate by a domestic interested party and adequate responses filed on behalf of the domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting a full sunset review of the antidumping duty order pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”) and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2)(i). As a result of this sunset review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled “Preliminary Results of Review.”

Effective Date: November 27, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Audrey R. Twyman, Damian Felton, or Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: 202-482-3534, 202-482-0133, and 202-482-0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 1, 2006, the Department published its notice of initiation of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Latvia, in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act. *See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Reviews*, 71 FR 43443 (August 1, 2006) (“*Notice of Initiation*”).

The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the following domestic parties: the Rebar Trade Action Coalition and its individual producer members, Nucor Corporation, CMC Steel Group, and Gerdau Ameristeel, as well as domestic producers TAMCO Steel and Schnitzer Steel Industries, Inc. (“Schnitzer”) (collectively “domestic interested parties”), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). The companies claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as manufacturers of a domestic-like product in the United States.

The Department received a complete substantive response to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). In this response, Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc. (“Cascade”) was substituted for Schnitzer as a domestic interested

party. Cascade is a wholly owned subsidiary of Schnitzer. Also, Steel Dynamics, Inc. (“SDI”) was added as a domestic producer. Because SDI did not file a notice of intent to participate in this review, it is not eligible to file a substantive response. *See* 19 CFR 351.218(d)(iii)(A). Therefore, the domestic interested parties are now the Rebar Trade Action Coalition and its individual producer members Nucor Corporation, CMC Steel Group, and Gerdau Ameristeel, as well as TAMCO Steel, and Cascade.

The Department received a complete substantive response from respondent interested party, Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs (“LM” or the “respondent interested party”), within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). On September 5, 2006, the Department received a rebuttal to Liepajas Metalurgs’ substantive response from the domestic interested parties.

19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A) provides that the Secretary normally will conclude that respondent interested parties have provided adequate response to a notice of initiation where the Department receives complete substantive responses from respondent interested parties accounting on average for more than 50 percent, by volume, or value, if appropriate, of the total exports of the subject merchandise to the United States over the five calendar years preceding the year of publication of the notice of initiation. On September 20, 2006, the Department found that LM accounted for more than 50 percent of exports by volume of the subject merchandise from Latvia to the United States. *See* Memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach, Director, from Damian Felton entitled, “Adequacy Determination in Antidumping Duty Sunset Review of Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia,” (September 20, 2006). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2)(i), the Department determined to conduct a full sunset review of this antidumping duty order.

The final results in the full sunset review of this antidumping duty order are due on or before March 29, 2007.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths, currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) under item numbers 7214.20.00, 7228.30.8050, 7222.11.0050, 7222.30.0000, 7228.60.6000, 7228.20.1000, or any other tariff item number. Specifically excluded are plain rounds (*i.e.*, non-deformed or smooth bars) and rebar that

has been further processed through bending or coating. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this sunset review are addressed in the “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia; Preliminary Results,” from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated November 20, 2006 (“Decision Memo”), which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail if the antidumping duty order were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memo, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Preliminary Results of Review

The Department preliminarily determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Latvia is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average margins:

Manufacturers/Producers/Exporters	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs	17.21
All Others	17.21

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 50 days after the date of publication of this notice, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 5 days after the case briefs, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(d)(1). Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after rebuttal briefs are due, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d)(1). The

Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such briefs, no later than March 29, 2007.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 20, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-20012 Filed 11-24-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-570-907, C-560-821, C-580-857]

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigations: Coated Free Sheet Paper From the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, and the Republic of Korea

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 27, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Layton or David Neubacher (the PRC), Dana Mermelstein or Sean Carey (Indonesia), and Eric Greynolds or Darla Brown (Korea), AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0371 and (202) 482-5823, (202) 482-1391 and (202) 482-3964, and (202) 482-6071 and (202) 482-2849, respectively.

Initiation of Investigations:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petitions

On October 31, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received petitions filed in proper form by NewPage Corporation (petitioner). The Department received from petitioner information supplementing the petitions throughout the 20-day initiation period.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), petitioner alleges that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of coated free sheet paper (CFS) in the People's Republic of China (the PRC), Indonesia, and the Republic of Korea (Korea) received countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening

material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that petitioner filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in sections 771(9)(C) of the Act and petitioner has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the countervailing duty investigations that it is requesting the Department to initiate (*see* "Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions" section below).

Scope of Investigations

The merchandise covered by each of these investigations includes coated free sheet paper and paperboard of a kind used for writing, printing or other graphic purposes. Coated free sheet paper is produced from not-more-than 10 percent by weight mechanical or combined chemical/mechanical fibers. Coated free sheet paper is coated with kaolin (China clay) or other inorganic substances, with or without a binder, and with no other coating. Coated free sheet paper may be surface-colored, surface-decorated, printed (except as described below), embossed, or perforated. The subject merchandise includes single- and double-side-coated free sheet paper; coated free sheet paper in both sheet or roll form; and is inclusive of all weights, brightness levels, and finishes. The terms "wood free" or "art" paper may also be used to describe the imported product.

Excluded from the scope are: (1) Coated free sheet paper that is imported printed with final content printed text or graphics; (2) base paper to be sensitized for use in photography; and (3) paper containing by weight 25 percent or more cotton fiber.

Coated free sheet paper is classifiable under subheadings 4810.13.1900, 4810.13.2010, 4810.13.2090, 4810.13.5000, 4810.13.7040, 4810.14.1900, 4810.14.2010, 4810.14.2090, 4810.14.5000, 4810.14.7040, 4810.19.1900, 4810.19.2010, and 4810.19.2090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

Comments on Scope of Investigations

During our review of the petitions, we discussed the scope with petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the regulations (*Antidumping Duties;*

Countervailing Duties; Final Rule, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all interested parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of the publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit (CRU), Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and to consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department invited representatives of the relevant foreign governments for consultations with respect to the countervailing duty petitions. The Department held consultations with representatives of the government of the PRC on November 9 and November 20, 2006. *See* the November 9 and November 20, 2006, memoranda to the file regarding the consultations with officials from the PRC (public documents on file in the CRU of the Department of Commerce, Room B-099). The Department held consultations with representatives of the governments of Indonesia and Korea on November 16, 2006. *See* the November 16, 2006, memoranda to the file regarding the consultations with officials from Indonesia and Korea (public documents on file in the CRU). On November 20, 2006, the Government of Indonesia (GOI) filed a letter reiterating their concerns regarding one of the issues the GOI raised at consultations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for or opposition to the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for