

Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 71 FR 64938 (“Preliminary Results”). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results of review. No interested party submitted comments. We have conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”).

Scope of the Order

The products covered by this order are certain preserved mushrooms, whether imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. The preserved mushrooms covered under this order are the species *Agaricus bisporus* and *Agaricus bitorquis*. “Preserved mushrooms” refer to mushrooms that have been prepared or preserved by cleaning, blanching, and sometimes slicing or cutting. These mushrooms are then packed and heated in containers including but not limited to cans or glass jars in a suitable liquid medium, including but not limited to water, brine, butter or butter sauce. Preserved mushrooms may be imported whole, sliced, diced, or as stems and pieces. Included within the scope of this order are “brined” mushrooms, which are presalted and packed in a heavy salt solution to provisionally preserve them for further processing.

Excluded from the scope of this order are the following: (1) All other species of mushroom, including straw mushrooms; (2) all fresh and chilled mushrooms, including “refrigerated” or “quick blanched mushrooms”; (3) dried mushrooms; (4) frozen mushrooms; and (5) “marinated,” “acidified” or “pickled” mushrooms, which are prepared or preserved by means of vinegar or acetic acid, but may contain oil or other additives.

The merchandise subject to this order is currently classifiable under subheadings 2003.10.0127, 2003.10.0131, 2003.10.0137, 2003.10.0143, 2003.10.0147, 2003.10.0153 and 0711.51.0000 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order dispositive.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margin percentage exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Agro Dutch Industries, Ltd.	0.61

Assessment

The Department shall determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b). With respect to Agro Dutch, we calculated importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all the U.S. sales examined and dividing this amount by the total entered value of the sales examined. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis* (i.e., is not less than 0.50 percent). The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 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 POR produced by the company included in these final results of review for which the reviewed company did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the “All Others” rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Agro Dutch will be 0.61 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (“LTFV”) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers

or exporters will continue to be 11.30 percent. This rate is the “All Others” rate from the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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 Secretary’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of 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 this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: January 30, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-1810 Filed 2-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-489-806]

Certain Pasta From Turkey: Final Results of Expedited Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review of the Countervailing Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On October 2, 2006, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of the second five-year sunset review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta (“pasta”) from Turkey, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). See *Initiation of Five-year (“Sunset”) Reviews*, 71 FR

57921 (October 2, 2006) (“*Second Sunset Review*”). The Department has conducted an expedited sunset review of this order pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). As a result of this sunset review, the Department finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the levels indicated in the “Final Results of Review” section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 5, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey R. Twyman or Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3534 or (202) 482-0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The countervailing duty order which covers pasta from Turkey was published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 1996. See *Notice of Countervailing Duty Order: Certain Pasta (“Pasta”) From Turkey*, 61 FR 38546 (July 24, 1996). On October 2, 2006, the Department initiated the second sunset review of this order, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Second Sunset Review*. The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the following domestic parties: A. Zerega’s Sons, Inc.; American Italian Pasta Company; Dakota Growers Pasta Company, Inc.; New World Pasta Company; and Philadelphia Macaroni Company (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 request for a 12-day extension of time from the Government of the Republic of Turkey (“GRT”) to submit its substantive response. The Department partially granted the GRT’s request and extended the deadline for filing a substantive response to November 8, 2006. The same extension was also granted to the domestic interested parties, per their request. On November 8, 2006, the Department received complete substantive responses to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties and from the GRT.

The Department did not receive any substantive responses from Turkish producers or exporters of the

merchandise covered by this order. Based on the fact that a government’s response alone, normally, is not sufficient for full sunset reviews in which the orders are not done on an aggregate basis, we determined to conduct an expedited (120 day) sunset review of this order. See section 751(c)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). See, e.g., *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews of Countervailing Duty Orders: Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from Canada*, 70 FR 67140 (November 4, 2005). See also Letter to Robert Carpenter, Director, Office of Investigations, International Trade Commission, from Wendy Frankel, Director, Import Administration, Department of Commerce, regarding inadequate response to the notice of initiation from respondent interested parties (November 21, 2006); and Memorandum from Saliha Loucif, International Trade Compliance Analyst, to Susan Kuhbach, Office Director, Import Administration, Department of Commerce, regarding “Adequacy Determination of the Second Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Turkey” (November 21, 2006).

On January 19, 2007, the Department placed the calculation of the all-others rate from the investigation onto the record of this sunset review and allowed parties to comment. We received comment from domestic interested parties and the GRT on January 24, 2007. No hearing was held because none was requested.

Scope of the Order

Covered by the order are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds (2.27 kilograms) or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastases, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this order is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons or polyethylene or polypropylene bags, of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the order are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white.

The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under subheading 1902.19.20 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written

description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Scope Ruling

To date, the Department has issued the following scope ruling:

On October 26, 1998, the Department self-initiated a scope inquiry to determine whether a package weighing over five pounds as a result of allowable industry tolerances may be within the scope of the countervailing duty order. On May 24, 1999, we issued a final scope ruling finding that, effective October 26, 1998, pasta in packages weighing or labeled up to (and including) five pounds four ounces is within the scope of the countervailing duty order. See Memorandum from John Brinkmann to Richard Moreland, dated May 24, 1999, which is on file in the Central Records Unit (“CRU”) in room B-099 of the main Department building.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in substantive responses by parties in this sunset review are addressed in the “Issues and Decision Memo for the Expedited Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Turkey; Final Results,” (“Decision Memo”), from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated January 30, 2007, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy, the net countervailable subsidy rate likely to prevail if the order were revoked, and the nature of the subsidies.

Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review and the corresponding recommendation in this public memorandum which is on file in the CRU. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Department’s Web page at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

The Department determines that revocation of the countervailing duty order on pasta from Turkey is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of countervailable subsidies at the following countervailing duty rates:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Net Subsidy Rate (percent)
Filiz Gida Sanayi ve Ticaret	3.03

Manufacturer/Exporter	Net Subsidy Rate (percent)
Maktas Makarnacilik ve Ticaret/ Gidasa Gida San.Tic.A.S. 1	4.49
Oba Makarnacilik Sanayi ve Ticaret	14.48
"All Others"	10.25

Notification Regarding Administrative Orders

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely 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 terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: January 30, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-1813 Filed 2-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-475-819]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Final Results of Expedited Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of the Countervailing Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On October 2, 2006, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of the second five-year sunset review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta ("pasta") from Italy, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). See *Initiation of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 71 FR 57921 (October 2, 2006) ("*Second Sunset Review*"). The Department has conducted an expedited sunset review of this order pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). As a result of this sunset review, the Department finds that

revocation of the countervailing duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the levels indicated in the "Final Results of Review" section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 5, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The countervailing duty order which covers pasta from Italy was published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 1996. See *Notice of Countervailing Duty Order and Amended Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Pasta ("Pasta") From Italy*, 61 FR 38544 (July 24, 1996). On October 2, 2006, the Department initiated the second sunset review of this order, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Second Sunset Review*. The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the following domestic parties: A. Zerega's Sons, Inc.; American Italian Pasta Company; Dakota Growers Pasta Company, Inc.; New World Pasta Company; and Philadelphia Macaroni Company (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.

On October 12, 2006, the Department received a request for a 12-day extension of time from the Government of Italy ("GOI") to submit its substantive response. The Department partially granted the GOI's request and extended the deadline for filing a substantive response to November 8, 2006. The same extension was also granted to the domestic interested parties, per their request. On November 8, 2006, the Department received complete substantive responses to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties and from the GOI. On November 2, 2006, we received a complete substantive response to the notice of initiation from the Delegation of the European Commission ("EC").

The Department did not receive any substantive responses from any Italian producers or exporters of the merchandise covered by this order.

Based on the fact that a government's response alone, normally, is not sufficient for full sunset reviews in which the orders are not done on an aggregate basis, we determined to conduct an expedited (120 day) sunset review of this order. See section 751(c)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). See, e.g., *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews of Countervailing Duty Orders: Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from Canada*, 70 FR 67140 (November 4, 2005). See also Letter to Robert Carpenter, Director, Office of Investigations, International Trade Commission, from Wendy Frankel, Director, Import Administration, Department of Commerce, regarding inadequate response to the notice of initiation from respondent interested parties (November 21, 2006); and Memorandum from Saliha Loucif, International Trade Compliance Analyst, to Susan Kubbach, Office Director, Import Administration, Department of Commerce, regarding "Adequacy Determination of the Second Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy," (November 21, 2006).

On January 19, 2007, the Department placed the calculation of the all others rate from the investigation onto the record of this sunset review and allowed parties to comment. We received comment from domestic interested parties on January 24, 2007. No hearing was held because none was requested.

Scope of the Order

Imports covered by the order are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds four ounces or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastasis, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this scope is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons, or polyethylene or polypropylene bags of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the scope of the order are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white. Also excluded are imports of organic pasta from Italy that are accompanied by the appropriate certificate issued by the Istituto Mediterraneo Di Certificazione, Bioagricoop S.r.l., QC&I International Services, Ecocert Italia, Consorzio per il Controllo dei Prodotti Biologici, Associazione Italiana per l'Agricoltura Biologica, or Codex S.r.l. In addition,