

Antidumping duty proceeding	Period to be reviewed
Crown All Corporation. Ferro-Alliages & Mineraux Inc. Gather Hope International Co. Ltd. GE Silicones (Canada). Global Minerals (Canada). Global Minerals Corp. Hunan Provincial Import and Export Group Corp. IMMECC Resources Inc. Jiangxi Gangyuan Silicon Industry Co., Ltd. Lorbec Metals Ltd. MPM Silicones, LLC. Seaview Trading. Transtrading House Ltd.	

<sup>1</sup> If one of the below-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of silicon metal from PRC that have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporter is a part.

<sup>2</sup> Some companies may appear to be listed twice, but there are two addresses provided in the administrative review requests for similar named companies and, therefore, we are listing them separately.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www.trade.gov/ia/>.

This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: July 31, 2007.

**James C. Doyle,**

*Office Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9.*

[FR Doc. E7-15203 Filed 8-3-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-412-822

#### Stainless Steel Bar from the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On March 30, 2007, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from the United Kingdom. *See Stainless Steel Bar from the United Kingdom: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 15106 (March 30, 2007) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made

certain changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review." In addition, the Department received information sufficient to warrant a successor-in-interest analysis in this administrative review. Based on this information, we determine that Enpar is the successor-in-interest to Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 6, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kate Johnson or Rebecca Trainor, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482-4929 and (202) 482-4007, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

This review covers one producer/exporter, Enpar Special Alloys Limited (formerly Firth Rixson Special Steels) (Enpar). On March 30, 2007, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on SSB from the United Kingdom. *See Preliminary Results*.

We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. On April 27, 2007, we received case briefs from Enpar and Sandvik Bioline, a producer of SSB from the United Kingdom. We received a rebuttal brief from the petitioners (*i.e.*, Carpenter Technology Corporation, Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc., and Electralloy Corporation, a division of G.O. Carlson, Inc.) on May

2, 2007. On April 30, 2007, Enpar requested that the Department conduct a public hearing, but withdrew its hearing request on June 4, 2007. A meeting was held with Enpar's counsel on June 20, 2007, to discuss issues raised in Enpar's case brief.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

#### Scope of the Order

For purposes of this order, the term "stainless steel bar" includes articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. Stainless steel bar includes cold-finished stainless steel bars that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), products that have been cut from stainless steel sheet, strip or plate, wire (*i.e.*, cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled

products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The stainless steel bar subject to this order is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.11.00.05, 7222.11.00.50, 7222.19.00.05, 7222.19.00.50, 7222.20.00.05, 7222.20.00.45, 7222.20.00.75, and 7222.30.00.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

**Successor-In-Interest Analysis**

We preliminarily determined that Enpar is the successor-in-interest to Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. Enpar explained in its questionnaire response that Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. was a subsidiary of the U.K.-based Firth Rixson Ltd. Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. and two other subsidiaries of the U.K.-based Firth Rixson Ltd., T.W. Pearson and Enpar, were combined in 2003 to form Enpar. Enpar has the same company registration number as that of Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd., the registered office is the same for both companies, and three of Enpar’s four directors were also directors of Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. We confirmed at verification that Enpar’s business structure is the same as that of Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. Although certain upgrades have been made to the production facility, the supplier and customer bases and relationships remain the same. The only real change is the name of the subsidiary. Accordingly, we preliminarily found that Enpar should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to SSB as the former Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd.

Since the *Preliminary Results*, no party to this proceeding has commented on this issue and we have found no additional information that would compel us to reverse our preliminary finding. Thus, for purposes of these final results, we continue to find that Enpar is the successor-in-interest to Firth Rixson Special Steels Ltd. for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability.

**Period of Review**

The POR is March 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006.

**Cost of Production**

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results*, we conducted an investigation to determine whether Enpar made home market sales of the foreign like product during the POR at prices below its costs

of production (COP) within the meaning of section 773(b)(1) of the Act. We performed the cost test for these final results following the same methodology as in the *Preliminary Results*, except as discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum accompanying this notice (the Decision Memo).

As a result of our cost test, we found 20 percent or more of Enpar’s sales of a given product during the reporting period were at prices less than the weighted-average COP for this period. Thus, we determined that these below-cost sales were made in “substantial quantities” within an extended period of time and at prices which did not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. See sections 773(b)(2)(B) - (D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of these final results, we found that Enpar made below-cost sales not in the ordinary course of trade. Consequently, we disregarded these sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

**Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this administrative review, and to which we have responded, are listed in the Appendix to this notice and addressed in the Decision Memo, which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, 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.

**Changes Since the Preliminary Results**

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. These changes are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo.

**Final Results of Review**

We determine that the following weighted-average margin percentage exists for the period March 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Percent Margin
Enpar Special Alloys Ltd. (formerly Firth Rixson Special Steels) .....	34.35

**Assessment**

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department will issue assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review. 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). We calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales for that importer.

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) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). 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 that the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (e.g., a reseller, trading company, or exporter) 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 intermediary involved in the transaction. See *Assessment Policy Notice* for a full discussion of this clarification.

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of SSB from the United Kingdom entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: 1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate shown above; 2) for previously 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, or the original 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 be 83.85 percent, the all-others rate established in the *Implementation of the Findings of the WTO Panel in US--Zeroing (EC): Notice of Determinations Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and Revocations and Partial Revocations of Certain Antidumping Duty Orders*, 72 FR 25261 (May 4, 2007). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice 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 double antidumping duties.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

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 these final results of review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 30, 2007.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### Appendix – Issues in Decision Memorandum

##### Issues

1. Average vs. Specific Material Costs
2. Calculation of Conversion Costs
3. Calculation of the All-Others Rate [FR Doc. E7-15204 Filed 8-3-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-201-822

#### Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests from respondent ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. (Mexinox S.A.) and Mexinox USA, Inc. (Mexinox USA) (collectively, Mexinox) and petitioners,<sup>1</sup> the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils (S4 in coils) from Mexico. This administrative review covers imports of subject merchandise from Mexinox S.A. during the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006.

We preliminarily determine that sales of S4 in coils from Mexico have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the constructed export price (CEP) and NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument: 1) a statement of the issues, 2) a brief summary of the argument, and 3) a table of authorities.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 6, 2007.

#### 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 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On July 27, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order; Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico*, 64 FR 40560 (July 27, 1999). On

July 3, 2006, the Department published a notice entitled *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 71 FR 37890 (July 3, 2006), covering, *inter alia*, S4 in coils from Mexico for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), Mexinox and petitioners requested that the Department conduct an administrative review. On August 30, 2006, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 71 FR 51573 (August 30, 2006).

On September 13, 2006, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to Mexinox. Mexinox submitted its response to section A of the questionnaire on October 13, 2006, and its response to sections B through E of the questionnaire on November 20, 2006. On March 9, 2007, the Department issued its first supplemental questionnaire for sections A through C. Mexinox responded to this first supplemental questionnaire on April 10, 2007. The Department also issued a supplemental questionnaire for section D on April 25, 2007, to which Mexinox responded on May 21, 2007. On May 7, 2007, the Department issued a second supplemental questionnaire for sections A through C, as well as for section E, which pertains to an affiliated U.S. reseller, Ken-Mac Metals (Ken-Mac). Mexinox filed its response to this second supplemental questionnaire on May 21, 2007. Finally, the Department issued a second supplemental questionnaire covering section D on June 26, 2007, to which Mexinox responded on July 3, 2007.

Because it was not practicable to complete this review within the normal time frame, on February 20, 2007, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice of the extension of time limits for this review. See *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 7764 (February 20, 2007). This extension established the deadline for these preliminary results as July 31, 2007.

#### Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

<sup>1</sup> Petitioners are Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, United Auto Workers Local 3303, Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America.