(mm) or more and a composite thickness of 4.5 mm or more. Clad steel plate is a rectangular finished steel mill product consisting of a layer of cladding material (usually stainless steel or nickel) which is metallurgically bonded to a base or backing of ferrous metal (usually carbon or low alloy steel) where the latter predominates by weight.

Stainless clad steel plate is manufactured to American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) specifications A263 (400 series stainless types) and A264 (300 series stainless types). Nickel and nickel–base alloy clad steel plate is manufactured to ASTM specification A265. These specifications are illustrative but not necessarily all–inclusive.

Clad steel plate within the scope of this order is classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) 7210.90.10.00. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this review are addressed in the ''Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Clad Steel Plate from Japan'' (Decision Memo) from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, 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 margins likely to prevail if the order were revoked. 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 room B–099 of the main Commerce 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 versions of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

### Final Results of Review

The Department determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on clad steel plate from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the rates listed below:

| Producers/Exporters | Margin (percent) |
|---|---|
| The Japan Steel Company | 118.53 |
| All Others | 118.53 |

### Notification regarding Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. 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 the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 25, 2007.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7–1571 Filed 1–30–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

other method of deposition of superimposing of the cladding metal followed by any mechanical or thermal process to ensure welding (e.g., electrocladding), in which the cladding metal (nickel, chromium, etc.) is applied to the basic metal by electroplating, molecular interpenetration of the surfaces in contact then being obtained by heat treatment at the appropriate temperature with subsequent cold rolling. See Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System Explanatory Notes, Chapter 72, General Note (IV) (C) (2) (e).

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–533–809]

### Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges (stainless steel flanges) from India manufactured by Kunj Forgings (Kunj). The period of review (POR) covers February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006. We preliminarily determine that Kunj made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV) in the United States during the POR. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this new shipper review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise for which the importer–specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*.

We invite interested parties 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 cited.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 31, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Fred Baker 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) 482–2924 or (202) 482–0649, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On February 9, 1994, the Department published the antidumping duty order on stainless steel flanges from India. *See Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India*, 59 FR 5994 (February 9, 1994). On February 28, 2006, we received requests for new shipper reviews from Kunj Forgings Pvt. Ltd. (Kunj), Micro Forge (India) Ltd. (Micro), Pradeep Metals Limited (Pradeep), and Rollwell Forge, Ltd. (Rollwell) for the period February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006. We initiated the reviews on April 6, 2006. *See Stainless Steel Flanges from India: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews* 71 FR 17439 (April 6, 2006). On September 29, 2006, we rescinded the reviews with respect to Micro, Pradeep, and Rollwell. *See Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India: Notice of Partial Rescission of New Shipper Reviews*, 71 FR 27468 (September 29, 2006).

On October 3, 2006, we extended the time limit for the preliminary results of this new shipper review to no later than January 25, 2007. *See Stainless Steel Flanges From India: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 58372 (October 3, 2006).

### Scope of the Order

The products covered by this order are certain forged stainless steel flanges, both finished and not finished, generally manufactured to specification ASTM A–182, and made in alloys such as 304, 304L, 316, and 316L. The scope includes five general types of flanges. They are weld–neck, used for butt–weld line connection; threaded, used for threaded line connections; slip–on and lap joint, used with stub–ends/butt–weld line connections; socket weld, used to fit pipe into a machined recession; and blind, used to seal off a line. The sizes of the flanges within the scope range generally from one to six inches; however, all sizes of the above–described merchandise are included in the scope. Specifically excluded from the scope of this order are cast stainless steel flanges. Cast stainless steel flanges generally are manufactured to specification ASTM A–351. The flanges subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7307.21.1000 and 7307.21.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive of whether or not the merchandise is covered by the scope of the order.

**Verification**

As provided in section 782(i)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), from December 11, 2006, through December 14, 2006, we verified information provided by Kunj. We used standard verification procedures, including the examination of relevant sales, cost, and financial records, and the selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report, on file in the CRU located in room B–099 in the main Department of Commerce building.

**Bona Fides Analysis**

Consistent with the Department's practice, we investigated the *bona fides* nature of the sales that Kunj made during the POR. Based on our investigation in the *bona fide* nature of the sales, the questionnaire responses Kunj submitted, and our verification thereof, as well as our preliminary determination that Kunj was not affiliated with any exporter or producer that had previously shipped subject merchandise to the United States, we preliminarily determine that Kunj's sales were made on a *bona fide* basis. For a complete discussion of our analysis, *see* the Department's January 25, 2007, memorandum to the file ''Analysis of the Bona Fide Nature of Kunj's Sales During the Period of Review,'' on file in room B–099 of the Department of Commerce building.

**Comparisons to Normal Value**

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise to the United States by Kunj were made at less than NV, we compared the U.S. export price (EP) to the NV, as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice, below. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Tariff Act, we calculated monthly weighted–average prices for NV and compared these to the prices of individual EP transactions. We found that for all U.S. sales there were no contemporaneous home market sales that passed the Department's twenty percent difference–in-merchandise (difmer) test. (For an explanation of our difmer analysis, *see* the memorandum to the file, ''Analysis of Data Submitted By Kunj Forgings Pvt., Ltd., in the 2005–2006 New Shipper Review of Stainless Steel Flanges from India,'' dated January 25, 2007 (analysis memorandum).) Therefore, we used constructed value (CV) as the basis for normal value. We describe below our calculation of NV, CV, and EP.

**Product Comparisons**

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act, we considered all products described by the Scope of the Order section, above, which were produced and sold by Kunj in the home market, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate comparisons to U.S. sales. We made comparisons using the following five model match characteristics: (1) Grade; (2) Type; (3) Size; (4) Pressure rating; (5) Finish.

**Export Price**

In accordance with section 772(a) of the Tariff Act, EP is defined as the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of the subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States, or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States. In accordance with section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, constructed export price (CEP) is the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter, as adjusted under subsections (c) and (d). For Kunj's sales to the United States, we used EP in accordance with section 772(a) of the Tariff Act because its merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser prior to importation, and CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record.

We calculated EP based on the prices charged to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We used invoice date as the date of sale. We based EP on the packed FOB Indian port prices to the first unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, including domestic inland freight and domestic brokerage and handling.

**Normal Value**

*A. Viability*

In order to determine whether there is sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product during the POR is equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise during the POR), we compared Kunj's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. *See* section 773(a)(1)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act. Based on Kunj's reported home market and U.S. sales quantities, we determine that the volume of aggregate home market sales during the POR is equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise during the POR. Accordingly, we find that Kunj had a viable home market. Therefore, we based NV on home market sales to unaffiliated purchasers made in the usual quantities and in the ordinary course of trade. *See* the January 25, 2007, analysis memorandum for a further discussion of home market viability.

*B. Price–to-Price Comparisons*

As indicated above, we compared U.S. sales with contemporaneous sales of the foreign like product in India. As noted, we considered stainless steel flanges identical based on the following five criteria: grade, type, size, pressure rating, and finish. As with EP, we used invoice date as the date of sale.

In calculating the net unit price, we used the gross unit price as it appeared on the invoice for each sale, rather than Kunj's reported gross unit price which (as we first discovered at the verification) was net of various unexplained expenses. We also made an adjustment to gross unit price for Kunj's reported late delivery discounts. We made adjustments for differences in packing costs between the two markets and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Tariff Act. We adjusted for differences in the circumstances of sale (COS) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We made these COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses. Home market direct selling expenses consisted of warranty expenses, bank charges, and imputed credit. U.S. direct selling expenses consisted of imputed credit and bank charges. Finally, we made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences between the U.S. models and the home market models to which it was being compared.

**Constructed Value**

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act, we based NV on CV because, as indicated above under the section ''Comparisons to Normal Value,'' we were unable to find a contemporaneous comparison market match for any of the U.S. sales. We calculated CV based on the cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, SG&A, and profit, as required by 19 CFR 351.401(b)(1). In calculating the cost of materials, we denied Kunj's claim for an offset to material costs for revenue generated by sales of scrap because Kunj did not adequately support either the amount of the offset nor its means of valuing the scrap sales price. *See* verification report at 33. In accordance with section 772(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by Kunj in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted–average comparison market selling expenses. Where appropriate, we made COS adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We made the COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses. The COS adjustments for CV were the same as those for price–to-price comparisons. *See* ''Price–to-Price Comparisons'' (above).

**Level of Trade**

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Tariff Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the home market at the same level of trade (LOT) as EP or CEP. The NV LOT is that of the starting–price sales in the home market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For CEP it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to an affiliated importer after the deductions required under section 772(d) of the Tariff Act.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison–market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison–market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act. For CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act (the CEP–offset provision). *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut–to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732–33 (November 19, 1997).

In implementing these principles in this review, we obtained information from Kunj about the marketing stages involved in its U.S. and home market sales, including a description of its selling activities in the respective markets. Generally, if the reported levels of trade are the same in the home and U.S. markets, the functions and activities of the seller should be similar. Conversely, if a party reports differences in levels of trade the functions and activities should be dissimilar.

Kunj reported one channel of distribution and one LOT in the home market contending that all home market sales were to end users. *See* Kunj's November 6, 2006, submission, at 18. After examining the record evidence provided by Kunj, we preliminarily determine that a single LOT exists in the home market.

Kunj further contends it provided substantially the same level of customer support on its U.S. EP sales to distributors/importers as it provided on its home market sales to end users. This support included manufacturing to order, and making arrangements for freight and insurance. *See* Kunj's May 8, 2006, submission at A–13. The Department has determined that we will find sales to be at the same LOT when the selling functions performed for each customer class are sufficiently similar. *See* 19 CFR 351.412 (c)(2). We find Kunj performed virtually the same level of customer support services on its U.S. EP sales as it did on its home market sales.

The record evidence supports a finding that in both markets and in all channels of distribution Kunj performs essentially the same level of services. Therefore, based on our analysis of the selling functions performed on EP sales in the United States, and its sales in the home market, we determine that the EP and the starting price of home market sales represent the same stage in the marketing process, and are thus at the same LOT. Accordingly, we preliminarily find that no level of trade adjustment is appropriate for Kunj.

**Currency Conversions**

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773(a) of the Tariff Act, based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

**Preliminary Results of Review**

As a result of our review we preliminarily find that a weighted–average dumping margin of 1.52 percent exists for Kunj for the period February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006.

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. *See* CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date per 19 CFR 351.310(d).

Interested parties may submit case briefs or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of new shipper review. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed no later than 5 days after the date of submission of case briefs and written comments. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument, and (3) a table of authorities. Further, parties submitting written comments should provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 90 days of publication of these preliminary results.

**Assessment Rates**

Upon issuance of the final results of this review, the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated importer–specific assessment rates based on the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR divided by the total quantity (in kilograms) of the examined sales. Upon completion of this review, where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we shall instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP fifteen days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following cash deposit rate will be effective upon publication of the final results of this new shipper review for shipments of stainless steel flanges from India entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act. For subject merchandise produced and exported by Kunj, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit rate will be zero. This cash deposit requirement, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

**Notification to Interested Parties**

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: January 25, 2007.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7–1575 Filed 1–30–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–357–812]**

### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Honey from Argentina

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 31, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Cordell 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) 482–0408 or (202) 482–0469, respectively.

On November 24, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from Argentina, covering the period December 1, 2004, through December 31, 2005, and the following exporter: Patagonik S.A. *See Honey From Argentina: Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 67850 (November 24, 2006). On December 15, 2006, the **Federal Register** published a correction notice due to typographical errors in the original preliminary results notice. *See Corrections Honey From Argentina: Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 75614 (December 15, 2006). The final results are currently due on February 14, 2007.[1]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Extension of Time Limits for Final Results**

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1) require the Department to issue the final results of a new shipper review within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued. The Department may, however, extend the deadline for completion of the final results of a new shipper review to 150 days if it determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated. *See* section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2).

[1] The November 24, 2006, **Federal Register** Notice stated the Department would issue final results within 120 days of publication of the Preliminary Results. The Notice should have read that the Department will issue the final results within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued. *See* 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1). The Department hereby corrects this inadvertent error.

As a result of extraordinarily complicated issues raised in the review segment, specifically the multiple issues raised by petitioner with regard to the *bona fide* nature of the sale as well as issues regarding the beekeepers' costs, it is not practicable to complete this new shipper review within the current time limit. Accordingly, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of the final results by 60 days until April 15, 2007, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2). Because April 15 falls on a Sunday, the deadline for the completion of the final results is April 16, 2007, the next business day.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act.

Dated: January 23, 2007.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7–1461 Filed 1–30–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–580–834]**

### Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From the Republic of Korea; Final Results and Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part

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

**SUMMARY:** On April 10, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils (SSSSC) from the Republic of Korea (Korea) (71 FR 18074). This review covers five producers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005. We are rescinding the review with respect to eight companies because they had no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculation for DaiYang Metal Co., Ltd. (DMC), a respondent in this review. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted–average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''