interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a producer of a domestic-like product in the United States. We received a complete substantive response from Maui within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR  $\S 351.218(d)(3)(i)$ . The Department also received a timely and complete substantive response from respondent interested parties, (The Thai Food Processors' Association, Thai Pineapple Canning Industry Corp., Ltd., ("TPC"), Malee Sampran Public Co., Ltd., ("Malee"), The Siam Agro Industry Pineapples and Others Public Co., Ltd., ("SAICO"), Great Oriental Food Products Co., Ltd., ("Great Oriental"), Thai Pineapple Products and Other Fruits Co., Ltd., ("THAICO"), The Tipco Foods (Thailand) PCL ("TIPCO"), Pranburi Hotei Co., Ltd., ("PHC"), and Siam Fruit Canning (1988) Co., Ltd., ("SIFCO")), (collectively, the "Respondents"), within the applicable deadline specified in 19 CFR § 351.218(d)(3)(i). On May 12, 2006, the Department received rebuttal comments from Maui.

Section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A) of the Department's regulations provides that the Department normally will conclude that respondents 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 calender years preceding the year of publication of the notice of initiation.

On May 22, 2006, the Department issued an adequacy determination stating that the Respondents did not meet the adequacy requirements. See Memorandum from Zev Primor to Tom Futtner "Adequacy Determination in Antidumping Duty Sunset Review of Canned Pineapple from Thailand" (May 22, 2006). On May 30, 2006, and June 8, 2006, we received timely comments pertaining to our calculation methodology from the Respondents and Maui, respectively. Upon review of the parties' comments, we modified our calculation methodology and determined that the Respondents met the adequacy requirements. See Memorandum from Zev Primor to Tom Futtner "Correction to the Adequacy Calculation in the Antidumping Duty Sunset Review of Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand" (July 12, 2006). As a result, in accordance with 19 CFR § 351.218(e)(2)(i), the Department determined to conduct a full sunset review of this antidumping duty order.

On July 25, 2006, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on CPF from Thailand is extraordinarily complicated and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than February 27, 2007, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act. See Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results and Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand, 71 FR 42,082 (July 25, 2006).

### Scope of the Order

The product covered by this review is CPF, defined as pineapple processed and/or prepared into various product forms, including rings, pieces, chunks, tidbits, and crushed pineapple, that is packed and cooked in metal cans with either pineapple juice or sugar syrup added. CPF is currently classifiable under subheadings 2008.20.0010 and 2008.20.0090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). HTSUS 2008.20.0010 covers CPF packed in a sugar-based syrup; HTSŪS 2008.20.0090 covers CPF packed without added sugar (i.e., juicepacked). Although these HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive.

There have been no scope rulings for the subject order. There was one changed circumstances determination in which the Department affirmed that TIPCO is the successor—in-interest to the Thai Pineapple Public Co., Ltd. See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand, 69 FR 36,058 (June 28, 2004)

## **Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in this review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand," (the "Decision Memorandum") from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated October 20, 2006, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in the Decision Memorandum which is on

file in room B–099 of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be viewed directly on the Web at <a href="http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html">http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html</a>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

# **Preliminary Results of Review**

We preliminarily determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on CPF from Thailand would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted—average margins:

Manufacturers/Export-	Weighted-Average
ers/Producers	Margin (percent)
SAICO	51.16 41.74 24.64

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

Dated: October 20, 2006.

#### David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–18055 Filed 10–26–06; 8:45 am]  $\tt BILLING\ CODE\ 3510-DS-S$ 

### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

#### **International Trade Administration**

A-570-836

## Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce. SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the review of glycine from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). This review covers the period March 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 27, 2006.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine Bertrand, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3207.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## **Statutory Time Limits**

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days after the last day of the anniversary month.

### **Background**

On March 29, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping duty order on glycine from the PRC. See Antidumping Duty Order: Glycine from the People's Republic of China, 60 FR 16116, (March 29, 1995). On April 28, 2006, the Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China. See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 71 FR 25145 (April 28, 2006). The preliminary results of this administrative review are currently due no later than December 1, 2006.

### **Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review**

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit because the Department requires additional time to analyze the supplemental questionnaire responses, issue additional supplemental questionnaires, as well as to evaluate what would be the most appropriate surrogate values to use during the period of review. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results by 120 days. The preliminary results will now be due no later than April 2, 2007, which is the first business day after the 120-day extension (the 120th day falls on the weekend). The final results continue to be due 120 days

after the publication of the preliminary results.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: October 23, 2006.

### Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–18049 Filed 10–26–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS-S

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

#### **International Trade Administration**

## California Institute of Technology, et al., Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty–Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 2104, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20301 Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United

Docket Number: 06–008. Applicant: California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125. Instrument: Neutron Guide, Manufacturer: Swiss Neutronics, Switzerland. Intended Use: See 71 FR 18082, July 27, 2006. Reasons: The article is a compatible key accessory for the high-resolution, direct-geometry, time-of-flight chopper spectrometer (ARCS) at the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge N.L. It will be used to investigate the energy spectra obtained when neutrons incident on a sample are scattered by the motions of atoms or of electron spins in the sample. Studies will include the thermodynamics of atom vibrations or spin motions, or of their characteristic energies and momenta, cooperative motions of electrons in solids relevant to electrical transport, magnetic properties and superconductivity. The neutron guide is especially useful for studies that require low or mediumenergy neutron beams that are incident upon the sample. Docket Number: 06–014. Applicant: Howard Hughes Medical Institute,

Harvard Medical School Boston, MA

02115. Instrument: Confocal Microscope, Model Opera. Manufacturer: Evotec, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 71 FR 18082, April 10, 2006. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides:

- An integrated fast autofocus system and an automated water immersion lens system for superior resolution and lower background in a true point confocal laser scanning microscope using a Nipkow spinning disk
- 2. Ültra high-throughput performance (> 200,000 images per day)
- 3. Parallel acquisition of three different wavelengths through three different LCD cameras with a dedicated cluster of three three computers that process an image while the following one is being acquired
- 4. Open architecture which allows creation of new scripts or modification and enhancement of existing or imported scripts
- Broad user support providing a wide variety of services with rapid servicing, parts replacement and instrument upgrading.

Advice provided by: The National Institutes of Health. Docket Number: 06-015. Applicant: University of Kentucky, Department of Chemistry, Lexington, KY 4056-0055. Instrument: Optical Parametric Oscillator System. Manufacturer: GWU Lasertechnik, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 71 FR 26048, July 27, 2006. Reasons: The foreign article is a compatible accessory for an existing Nd:YAG laser as well as an existing data acquisition system developed over several years. It provides: (1) a wavelength tuning range from 412 nm to  $2.5 \mu m$ , (2) a divergence of < 0.5 mrad, (3) linewidth < 4 cm - 1 and (4)motorized crystal tuning. Docket Number: 06–017. Applicant: University of Michigan, Materials Science and Engineering Department, Ann Arbor, MI 48109–2136. Instrument: Ultrasonic Fatigue Testing Equipment. Manufacturer: BOKU Institute of Physics, Austria. Intended Use: See notice at 71 FR 26048, May 3, 2006. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides a highly specialized system to be used for studying ultra-high cyclic fatigue behavior of materials in the gigacycle regime. It provides measurements for understanding crack growth behavior in various materials including next generation superalloys and prediction of lifetime behavior with cyclic loading frequencies to 20 KHz with capability to stall and return to load repeatedly.