

producers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department shall make a preliminary determination in an administrative review of an antidumping order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend the 245-day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period. We determine that it is not practicable to complete this administrative review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act because we require additional time to analyze the respondent's cost of production response and issue supplemental questionnaires. Therefore, we have fully extended the deadline for completing the preliminary results until July 31, 2007, which is 365 days from the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The deadline for the final results of the review continues to be 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This extension notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 19, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-5502 Filed 3-23-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Rescission in Part and Intent to Rescind in Part

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting the nineteenth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished or unfinished ("TRBs"), from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"),

covering the period June 1, 2005, through May 31, 2006. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on entries of subject merchandise during the period of review ("POR") for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days from the date of publication of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Eugene Degnan or Robert Bolling, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0414 and (202) 482-3434, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 2, 2006, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC for the period June 1, 2005, through May 31, 2006. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 71 FR 32032 (June 2, 2006). On June 30, 2006, The Timken Company ("Timken" or "Petitioner") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order covering TRBs from the PRC for entries of subject merchandise produced and/or exported by Chin Jun Industrial Ltd. ("Chin Jun"), and Peer Bearing Company - Changshan ("CPZ"). Additionally, on June 30, 2006, Hebei Longsheng Metals & Minerals Co., Ltd. ("Hebei Longsheng") and Yantai Timken Company Limited ("Yantai") independently requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their respective sales. Further, on June 30, 2006, Koyo Corporation of U.S.A. ("Koyo"), a U.S. producer of TRBs, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of Yantai's sales. On July 27, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of the initiation of the antidumping duty administrative review of TRBs from the PRC for the period June 1, 2005, through May 31, 2006, for Chin Jun, CPZ, Hebei Longsheng, and Yantai. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative*

Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part, 71 FR 42626 (July 27, 2006) ("Initiation Notice").

On August 9, 2006, the Department issued its antidumping duty questionnaire to all of the above respondents.

On August 28, 2006, Chin Jun reported to the Department that it was a dormant company during the POR and had no sales of subject merchandise. On September 6, 2006, Yantai withdrew its request for review, stating that it did not intend to participate further in the review because of the limited value of its exports. Also on September 6, 2006, Hebei Longsheng submitted its Section A response to the Department's original questionnaire. On September 8, 2006, CPZ reported to the Department that it did not intend to submit questionnaire responses because of the limited value of its exports. On September 29, 2006, Hebei Longsheng withdrew its request for review, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Notice of Intent to Rescind in Part and Partial Rescission

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department may rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, with respect to a particular exporter or producer, if the Secretary concludes that, during the period covered by the review, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise. The Department explains this practice in the preamble to the Department's regulations. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties*, 62 FR 27296, 27317 (May 19, 1997) ("Preamble"); *see also Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Taiwan: Preliminary Results and Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 5789, 5790 (February 7, 2002), and *Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Taiwan: Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 66 FR 18610 (April 10, 2001). Because Chin Jun reported to the Department that it was a dormant company during the POR and it had no sales of subject merchandise, and we have received no evidence that Chin Jun had any shipments to the United States of subject merchandise during the POR, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department preliminarily rescinds this review as to Chin Jun.

The Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) further provide that the Department will rescind an administrative review if the party that requested the review withdraws its request for review within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of

initiation of the requested review, or withdraws its request at a later date if the Department determines that it is reasonable to extend the time limit for withdrawing the request. Hebei Longsheng withdrew its request for review within the 90-day time limit and no other party requested a review with respect to Hebei Longsheng. Therefore, we are rescinding this review as to Hebei Longsheng.

Yantai also withdrew its request for review within the 90-day time frame discussed above; however, another interested party (*i.e.*, Koyo) also requested a review of Yantai. Therefore, we are not rescinding this review as to Yantai.

Period of Review

The POR is June 1, 2005, through May 31, 2006.

Scope of the Order

Merchandise covered by this order is TRBs from the PRC; flange, take-up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. This merchandise is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") item numbers 8482.20.00, 8482.91.00.50, 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.80, 8708.99.80.15, and 8708.99.80.80. Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Application of Facts Available

Section 776(a)(1) and (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") provides that the Department shall apply "facts otherwise available" if, *inter alia*, necessary information is not on the record or an interested party or any other person (A) withholds information that has been requested, (B) fails to provide information within the deadlines established, or in the form and manner requested by the Department, subject to subsections (c)(1) and (e) of section 782, (C) significantly impedes a proceeding, or (D) provides information that cannot be verified as provided by section 782(i) of the Act.

Where the Department determines that a response to a request for information does not comply with the request, section 782(d) of the Act provides that the Department will so inform the party submitting the response and will, to the extent

practicable, provide that party the opportunity to remedy or explain the deficiency. If the party fails to remedy the deficiency within the applicable time limits and subject to section 782(e) of the Act, the Department may disregard all or part of the original and subsequent responses, as appropriate. Section 782(e) of the Act provides that the Department "shall not decline to consider information that is submitted by an interested party and is necessary to the determination but does not meet all applicable requirements established by the administering authority" if the information is timely, can be verified, is not so incomplete that it cannot be used, and if the interested party acted to the best of its ability in providing the information. Where all of these conditions are met, the statute requires the Department to use the information supplied if it can do so without undue difficulties.

Section 776(b) of the Act further provides that the Department may use an adverse inference in applying the facts otherwise available when a party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information. Such an adverse inference may include reliance on information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that, when the Department relies on secondary information rather than on information obtained in the course of an investigation or review, it shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information from independent sources that are reasonably at its disposal. Secondary information is defined as "[i]nformation derived from the petition that gave rise to the investigation or review, the final determination concerning the subject merchandise, or any previous review under section 751 concerning the subject merchandise." *See Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act*, H.R. Rep. No. 103-316, Vol. 1, at 870 (1994) ("SAA"), reprinted in 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4040, 4198-99. Corroborate means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. *Id.* To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used.

Application of Total Adverse Facts Available

CPZ

As discussed above, the Department initiated an administrative review of CPZ's exports of merchandise covered by the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC. *See Initiation Notice*. On August 9, 2006, the Department issued its original questionnaire to CPZ. On September 8, 2006, CPZ reported to the Department that it did not intend to submit questionnaire responses because of the limited value of its exports. We find that because CPZ failed to submit questionnaire responses, CPZ has not demonstrated its entitlement to a separate rate and is, therefore, subject to the PRC-wide rate.

Yantai

On September 6, 2006, Yantai reported to the Department it was withdrawing its request for review and it did not intend to further participate in the review because of the limited value of its exports. However, because Koyo also requested an administrative review of Yantai, the Department could not rescind as to Yantai. Because Yantai failed to submit questionnaire responses, the Department was unable to conduct a separate-rate analysis of Yantai. Accordingly, the Department finds that Yantai has not demonstrated its entitlement to a separate rate and is, therefore, subject to the PRC-wide rate.

The PRC-Wide Entity

Because CPZ and Yantai did not respond to the Department's questionnaire, and therefore did not demonstrate their eligibility for separate-rate status, the Department is treating these PRC producers/exporters as part of the PRC-wide entity.

Additionally, because we have determined that the companies named above are part of the PRC-wide entity, the PRC-wide entity is now under review. Pursuant to section 776(a) of the Act, we further find that because the PRC-wide entity (including the companies discussed above) failed to respond to the Department's questionnaires, withheld or failed to provide information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested by the Department, or otherwise impeded the proceeding, it is appropriate to apply a dumping margin for the PRC-wide entity using facts otherwise available on the record. Additionally, because these parties failed to respond to our requests for information, we find that an adverse inference is appropriate.

Selection of the Adverse Facts Available Rate

In deciding which facts to use as adverse facts available (“AFA”), section 776(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.308(c)(1) authorize the Department to rely on information derived from (1) the petition, (2) a final determination in the investigation, (3) any previous review or determination, or (4) any information placed on the record. In administrative reviews, the Department normally selects, as AFA, the highest rate determined for any respondent in any segment of the proceeding. *See, e.g., Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 19504 (April 21, 2003); *see also Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Taiwan: Preliminary Results and Rescission in Part of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 57991 (February 7, 2002).

The Court of International Trade (“CIT”) and the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”) have consistently upheld the Department’s practice. *See Rhone Poulenc, Inc. v. United States*, 899 F.2d 1185, 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (“Rhone Poulenc”); *NSK Ltd. v. United States*, 346 F. Supp. 2d 1312, 1335 (CIT 2004) (upholding a 73.55 percent total AFA rate, the highest available dumping margin from a different respondent in an less than fair value investigation); *see also Kompass Food Trading Int’l v. United States*, 24 CIT 678, 689 (2000) (upholding a 51.16 percent total AFA rate, the highest available dumping margin from a different, fully cooperative respondent); and *Shanghai Taoen International Trading Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 2005 Ct. Int’l. Trade 23 *23; Slip Op. 05–22 (February 17, 2005) (upholding a 223.01 percent total AFA rate, the highest available dumping margin from a different respondent in a previous administrative review).

The Department’s practice when selecting an adverse rate from among the possible sources of information is to ensure that the margin is sufficiently adverse “as to effectuate the purpose of the facts available role to induce respondents to provide the Department with complete and accurate information in a timely manner.” *See Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors from Taiwan: Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value*, 63 FR 8909, 8932 (February 23, 1998). The Department’s practice also ensures “that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully.” *See SAA* at 890, *see also Final Determination of Sales at*

Less than Fair Value: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, 69 FR 76910 (December 23, 2004); *see also D&L Supply Co. v. United States*, 113 F. 3d 1220, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In choosing the appropriate balance between providing respondents with an incentive to respond accurately and imposing a rate that is reasonably related to the respondent’s prior commercial activity, selecting the highest prior margin “reflects a common sense inference that the highest prior margin is the most probative evidence of current margins, because, if it were not so, the importer, knowing of the rule, would have produced current information showing the margin to be less.” *Rhone Poulenc*, 899 F. 2d at 1190.

Consistent with the Department’s practice and the purposes of section 776(b) of the Act, as AFA, we are assigning the rate of 60.95 percent to the PRC-wide entity, which is the highest rate calculated in any segment of the proceeding. This rate was calculated for Premier Bearing and Equipment Ltd. (“Premier”) in the final results of redetermination on remand from the CIT for the seventh administrative review of TRBs covering the POR of June 1, 1993, to May 31, 1994. *Peer Bearing Co. v. United States*, Slip op. 02–53 (CIT 2002); as upheld by the Federal Circuit in 78 Fed. Appx. 718 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *see also Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished from the PRC: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 79902, (Dec. 31, 2002) (“*TRBs Amended Final*”), and *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from the PRC: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 10423 (March 5, 2004) (“*TRBs Amended Final 2*”). The Department preliminarily determines that this information is the most appropriate, from the available sources, to effectuate the purposes of AFA. The Department’s reliance on secondary information to determine an AFA rate is subject to the requirement to corroborate. *See* section 776(c) of the Act and the “*Corroboration of Secondary Information*” section below.

Corroboration of Secondary Information

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that, where the Department selects from among the facts otherwise available and relies on “secondary information,” the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information from independent sources reasonably at the Department’s disposal. Secondary

information is described in the SAA as “[i]nformation derived from the petition that gave rise to the investigation or review, the final determination concerning the subject merchandise, or any previous review under section 751 concerning the subject merchandise.” *See SAA* at 870. The SAA states that “corroborate” means to determine that the information used has probative value. The Department has determined that to have probative value information must be reliable and relevant. *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished from Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 57391, 57392 (November 6, 1996). The SAA also states that independent sources used to corroborate such evidence may include, for example, published price lists, official import statistics and customs data, and information obtained from interested parties during the particular investigation. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: High and Ultra-High Voltage Ceramic Station Post Insulators from Japan*, 68 FR 35627 (June 16, 2003); and *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Live Swine From Canada*, 70 FR 12181 (March 11, 2005).

The reliability of the AFA rate was determined by the calculation of the margin for Premier, pursuant to the final results of redetermination on remand from the CIT, for the seventh administrative review of TRBs (covering the period June 1, 1993, to May 31, 1994). *See TRBs Amended Final* and *TRBs Amended Final 2*. The Department has received no information to date that warrants revisiting the issue of the reliability of the rate calculation itself. *See e.g., Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of the New Shipper Review and Final Results and Partial Rescission of the Third Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 41304, 41307–41308 (July 11, 2003). No information has been presented in the current review that calls into question the reliability of this information. Thus, the Department finds that the information contained in the 1993–1994 review is reliable.

With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal to determine whether a margin continues to have relevance. Where

circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as AFA, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. *See Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (February 22, 1996) (where the Department disregarded the highest margin in that case as adverse best information available (the predecessor to facts available) because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin). Similarly, the Department does not apply a margin that has been discredited. *See D&L Supply Co. v. United States*, 113 F.3d 1220, 1221 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (ruling that the Department will not use a margin that has been judicially invalidated). To assess the relevancy of the rate used, the Department has no record evidence to call into question Premier's margins. Further, in our recently completed final results for the 2003–2004 review of TRB's, we also applied the 60.95 percent rate to the PRC-wide entity as AFA. *See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished from the PRC: Amended Final Results of Administrative Review*, 71 FR 9521 (February 24, 2006). Therefore, we determine that the rate from the 1993–1994 review continues to be relevant for use in this administrative review.

As the 1993–1994 margin is both reliable and relevant, we determine that it has probative value. Accordingly, we determine that the highest rate from any segment of this administrative proceeding, 60.95 percent, meets the corroboration criteria established in section 776(c) that secondary information have probative value. As a result, the Department determines that the 1993–1994 margin is corroborated for the purposes of this administrative review and may reasonably be applied to the PRC-wide entity as AFA.

Because these are preliminary results of review, the Department will consider all margins on the record at the time of the final results of review for the purpose of determining the most appropriate final margin for the PRC-wide entity. *See Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Solid Fertilizer Grade Ammonium Nitrate From the Russian Federation*, 65 FR 1139 (January 7, 2000).

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period June 1, 2005, through May 31, 2006:

TRBS FROM THE PRC

Producer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)
PRC-Wide Entity*	60.95

* Including CPZ and Yantai.

Disclosure

The Department will disclose calculations performed for these preliminary results to the parties within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). The Department requests that parties submitting written comments also provide the Department with an additional copy of those comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rates

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review. In this review, if these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will direct CBP to assess the resulting rate against the entered customs value for the subject merchandise on each importer's/customer's entries during the POR.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for shipments of subject merchandise from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by

sections 751(a)(1)(C) and (a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for CPZ and Yantai, the cash deposit rate will be that established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 60.95 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporters that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

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.

The Department is issuing and publishing these preliminary results of administrative review in accordance with sections 751(a) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.221(b) and 351.214(h).

Dated: March 1, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–5500 Filed 3–23–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Issuance of an Export Trade Certificate of Review, Application No. 06–00003.

SUMMARY: On March 16, 2007, the U.S. Department of Commerce issued an Export Trade Certificate of Review to the American Sugar Alliance (“ASA”). This notice summarizes the conduct for which certification has been granted.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey Anspacher, Director, Export