Pursuant to the Department's request, Ugitech reported per—unit home market indirect selling expenses based on multiple expense allocation methodologies in accordance with its reported sales channels and its claimed LOTs. Consistent with our LOT determination explained above, we applied the reported indirect selling expense variables which represented the expense amounts allocated over all home market sales, rather than by reported sales channel and claimed LOT.

#### **Currency Conversion**

We made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A of the 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 this review, we preliminarily determine that the weighted—average dumping margin for the period March 1, 2004, through February 28, 2005, is as follows:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Percent Margin
Ugitech S.A	9.70

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). If requested, a hearing will be scheduled after determination of the briefing schedule.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Room B—099, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case briefs. Case briefs from interested parties and rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted in accordance with a schedule to be determined. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are also encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed

five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any written briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

#### **Assessment Rates**

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212. The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions for the companies subject to this review directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of the final results of this review.

For assessment purposes, we calculated importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping margins calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those same sales. 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., at or above 0.50 percent). See 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1). The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.

# **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 the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent, and therefore, de minimis within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (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 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 3.90 percent, the "All Others" rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. See SSB Order. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

#### **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.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: January 12, 2006.

#### David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–658 Filed 1–20–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

# **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

# International Trade Administration [A-489-807]

Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 23, 2006. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Irina Itkin or Alice Gibbons at (202) 482–0656 or (202) 482–0498, respectively, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Background**

On April 1, 2005, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Review" of the antidumping duty order on certain steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Turkey for the period of review April 1, 2004, through March 31, 2005. *See* 

Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request a Review, 70 FR 16799 (April 1, 2005). The Department received timely requests for review from Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. and Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (collectively "Colakoglu"); Diler Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S., Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S., and Diler Dis Ticaret A.S. (collectively ''Diler''); Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas); and ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi A.S. (ICDAS), foreign producers/ exporters in this proceeding. The Department also received a timely request for review from Nucor Corporation and Gerdau Ameristeel Corporation, domestic producers of rebar and interested parties in this proceeding, covering 34 producers/ exporters of rebar from Turkey, including the producers/exporters referenced above. On May 27, 2005, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on rebar from Turkey. See Initiation of Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part, 70 FR 30694 (May 27, 2005). The Department released the antidumping questionnaire in May and August 2005 to the 34 producers/ exporters for which an administrative review was requested. Colakoglu, Diler, Ekinciler Demir ve Celik Sanayi A.S. and Ekinciler Dis Ticaret A.S., and Habas responded to the Department's questionnaire in August 2005 and ICDAS responded to the Department's questionnaire in October 2005. The preliminary results for this proceeding are due no later than May 1, 2006.

#### Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar. Deformed rebar is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tarif Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7213.10.000 and 7214.20.000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### **Determination To Rescind, in Part**

On November 8, 2005, the Department published its final results for the April

1, 2003, though March 31, 2004, administrative review and found that ICDAS met the requirements of revocation as described in 19 CFR 351.222. See Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey: Final Results, Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part, and Determination To Revoke in Part, 70 FR 67665 (Nov. 8, 2005). Due to ICDAS' revocation in that review, we are rescinding the April 1, 2004, through March 31, 2005, administrative review with respect to ICDAS because there is no statutory or regulatory basis to conduct an administrative review for a producer/exporter that has met the requirements of revocation.

Dated: January 12, 2006.

#### David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-652 Filed 1-20-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

International Trade Administration, North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews

**AGENCY:** NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision of panel.

SUMMARY: On January 17, 2006 the binational panel issued its decision in the review of the determination on remand made by the International Trade Commission, respecting Magnesium from Canada Full Sunset Review of AD and CVD Orders, Secretariat File No. USA-CDA-2000-1904-09. The binational panel affirmed in part and remanded in part to the International Trade Commission. Copies of the panel decision are available from the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Caratina L. Alston, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–5438.

Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–5438. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final

determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico established Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the Federal Register on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8686). The panel review in this matter has been conducted in accordance with these Rules. Panel Decision: The panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the International Trade Commission's determination on remand respecting Magnesium from Canada. The panel remand in part to the Commission and instructed the Commission as follows: Analyze the price, volume and impact of revocation of the countervailing duty order on alloy magnesium to show how the record supports the Commission's conclusions, providing a reasoned explanation based on all of the evidence on the record to support a decision that revocation of the countervailing duty order on imports of allov magnesium from Canada would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic alloy magnesium industry within the reasonably foreseeable future due to underselling by Magnola. The Commission must provide further reasoned analysis supported by substantial evidence on the record, including any factual evidence not referred to in its Views on Remand, as to the conclusion that Magnola would enter the market by underselling in order to establish export volumes that would be significant in relation to anticipated demand increases. The Commission is directed to respond to this Order within sixty (60) days of receipt.

Dated: January 17, 2006.

# Caratina L. Alston,

U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat. [FR Doc. E6–655 Filed 1–20–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–GT–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Application for Commission in the NOAA Officer Corps

**AGENCY:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).