

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in these cases are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated September 28, 2006, (Decision Memorandum), 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 margin likely to prevail if the orders are revoked.

Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these sunset reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Department building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov>, under the heading

"September 2006." The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Argentina, Brazil, and Germany would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturers/exporters/producers	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Argentina.	
Siderca SAIC	108.13
All Others	108.13
Brazil.	
V & M do Brasil, S.A.	124.94
All Others	124.94
Germany.	
Vallourec & Mannesmann Tubes - V&M Deutschland GmbH	57.72
All Others	57.72

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (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, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 29, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-16601 Filed 10-5-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

A-533-809

**Stainless Steel Flanges from India:
Notice of Initiation of Antidumping
Duty New Shipper Reviews**

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received requests for new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on certain

forged stainless steel flanges (flanges) from India issued on February 9, 1994. *See Amended Final Determination and Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India*, 59 FR 5994 (February 9, 1994). In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.214(d) (2005), we are initiating antidumping new shipper reviews of Micro Forge (India), Ltd. (Micro) and Pradeep Metals Limited (Pradeep), exporters and producers that requested new shipper reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker, Michael Heaney, 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, (202) 482-4475, or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d), the Department received timely requests submitted by Micro and Pradeep (producers and exporters of flanges) for new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on flanges from India. *See* August 31, 2006, letters from Micro and Pradeep to the Secretary of Commerce requesting new shipper reviews.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b), Micro and Pradeep certified that they are both exporters and producers of the subject merchandise, that they did not export

subject merchandise to the United States during the period of the investigation (POI) (July 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992), and that since the investigation was initiated, they have not been affiliated with any producer or exporter who exported the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. They also submitted documentation establishing the date on which they first shipped the subject merchandise to the United States, the volume of those shipments, and the date of their first sales to unaffiliated customers in the United States. They also certified they had no shipments to the United States during the period subsequent to their first shipments.

Initiation of Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and section 351.214(d) of the Department's regulations, we find that the requests submitted by Micro and Pradeep meet the threshold requirements for initiation of a new shipper review. Accordingly, we are initiating new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on flanges from India manufactured and exported by Micro and Pradeep. These reviews cover the period February 1, 2006, through July 31, 2006. We intend to issue the preliminary results of these reviews no later than 180 days after the date on which these reviews are initiated, and the final results within 90 days after the date on which we issue the preliminary results. *See* section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

On August 17, 2006, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 (H.R. 4) was

signed into law. Section 1632 of H.R. 4 temporarily suspends the authority of the Department to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to collect a bond or other security in lieu of a cash deposit in new shipper reviews. Therefore, the posting of a bond under Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act in lieu of a cash deposit is not available in this case. Importers of subject merchandise manufactured and exported by Micro and Pradeep must continue to post a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on each entry of subject merchandise at the current all-others rate of 162.14 percent.

Interested parties may submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and this notice are issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and sections 351.214(d) and 351.221(c)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: September 29, 2006.

Stephen Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-16517 Filed 10-5-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-401-806]

Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Sweden: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a timely request by the petitioners,¹ the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod ("SSWR") from Sweden with respect to Fagersta Stainless AB ("FSAB"). The period of review ("POR") is September 1, 2004, through August 31, 2005.

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value ("NV"). Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results. If the preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative

review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian C. Smith, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration-Room B-099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1766.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 15, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on SSWR from Sweden. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden*, 63 FR 49329 ("SSWR Order"). On September 30, 2005, the petitioners submitted a letter timely requesting that the Department conduct an administrative review of the sales of SSWR made by FSAB, pursuant to section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). The Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review with respect to FSAB. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Reviews*, 70 FR 61601 (October 25, 2005). On November 7, 2005, we issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to FSAB. FSAB submitted its section A questionnaire response in December 2005 and responses to the remaining sections of the questionnaire in January 2006. We also issued to FSAB a section A supplemental questionnaire in January 2006 and a sections B and C supplemental questionnaire in February 2006. We received FSAB's timely responses to these supplemental questionnaires in March and April 2006, respectively.

On April 13, 2006, we issued a decision memorandum which outlined the Department's basis for collapsing FSAB with its affiliates, AB Sandvik Materials Technology ("SMT") and Kanthal AB ("Kanthal"), and treating them as a single entity in this review. *See April 13, 2006, Memorandum from the Team to The File, entitled, Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden: Whether to Collapse FSAB, SMT, and Kanthal*. Also, on April 13, 2006, we issued to FSAB a supplemental sections D and E questionnaire to which it submitted its response on May 11, 2006.

On April 26, 2006, we extended the time limit for the preliminary results in this review until August 1, 2006. *See Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for*

2004-2005 Administrative Review, 71 FR 25813 (May 2, 2006).

On May 19, 2006, we issued to FSAB a second sections B and C supplemental questionnaire for which it submitted its response on June 19, 2006.

On June 8, we issued to FSAB a sections D and E second supplemental questionnaire to which it submitted its response on July 6, 2006.

On June 19 and 22, 2006, we met with counsel for FSAB and the petitioners, respectively, at their requests, to discuss FSAB's proposal that the Department include an additional criterion (*i.e.*, electro-slag refining ("ESR")) to the current model-matching criteria used in this administrative review (*see June 21, 2006, Memorandum to the File, entitled, Ex-Parte Meeting with FSAB*; and June 28, 2006, Memorandum to the File, entitled, *Ex-Parte Meeting with Counsel for the Petitioners*).

As a result of the above-mentioned meetings, we issued letters to FSAB and the petitioners on July 10, 2006, in which we invited them to comment further on this matter. On July 12, 2006, we met with a Swedish Embassy official, at the Swedish Embassy's request, to discuss the ESR matter (*see July 13, 2006, Memorandum to the File, entitled, Ex-Parte Meeting with Swedish Embassy Official*). In response to the Department's July 10, 2006, letters, both parties submitted comments on July 17, 2006. On July 24, 2006, only FSAB submitted rebuttal comments on this matter.

In order to fully consider the parties' comments on the ESR matter, we fully extended the time limit for the preliminary results in this review until October 2, 2006. *See Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for 2004-2005 Administrative Review*, 71 FR 40698 (July 18, 2006).

On July 28, 2006, we issued to FSAB a third sections D and E supplemental questionnaire to which it submitted its response on August 18, 2006.

Scope of the Order

For purposes of this order, SSWR comprises products that are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed and/or pickled and/or descaled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons or other shapes, in coils, that may also be coated with a lubricant containing copper, lime or oxalate. SSWR is made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are manufactured only by hot-rolling or hot-rolling annealing, and/or pickling and/or descaling, are normally sold in coiled

¹ The petitioners include the following companies: Carpenter Technology Corporation, Dunkirk Specialty Steel, LLC Clearon Corporation and Occidental Chemical Corporation.