

may be used at the ESG facilities (representing 25 – 40% of material value) may include plastic tubes/pipes/hoses/fittings/floor coverings/seals/gaskets/o-rings, rubber mats/gaskets/o-rings/seals/knobs/dampeners, carpeting (will be admitted under privileged foreign (PF) status (19 CFR § 146.41)), articles of plaster, tableware, steel and iron pipe/tube/profiles/casings/fittings, stainless steel pipe/tube/flanges, doors, windows, structures, tanks, drums, LNG containers, anchors, articles of copper, couplings (of nickel, aluminum, lead, zinc, tin), articles of chromium, flexible tubing, marine steam turbines, engines (diesel and spark ignition) and parts, turbojets, propellers, gas turbines and parts, pumps, compressors, fans, air conditioners, furnaces and parts, heat exchange units, chillers, water heaters and parts, centrifuges, filters and filtering equipment, cranes, trash compactors, valves, bearings (items subject to AD/CVD orders will be admitted under PF status), gears, flywheels, clutches, parts of transmissions, generators and sets, starters, radio transceivers and remote controllers, radar equipment, parts of signaling equipment, electric switchgear and control panels, ignition wiring sets, compasses, instruments and meters, navigational instruments, thermostats, marine chronometers, furniture, and lamps (duty rate range: free – 9.0%; 25¢/ea.+3.9%, *ad valorem*; 84¢/bbl).

FTZ procedures would exempt ESG from customs duty payments on the foreign components used in export activity. On its domestic sales, the company would not be required to pay applicable customs duties on the foreign components, or it would be able to elect the duty rate that applies to finished oceangoing vessels (duty free) for the foreign components when the vessels are processed for customs entry. The manufacturing activity conducted under FTZ procedures would be subject to the “standard shipyard restriction” applicable to foreign-origin steel mill products (e.g., angles, pipe, plate), which requires that full customs duties be paid on such items. The application indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the facilities’ international competitiveness. In accordance with the Board’s regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is August 13, 2007.

Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to August 27, 2007.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations: Office of the Area Port Director, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 2831 Talleyrand Avenue, Jacksonville, FL 32206; and, the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign–Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230–0002.

For further information, contact Pierre Duy, examiner, at [pierre\\_duy@ita.doc.gov](mailto:pierre_duy@ita.doc.gov), or (202) 482–1378.

Dated: June 5, 2007.

**Pierre V. Duy,**

*Acting Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E7–11320 Filed 6–11–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Bureau of Industry and Security

#### Action Affecting Export Privileges; Cirrus Electronics LLC et al.

In the Matter of: Cirrus Electronics LLC, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615; Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore; Cirrus Electronics Marketing (P) Ltd., 1303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India; Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Managing Director, CEO, President, and Group Head of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615; Mythili Gopal, International Manager of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615; Akn Prasad, CEO of India Operations of Cirrus, #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India; Sampath Sundar, Director of Operations of Cirrus, Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore, Respondents.

#### Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations (“EAR”),<sup>1</sup> the Bureau of Industry and

Security (“BIS”), U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”), has requested that I issue an Order temporarily denying the export privileges under the EAR of:

(1) Cirrus Electronics, doing business as Cirrus Electronics LLC, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615 (“Cirrus U.S.A.”).

(2) Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore (“Cirrus Singapore”).

(3) Cirrus Electronics Marketing (P) Ltd., #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India (“Cirrus India”).

(4) Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Managing Director, CEO, President, and Group Head of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615.

(5) Mythili Gopal, International Manager of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681–3615.

(6) Akn Prasad, CEO of India Operations of Cirrus, #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India.

(7) Sampath Sundar, Director of Operations of Cirrus, Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore.

(hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Respondents”) for 180 days.

In its request, BIS has presented evidence that shows that the Respondents knowingly engaged in conduct prohibited by the EAR and took actions to evade the EAR by shipping items through Singapore and concealing the true identity of the end-users. The Respondents participated in the export of items subject to the EAR to two end-users on the Entity List set forth in Supp. 4 to Part 744 of the EAR without the export licenses required by Section 744.1 of the EAR.

Specifically, the evidence shows that on at least five occasions between on or about September 30, 2005 and on or about April 17, 2006, the Respondents exported items subject to the EAR from the United States to the Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre (“VSSC”) and Bharat Dynamics Ltd. (“BDL”) in India without the license required by Section 744.1 of the EAR. VSSC and BDL are

U.S.C. app. 2401–2420 (2000)) (“EAA”). Since August 21, 2001, the EAA has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 3, 2006 (71 FR 44551 (August 7, 2006)), has continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)) (“IEEPA”).

<sup>1</sup> The EAR are currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730–774 (2007). The EAR are issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50

organizations set forth on the Entity List set forth in Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the EAR. On two occasions on or about March 24, 2006 and on or about April 17, 2006, the Respondents exported Static Random Access Memory computer chips, items subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification Number 3A001.a.2.c., to VSSC. These items are controlled for national security reasons and required a license for export to Singapore, India, and VSSC. On three occasions on or about September 30, 2005, November 5, 2005, and January 14, 2006, the Respondents exported semiconductors and capacitors, items subject to the EAR ("EAR99") to BDL. These items have applications in missile guidance and firing systems and required a license for export to BDL. In each instance, the items were shipped from the United States to Singapore for subsequent shipment to VSSC and BDL. The Respondents were aware of the Entity List licensing requirements and on at least one occasion provided an end-user statement to a U.S. vendor that falsely represented the end-user in order to conceal the intended actual end user, VSSC, of the vendor's items.

I find that the evidence presented by BIS demonstrates that the Respondents have knowingly violated the EAR, that such violations have been deliberate and covert, and that there is a likelihood of future violations, particularly given the nature of the transactions. As such, a Temporary Denial Order ("TDO") is needed to give notice to persons and companies in the United States and abroad that they should cease dealing with the Respondents in export transactions involving items subject to the EAR. Such a TDO is consistent with the public interest to preclude future violations of the EAR.

Accordingly, I find that a TDO naming Cirrus USA, its two offices in Singapore and India, Cirrus Singapore and Cirrus India, respectively, and its four officers, Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Mythili Gopal, Akn Prasad, and Sampath Sundar, as Respondents is necessary, in the public interest, to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR. This Order is issued on an *ex parte* basis without a hearing based upon BIS's showing of an imminent violation.

*It is therefore ordered:*

First, that the Respondents, CIRRUS ELECTRONICS LLC, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3615, and Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial

Park 3, Singapore, and Cirrus Electronics Marketing (P) Ltd., #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India, and Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Managing Director, CEO, President, and Group Head of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3703, and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3615, and Mythili Gopal, International Manager of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina, 29681-3615, and Akn Prasad, CEO of India Operations of Cirrus, #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India, and Sampath Sundar, Director of Operations of Cirrus, Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore (collectively the "Denied Persons"), may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item expected or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Persons any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Persons of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Persons acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Persons of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Persons in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Persons, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Persons if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to any of the Denied Persons by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the EAR, the Respondents may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request with the Assistant Secretary not later than 20 days before the expiration date and serving the request on the Respondents. The Respondents may oppose a request to renew this Order by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be served on the Respondents and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This Order is effective upon date of publication in the **Federal Register** and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Entered this 1st day of June, 2007.

**Darryl W. Jackson,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 07-2899 Filed 6-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-890]

#### Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limits for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 12, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Gene Degnan, 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.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

The Department of Commerce ("the Department") published an antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom furniture ("WBF") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") on January 4, 2005. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China*, 70 FR 329 (January 4, 2005). On March 7, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of the initiation of the antidumping duty administrative review of WBF from the PRC and new shipper reviews for the period June 24, 2004, through December 31, 2005. *See Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping Duty Order on Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China*, 71 FR 11394 (March 7, 2006) and *Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Reviews*, 71 FR 11404 (March 7, 2006) ("Initiation of Second Annual New Shipper Reviews"). On August 24, 2006, the Department aligned the deadlines and the time limits of the new shipper reviews of WBF with the 2004-2005 administrative

review of WBF. *See Memorandum to the File from Lilit Astvatsatryan, Case Analyst, through Wendy Frankel, Office Director, dated August 24, 2006.* On February 9, 2007, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the first administrative review and the new shipper reviews. *See Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Preliminary Results of New Shipper Reviews and Notice of Partial Rescission*, 72 FR 6201 (February 9, 2007). The final results of review are currently due no later than June 9, 2007.

#### Extension of Time Limit of Final Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), requires the Department to issue final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time period to a maximum of 180 days. Completion of the final results of the administrative review within the 120-day period is not practicable because the Department conducted verification in the administrative review after publication of the preliminary results, and, therefore, needs additional time to complete post-preliminary results verification reports, invite and analyze comments by interested parties on the preliminary results and verification reports, and analyze information gathered at verification.

Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time specified under the Act, we are extending the time period for issuing the final results of the administrative and new shipper reviews to 180 days, until August 8, 2007, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. This notice is published pursuant to sections 751(a) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: June 5, 2007.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7-11318 Filed 6-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No.: 070413089-7091-01]

#### Announcing Draft Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) Publication 198-1, the Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code, and Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the Draft Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 198-1, the Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC), for public review and comment. The draft standard, designated "Draft FIPS 198-1," is proposed to supersede FIPS 198, the Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code, issued March 2002. FIPS 198-1 specifies a keyed-hash message authentication code (HMAC), a mechanism for message authentication using cryptographic hash functions and shared secret keys. The proposed standard is available at <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/drafts.html>.

Prior to the submission of this proposed standard to the Secretary of Commerce for review and approval, it is essential that consideration be given to the needs and views of the public, users, the information technology industry, and Federal, State, and local government organizations. The purpose of this notice is to solicit such views.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by September 10, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be sent to: Chief, Computer Security Division, Information Technology Laboratory, Attention: Comments on Draft FIPS 198-1, 100 Bureau Drive—Stop 8930, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8930. Electronic comments may be sent to [proposed198-1@nist.gov](mailto:proposed198-1@nist.gov) with a subject line of Keyed-Hash Message Authentication Code. The current FIPS 198 and its proposed replacement, Draft FIPS 198-1, are available electronically at <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/index.html>.

Comments received in response to this notice will be published electronically at <http://csrc.nist.gov/CryptoToolkit/tkhash.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general information, contact: Elaine Barker, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Stop 8930,