from Thailand causes material injury to the domestic industry; that finding was undisturbed by the partial revocation of SSI. Further, that revocation was premised on the absence of dumping rather than the absence of injury and was expressly conditioned on the possibility of reinstatement should dumping resume.

The partial revocation of the order with respect to SSI did not nullify the validity of the underlying injury and less than fair value determinations that resulted in the issuance of an antidumping duty order which remains in force, particularly when the partial revocation is the result of behavior subsequent to those earlier determinations. The ITC's injury determination, furthermore, does not examine the injury caused by discrete companies, but rather the injury caused by all dumped exports originating in a particular exporting country. Even if one or more exporters in that country may have been revoked from the order on the basis of absence of dumping, all dumped exports of subject merchandise from that country continue to cause or threaten material injury, pursuant to the ITC's affirmative injury determination. Thus, unless all exporters are revoked from the order, the order continues to exist, as does the potential for reinstatement. SSI itself agreed to such a reinstatement as a condition of its partial revocation, if the Department were to conclude that it has sold the merchandise at below NV. Specifically, SSI filed a certification from a company official pursuant to the Department's regulations that it agreed to the immediate reinstatement in the order, so long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Secretary concludes that, subsequent to the revocation, it sold hot–rolled steel at less than NV. Thus, a new injury finding specific to SSI is neither necessary nor appropriate for reinstatement pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(h)(2)(i)(B).

The standard for initiation of a changed circumstances review under 751(b) of the Act is whether a request from an interested party for a review of a final affirmative determination that resulted in an antidumping duty order, a suspension agreement, or a final affirmative determination shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of such determination or agreement. The information submitted by petitioner in its letters of November 8, 2006, December 5, 2006, January 12, 2007, and February 26, 2007, September 27, 2007, and January 29, 2008, concerning SSI's COP and U.S. sales activity, suggest SSI may have resumed dumping subsequent to SSI's revocation from the order. Depending on the source of data used to value SSI's steel slab prices, petitioner alleges underselling of hot–rolled steel by SSI in the United States at prices between 2.00 and 23.89 percent below NV during the 05–06 period, and 0.60 percent and 28.22 percent below NV during the 06–07 period. The Department finds that the petitioner's changed circumstances request, which suggests a resumption of dumping, satisfies that standard for initiating.

Based on the foregoing, we find that petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to initiate a changed circumstances review to examine SSI's pricing and determine whether SSI has resumed dumping sufficient to reinstate the company within the order of hot–rolled steel from Thailand.

For purposes of this initiation, the evidence provided by petitioner indicates that SSI may have resumed dumping in not just one, but two periods. This evidence further supports the Department's determination to initiate a review to determine whether in fact SSI has resumed dumping.

Period of Changed Circumstances Review

The Department expects to request data from SSI for the July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007 period in order to determine whether SSI has resumed dumping sufficient to warrant reinstatement within the order of hot–rolled steel from Thailand.

Public Comment

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of changed circumstances review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4) and 351.221(c)(3)(i), which will set forth the Department's preliminary factual and legal conclusions. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4)(ii), interested parties will have an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. The Department will issue its final results of review in accordance with the time limits set forth in 19 CFR 351.216(e).

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 28, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–7204 Filed 4–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

(C–580–851)

Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors from the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of the Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shane Subler at (202) 482–0189 or David Neubacher at (202) 482–5823; AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 25, 2007, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on dynamic random access memory semiconductors from the Republic of Korea, covering the period January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 54428 (September 25, 2007). On December 14, 2007, the petitioner alleged that Hynix Semiconductor, Inc., received new subsidies.

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), requires the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') to issue the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and the final results of review within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. If it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend these deadlines to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

This administrative review is extraordinarily complicated due to the complexity of the countervailable

subsidy practices found in the investigation and the new subsidy allegations. Because the Department requires additional time to review, analyze, and possibly verify the information, and to issue supplemental questionnaires, if necessary, it is not practicable to complete this review within the originally anticipated time limit (*i.e.*, by May 2, 2008). Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results by 90 days to not later than July 31, 2008, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 31, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–7212 Filed 4–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A–570–851)

Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People(s Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 2008.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') has received a request from Zhangzhou Golden Banyan Foodstuffs Industrial Co., Ltd. (''Golden Banyan''),[1] a producer and exporter of preserved mushrooms, to conduct a new shipper review (''NSR'') of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). Since this request meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for initiation, the Department is initiating a NSR of Golden Banyan, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), and 19 CFR 351.214(d).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shawn Higgins; AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0679.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 19, 1999, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from the PRC. *See Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms From the People(s Republic of China*, 64 FR 8308 (February 19, 1999). Thus, the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from the PRC has a February anniversary month. The Department received a request for a NSR from Golden Banyan on February 29, 2008, which is during the annual anniversary month.

Golden Banyan identified itself as a producer and exporter of preserved mushrooms. Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), Golden Banyan certified that it did not export preserved mushrooms to the United States during the period of investigation (''POI''). Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(A), Golden Banyan also certified that it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer that exported preserved mushrooms to the United States during the POI. Furthermore, the company also certified that its export activities are not controlled by the government of the PRC, satisfying the requirement of 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B).

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), Golden Banyan submitted documentation establishing the date on which the subject merchandise was first entered for consumption in the United States, the volume of that first shipment and any subsequent shipments, and the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. The Department queried the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') entry database, which confirmed that Golden Banyan had officially entered subject merchandise into the United States via assignment of an entry date in the Customs database by CBP. The Department issued Golden Banyan a supplemental questionnaire, focused on inconsistencies we observed between information supplied in Golden Banyan's NSR request and the CBP data, on March 11, 2008. On March 20, 2008, the Department received a timely response from Golden Banyan to the supplemental questionnaire.

We note that although Golden Banyan submitted documentation regarding the volume of its shipment and the date of their first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States, our customs query shows that Golden Banyan's shipment entered the United States shortly after the anniversary month. Under 19 CFR 351.214(f)(2)(ii), when the sale of the subject merchandise occurs within the period of review (''POR''), but the entry occurs after the normal POR, the POR may be extended unless it would be likely to prevent the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations. The preamble to the Department's regulations states that both the entry and the sale should occur during the POR, and that under ''appropriate'' circumstances the Department has the flexibility to extend the POR. *See* Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule, 62 FR 27296, 27319–27320 (May 19, 1997). In this instance, Golden Banyan's shipment entered a few days into the month following the end of the POR. The Department does not find that this delay prevents the completion of the review within the time limits set by the Department's regulations.

Initiation of Review

Based on the information on the record, and in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we have determined that Golden Banyan has met the statutory and regulatory requirements for the initiation of a NSR. Therefore, we are initiating a NSR for Golden Banyan. See Memorandum to the File, from Shawn Higgins, International Trade Compliance Analyst, through Abdelali Elouaradia, Director, Office 4, AD/CVD Operations, ''Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People(s Republic of China,'' dated March 31, 2008.

We intend to issue the preliminary results of this review not later than 180 days after the date on which this review is initiated, and the final results of this review within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results are issued. *See* section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act; 19 CFR 351.214(h)(i).

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(A), the POR for a NSR initiated in the month immediately following the anniversary month will be

[1] Zhangzhou Golden Banyan Foodstuffs Industrial Co., Ltd., has applied to the Zhangzhou Municipal Industrial and Commercial Administrative Bureau (''Commercial Administrative Bureau'') to change its name to Fujian Golden Banyan Foodstuffs Industrial Co., Ltd. On December 21, 2007, the Commercial Administrative Bureau granted Golden Banyan advanced approval for the company's requested name change. However, Golden Banyan is still waiting for the name change to apply to the company's business license and certificate of approval. Accordingly, Golden Banyan submitted its request for a new shipper review under both the company's current and pending corporate names.