

tissue paper products from the PRC would be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	Weighted-Average Margin (percent)
Qingdao Wenlong Co. Ltd	112.64
Fujian Nanping Investment & Enterprise Co	112.64
Fuzhou Light Industry Import & Export Co. Ltd	112.64
Guilin Qifeng Paper Co. Ltd	112.64
Ningbo Spring Stationary Limited Company	112.64
Everlasting Business & Industry Corporation Ltd	112.64
BA Marketing & Industrial Co. Ltd	112.64
Samsam Production Limited & Guangzhou Baxi Printing Products Limited	112.64
Max Fortune Industrial Limited	112.64
PRC-wide rate	112.64

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 orders 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: June 3, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-13972 Filed 6-9-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Notice of Informational Meeting for the i6 Challenge Under EDA's Economic Adjustment Assistance Program

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration (EDA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The i6 Challenge is a new, multi-agency innovation competition led by the Economic Development Administration (EDA), a bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC). The i6 Challenge is designed to encourage and reward innovative, ground-breaking ideas that will accelerate technology commercialization and new-venture formation across the United States, for the ultimate purpose of helping to drive economic growth and job creation. To

accomplish this, the i6 Challenge targets sections of the research-to-deployment continuum that are in need of additional support, in order to strengthen regional innovation ecosystems. Applicants to the i6 Challenge are expected to propose mechanisms to fill in existing gaps in the continuum or leverage existing infrastructure and institutions, such as economic development organizations, academic institutions, or other non-profit organizations, in new and innovative ways to achieve the i6 objectives. Under the i6 Challenge, EDA intends to fund implementation grants for technical assistance through its Economic Adjustment Assistance Program (42 U.S.C. 3149). The federal funding opportunity for the i6 Challenge was announced on May 3, 2010, and a notice and request for applications was published in the **Federal Register** (75 FR 23676).

DATES: EDA will hold an additional informational meeting via conference call at 4 p.m. (Eastern time) on Monday, June 21, 2010, to answer questions about the i6 Challenge. More details on the meeting and any updates will be posted at the i6 Challenge Web site at <http://www.eda.gov/i6>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information, please send questions via e-mail to i6@doc.gov. EDA's Web site at <http://www.eda.gov/i6> also has information on EDA and the i6 Challenge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Meeting: To communicate the goals and requirements of the i6 Challenge and to answer questions related to the federal funding opportunity announcement.

Public Participation: To participate in the informational meeting, please call 1-800-779-5194. Please give the operator the passcode "EDA." Because of the anticipated number of callers, callers should plan to dial-in 10 minutes early. Please be advised that the organizers of the meeting intend to (1)

record the full conference call and all questions and answers, and (2) post the recording at <http://www.eda.gov/i6>.

Dated: June 7, 2010.

Hina Shaikh,
Deputy Chief Counsel, Economic Development Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-13970 Filed 6-9-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-24-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-008]

Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Taiwan

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan for the period May 1, 2008, to April 30, 2009 (the POR). We preliminarily determine that sales of subject merchandise by Yieh Phui Enterprise Co., Ltd. (Yieh Phui) have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. We will issue the final results no later than 120 days from the publication of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 10, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Bezirgianian or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution

Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1131 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan. *See Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Taiwan: Antidumping Duty Order*, 49 FR 19369 (May 7, 1984) (*Antidumping Duty Order*). On May 1, 2009, the Department issued a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this order for the POR. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 74 FR 20278 (May 1, 2009). On June 1, 2009, a domestic producer, Wheatland Tube Company (petitioner), requested an administrative review of Yieh Phui Enterprise Co., Ltd. On June 24, 2009, the Department published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 74 FR 30052 (June 24, 2009).

Yieh Phui submitted a response to Section A of the Department's questionnaire on July 31, 2009, and a response to Sections B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire on August 31, 2009. In response to the Department's August 25, 2009, supplemental questionnaire pertaining to Yieh Phui's Section A response, Yieh Phui submitted a response on September 18, 2009. In response to the Department's November 6, 2009, supplemental questionnaire covering Yieh Phui's Sections A-D responses, Yieh Phui submitted a response for Section A on November 30, 2009, and a response for Sections B-D on December 8, 2009. On December 15, 2009, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire covering product characteristic issues, to which Yieh Phui responded on December 22, 2009. In response to the Department's January 29, 2010, supplemental questionnaire covering Yieh Phui's earlier Section A-D and product characteristic questionnaire responses, Yieh Phui submitted responses on February 16, 2010 (Section A) and March 10, 2010 (Sections B-D). On April 22, 2010, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire relating to information from various Yieh Phui submissions. Yieh Phui submitted a

response (including its final sales and cost databases) on May 14, 2010.

On January 11, 2010, the Department published an extension of the preliminary results of the administrative review. *See Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Taiwan; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 1335 (January 11, 2010). On February 12, 2010, the Department tolled administrative deadlines, including in the instant review, by one calendar week. *See "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Snowstorm,"* dated February 12, 2010. As a result, the deadline for the issuance of the preliminary results of the instant review is June 7, 2010.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order is certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan, which are defined as: Welded carbon steel pipes and tubes, of circular cross section, with walls not thinner than 0.065 inch, and 0.375 inch or more but not over 4.5 inches in outside diameter, currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.30.5040, and 7306.30.5055. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise subject to this order is dispositive.

Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used export price (EP), as defined in section 772(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Section 772(a) of the Act defines EP as the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold before the date of importation by the producer or exporter outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States, as adjusted under section 772(c) of the Act. We calculated an EP for Yieh Phui's U.S. sales because they were made directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and constructed export price (CEP) was not otherwise warranted based on the facts on the record.

For EP sales, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price), where appropriate, for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. Movement expenses included inland freight, warehousing expenses, brokerage fees,

trade promotion fees, harbor maintenance fees, and international freight.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Market

Section 773(a)(1) of the Act directs that NV be based on the price at which the foreign like product is sold in the home market, provided the merchandise is sold in sufficient quantities (or value, if quantity is inappropriate) and that there is not a particular market situation that prevents a proper comparison with sales to the United States. The statute contemplates that quantities (or value) will normally be considered insufficient if they are less than five percent of the aggregate quantity (or value) of sales of the subject merchandise to the United States. *See* section 773(a)(1) of the Act.

We found that Yieh Phui had a viable home market for circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes because its home market sales, by quantity, exceeded the five percent threshold. *See "Analysis Memorandum for Yieh Phui Enterprise Co., Ltd. (Yieh Phui): Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Taiwan (A-583-008), May 1, 2008—April 30, 2009"* (Yieh Phui Preliminary Analysis Memorandum) at 2. Yieh Phui submitted home market sales data for purposes of the calculation of NV. In deriving NV, we made adjustments as detailed in the "Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices" section below.

B. Arm's-Length Sales

The respondent reported sales of the foreign like product to affiliated customers, which, according to Yieh Phui, consumed the merchandise. To test whether these sales to affiliated customers were made at arm's length, where possible, we compared the prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers, net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, and packing. Where the price to that affiliated party was, on average, within a range of 98 to 102 percent of the price of the same or comparable merchandise sold to the unaffiliated parties at the same level of trade, we determined that the sales made to the affiliated party were at arm's length. *See Modification Concerning Affiliated Party Sales in the Comparison Market*, 67 FR 69186 (November 15, 2002). Yieh Phui's sales to affiliated parties that were determined not to be at arm's length were disregarded in the cost test and in the comparison to U.S. sales.

C. Cost of Production Analysis

Because we disregarded below-cost sales in the most recently completed segment of the proceeding, we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that home market sales of the foreign like product by the respondent were made at prices below the cost of production (COP) during the POR, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. See “Yieh Phui Preliminary Analysis Memorandum” at 7. Therefore, we required Yieh Phui to submit a response to Section D of the Department’s Questionnaire.

1. Calculation of Cost of Production

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the weighted-average COP by model based on the sum of materials, fabrication, general and administrative (G&A), and interest expenses. For more details, see “Yieh Phui Preliminary Analysis Memorandum” at 7–8.

2. Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices

We compared the weighted-average COPs for the respondent to its home market sales prices of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act, to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time (*i.e.*, normally a period of one year) in substantial quantities and whether such prices were sufficient to permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a model-specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

3. Results of the COP Test

We disregard below-cost sales where: (1) 20 percent or more of the respondent’s sales of a given product during the POR were made at prices below the COP in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act; and (2) based on comparisons of price to weighted-average COPs for the POR, we determine that the below-cost sales of the product were at prices that would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable time period, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. We found Yieh Phui made sales below cost and we disregarded such sales where appropriate. See “Yieh Phui Preliminary Analysis Memorandum” at 8.

D. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison-Market Prices

We determined NV for Yieh Phui as follows. We made deductions from the

gross price to account for discounts and rebates. We deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also deducted home market movement expenses pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. In addition, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. Specifically, we made adjustments to normal value for comparison to Yieh Phui’s EP transactions by deducting direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (*i.e.*, credit expenses) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, credit expenses, bank charges, and cargo certification fees) and U.S. commissions. See section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.410(c). Where we compared Yieh Phui’s U.S. sales to home market sales of merchandise, we made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

E. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Constructed Value

Section 773(a)(4) of the Act provides that, where NV cannot be based on comparison-market sales, NV may be based on constructed value (CV). Accordingly, for those models of circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes for which we could not determine the NV based on comparison-market sales, either because there were no sales of a comparable product or all sales of the comparison products failed the COP test, we based NV on CV.

Section 773(e)(1) of the Act provides that CV shall be based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the imported merchandise plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), interest expenses, profit, and U.S. packing expenses. We calculated the cost of materials and fabrication based on the methodology described in the COP section of this notice. We based SG&A and profit on the actual amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the comparison market, in accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made adjustments to CV for differences in COS in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We deducted direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (*i.e.*, credit expenses). See section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR

351.410(c). We added U.S. direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, credit expenses, bank charges, and cargo certification fees) and U.S. commissions to the NV.

F. Level of Trade/Constructed Export Price Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP and CEP sales, to the extent practicable. When there are no sales at the same LOT, we compare U.S. sales to comparison market sales at a different LOT. When NV is based on CV, the NV LOT is that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2), to determine whether comparison market sales were at a different LOT, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated (or arm’s-length) customers. The Department identifies the LOT based on: The starting price or constructed value (for normal value); the starting price (for EP sales); and the starting price, as adjusted under section 772(d) of the Act (for CEP sales). If the comparison-market sales were at a different LOT and the differences affect price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we will make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

Finally, if the NV LOT is more remote from the factory than the CEP LOT and there is no basis for determining whether the differences in LOT between NV and CEP affected price comparability, we will grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

Yieh Phui indicated there was a single level of trade for all sales in both markets, and petitioner has not claimed that multiple levels of trade existed for Yieh Phui. Yieh Phui provided responses to the Department’s questions regarding channels of distribution and selling activities performed for different categories of customers. See Yieh Phui’s July 31, 2009 Section A response, at 12–14. Yieh Phui’s chart of numerous specific selling functions indicates the selling functions performed for sales in both markets are virtually identical, with no significant variation across the broader categories of sales process/marketing support, freight and delivery, inventory and warehousing, and quality assurance/warranty services. For more details, see “Yieh Phui Preliminary Analysis Memorandum.” We have

preliminarily determined there is one single level of trade for all sales in both the home market and the U.S. market, and, therefore, that no basis exists for a level of trade adjustment.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A of the Act, based on exchange rates in effect on the date of the U.S. sale, as provided by the Federal Reserve Bank. *See also* 19 CFR 351.415.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine the following weighted-average margin exists for the period May 1, 2008, through April 30, 2009:

Producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin (percentage)
Yieh Phui Enterprise Co., Ltd ...	5.04

Disclosure and Public Comment

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b), the Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. *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 five days after submission of case briefs. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issues; (2) a brief summary of the arguments; and (3) a table of authorities. Further, parties submitting written comments should provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. An 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 two days after the date for submission of rebuttal briefs, or the first working day thereafter. 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) of the Act.

Assessment

Upon completion of the administrative review, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department will calculate an assessment rate on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appropriate appraisal instructions for the company subject to this review directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

Because Yieh Phui did not report the entered value of its sales, we will calculate importer-specific (or customer-specific) per-unit duty assessment rates by aggregating the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales of each importer (or customer) and dividing each of these amounts by the respective quantities (by weight) associated with those sales. To determine whether the duty assessment rates are *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will calculate importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratios based on estimated entered values.

We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review for each importer (or customer) for which the importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratio is above *de minimis* (*i.e.*, at or above 0.50 percent). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratio is *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.50 percent).

The Department clarified its “automatic assessment” regulation on May 6, 2003. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the company included in the final results where the reviewed companies did not know the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (*e.g.*, a reseller, trading company, or exporter) was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there was no rate calculated in this review for the intermediary involved in the transaction. *See id.*, 68 FR at 23954.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan

entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Yieh Phui will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if a rate is less than 0.50 percent, and therefore *de minimis*, the cash deposit 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 less-than-fair-value (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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 9.70 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Antidumping Duty Order*.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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.

These preliminary results are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 4, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–13974 Filed 6–9–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P