

initiating a changed circumstances review.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Elizabeth Eastwood or Henry Almond; AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3874 or (202) 482-0049, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On March 9, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on certain orange juice from Brazil. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Orange Juice from Brazil*, 72 FR 12183 (Mar. 9, 2006).

On June 14, 2007, Tropicana requested that the Department initiate a changed circumstances review to consider partially revoking the antidumping duty order on certain orange juice from Brazil to exclude ULPOJ. According to Tropicana, producers accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product have no interest in maintaining the order on ULPOJ.

On July 24, 2007, we requested documentation from Tropicana regarding its industry support assertions and the documentation to support the pulp content of ULPOJ. On January 31, 2008, Tropicana responded to the Department's request for information, providing: 1) letters of support from processors either supporting or not opposing Tropicana's request to exclude ULPOJ from the order; 2) a calculation of the level of industry support; and 3) documentation regarding the pulp content of ULPOJ.

On February 29, 2008, we received comments from Florida Citrus Mutual, A. Duda & Sons, Inc. (doing business as Citrus Belle), and Citrus World, Inc. (collectively, "the petitioners"), regarding Tropicana's request. The petitioners contend that the Department must consider the position of the entire domestic industry (*i.e.*, both processors and growers) when determining the level of industry support, as was done for purposes of the initiation of this proceeding. According to the petitioners, when the growers are considered, there will be an insufficient level of industry support necessary for the Department to partially revoke the order under 19 CFR 351.222(g)(1)(i). In addition, the petitioners note that, contrary to Tropicana's assertion, the U.S. domestic industry is capable of producing ULPOJ. Therefore, the

petitioners urge the Department to reject Tropicana's request and not initiate this changed circumstances review.

On March 6, 2008, we requested additional information from Tropicana regarding an incomplete letter contained in its January 31 response. On March 10, 2008, Tropicana submitted the requested information.

**Scope of the Order**

The scope of this order includes certain orange juice for transport and/or further manufacturing, produced in two different forms: (1) frozen orange juice in a highly concentrated form, sometimes referred to as frozen concentrated orange juice for manufacture (FCOJM); and (2) pasteurized single-strength orange juice which has not been concentrated, referred to as not-from-concentrate (NFC). At the time of the filing of the petition, there was an existing antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil. See *Antidumping Duty Order; Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil*, 52 FR 16426 (May 5, 1987). Therefore, the scope of this order with regard to FCOJM covers only FCOJM produced and/or exported by those companies which were excluded or revoked from the pre-existing antidumping order on FCOJ from Brazil as of December 27, 2004. Those companies are Cargill Citrus Limitada, Coinbra-Frutesp S.A., Sucocitrico Cutrale, S.A., Fischer S/A - Agroindustria, and Montecitrus Trading S.A.

Excluded from the scope of the order are reconstituted orange juice and frozen concentrated orange juice for retail (FCOJR). Reconstituted orange juice is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, by adding water, oils and essences to the orange juice concentrate. FCOJR is concentrated orange juice, typically at 42 Brix, in a frozen state, packed in retail-sized containers ready for sale to consumers. FCOJR, a finished consumer product, is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, a bulk manufacturer's product.

The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheadings 2009.11.00, 2009.12.25, 2009.12.45, and 2009.19.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only and are not dispositive. Rather, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

**Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review**

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for a review of, an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(d), the Department finds there is sufficient information to warrant initiating a changed circumstances review. Therefore, pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d), we are initiating a changed circumstances review to determine whether the Department should partially revoke the order on certain orange juice from Brazil to exclude ULPOJ.

While Tropicana contends that it has sufficient industry support under 19 CFR 351.222(g)(1)(i) for the Department to partially revoke the order to exclude ULPOJ, we note that the petitioners have questioned Tropicana's exclusion of orange growers from the calculation of industry support. We will address the level of industry support for Tropicana's request in the context of this proceeding.

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 in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 23, 2008.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E8-9337 Filed 4-28-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904; Binational Panel Reviews: Notice of Consent Motion To Terminate Panel Review**

**AGENCY:** NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade

Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Consent Motion to Terminate Panel Review of the final results of the second antidumping administrative review respecting Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada (Secretariat File No. USA-CDA-2006-1904-04).

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Notice of Consent Motion to Terminate the Panel Review by the case participants, the panel review is terminated as of April 18, 2008. A panel was appointed to this panel review and has been dismissed pursuant to Rule 71(2) of the *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Review*, effective April 18, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Valerie Dees, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, 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 was requested and terminated pursuant to these Rules.

*Dated:* April 22, 2008.

**Valerie Dees,**

*United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*  
[FR Doc. E8-9296 Filed 4-28-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-570-936]

#### Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* April 29, 2008.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kristen Johnson or Eric Greynolds, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-4793 and (202) 482-6071, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### The Petition

On April 3, 2008, the Department of Commerce ("Department") received the Petition concerning imports of certain circular welded carbon quality steel line pipe ("welded line pipe") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") filed in proper form by United States Steel Corporation, Maverick Tube Corporation, Tex-Tube Company, and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, and AFL-CIO-CLC (collectively, "Petitioners"). See *Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Certain Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea*, dated April 3, 2008 ("Petition").

On April 9 and 10, 2008, the Department issued requests for additional information and clarification of certain areas of the Petition. Based on the Department's requests, Petitioners filed additional information supplementing the Petition on April 14, 2008, including one submission on general issues (Response to the Department Questionnaire Concerning Volume I of the Petition, dated April 14, 2008 ("Supp. Response")) and one submission on the imposition of countervailing duties ("CVD") (Response to the Department Questionnaires Concerning Volume III of the Petition, dated April 14, 2008 ("Supp. CVD Response")). On April 16, 2008, the Department called Petitioners to request certain information relating to the Petition. See Memorandum to the File from Meredith A.W. Rutherford,

Import Policy Analyst, regarding Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties—Certain Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea: Phone Call with Petitioner Regarding Industry Support, dated April 16, 2008. On April 17, 2008, the Department issued a request for additional information and clarification of certain areas of the Petition concerning the imposition of countervailing duties. On April 18, 2008, Wheatland Tube Company, a U.S. manufacturer of welded line pipe, filed a letter in support of the Petition. On April 21, 2008, Petitioners filed additional information in response to the April 16, 2008, memorandum to the file. See Response to the Department's Second Request for Additional Information Concerning the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea, dated April 21, 2008 ("Second Supp. Response"). Petitioners also filed a response to the Department's April 17, 2008, request for additional information on the imposition of countervailing duties. See Response to the Department's Request for Additional Information Concerning Volume III of the Petition filed on April 3, 2008 ("Second CVD Supp. Response").

On April 21, 2008, the Department called Petitioners regarding the scope language. See Memorandum to the File from Norbert Gannon, Supervisory Import Policy Analyst, regarding Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties—Certain Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Korea: Phone Call with Petitioners Regarding Industry Support, dated April 21, 2008. Additionally, on April 21, 2008, Stupp Corporation, a domestic producer of subject merchandise, filed a letter in support of the Petition.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), Petitioners allege that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of welded line pipe in the PRC receive countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and Petitioners have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the CVD investigation (see "Determination of