

III. Method of Collection

A survey with a cover letter that includes a brief description of, and rationale for, the survey will be sent by e-mail to potential respondents by the first week of June of each year. A report of the respondent's expenditures of the NIH award amounts, following the proposed format for expenditure categories included with the survey form, will be requested to be completed and submitted online no later than 120 days after mailing. Survey respondents will be selected on the basis of award levels, which determine the weight of the respondent in the biomedical research and development price index. Potential respondents will include (1) The top 100 organizations in total awards, which account for about 59 percent of total awards; (2) 40 additional organizations that are not primarily in the "Research and Development (R&D) contracts" category; and (3) 10 additional organizations that are primarily in the "R&D contracts" category.

IV. Data

OMB Number: 0608-0069.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Universities or other organizations that are NIH award recipients.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 90.

Estimated Time per Response: 11 hours and 12 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 1,008 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: \$0.

V. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the NIH, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 29, 2011.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011-7804 Filed 4-1-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-EA-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-822]

Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Mexico: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from an interested party, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order covering stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico. The period of review is July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010. Based on the withdrawal of request for review submitted by Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, North American Stainless, and AK Steel Corporation (collectively "petitioners"), we are now rescinding this administrative review.

DATES: Effective Date: April 4, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Olga Carter, John Drury or Angelica Mendoza, 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) 482-8221, (202) 482-0195 or (202) 482-3019 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 1, 2010, the Department published a notice announcing an opportunity for interested parties to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 75 FR 38074 (July 1, 2010). On July 30, 2010, petitioners filed a request that the Department initiate an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico with respect to ThyssenKrupp Mexinox, S.A. de C.V. ("Mexinox"). Based on petitioners' request, on August 31, 2010, the

Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Deferral of Initiation of Administrative Review*, 75 FR 53274 (August 31, 2010).

Rescission of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review, "in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. The Secretary may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to do so." On March 21, 2011, petitioners withdrew their request for a review of the order with respect to Mexinox. Although the party submitted a letter withdrawing their review request after the 90-day regulatory deadline, the Department finds it is reasonable to extend the deadline for withdrawing the review request because it has not yet devoted significant time or resources to the review.

Because of the withdrawal of the request for review and because we received no other requests for review, we are rescinding the administrative review of the order with respect to Mexinox. This rescission is in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For Mexinox, the antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of this notice.

Notifications

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent

assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning destruction of proprietary information disclosed under an APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the 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.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: March 28, 2011.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011-7793 Filed 4-1-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-837]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From Taiwan: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Review

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On February 22, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET Film) from Taiwan.¹ The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009. We are amending the *Final Results* to correct a ministerial error that was made in the calculation of the antidumping duty margin for Nan Ya Plastics Corporation, Ltd. (Nan Ya), pursuant to section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

DATES: *Effective Date:* (February 22, 2011)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gene Calvert, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration,

U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3586.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 8, 2011, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c)(1), Nan Ya filed a timely submission alleging ministerial errors with respect to the Department's use of sales datasets and matching of CONNUMs in the antidumping duty margin calculation for Nan Ya in the *Final Results*.² On March 14, 2011, DuPont Teijin Films; Mitsubishi Polyester Film Inc.; SKC, Inc.; and Toray Plastics (America), Inc. (collectively, Petitioners) provided timely rebuttal comments to Nan Ya's model matching allegation.³

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the antidumping order are all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, whether extruded or coextruded. Excluded are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer more than 0.00001 inches thick. Imports of PET Film are currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item number 3920.62.00. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Ministerial Error Allegation

A ministerial error is defined in section 751(h) of the Act as " * * * errors in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the administering authority considers ministerial."⁴ In its Allegation of Ministerial Errors, Nan Ya alleged that: (1) The Department inadvertently used the incorrect U.S. and home market sales datasets to calculate Nan Ya's antidumping duty margin for the final results; and (2) the Department erroneously matched similar home market subject merchandise to U.S. sales where there was no identical sale during the comparison period.⁵

Specifically, Nan Ya argues that the last criteria in the Department's model matching hierarchy, surface treatment, has a greater impact on the sales price and the production costs of PET Film compared to the other criteria in the hierarchy, and that it should receive more weight during the model matching process. Petitioners commented only on Nan Ya's model matching allegation, contending that the Department did not commit a ministerial error. According to Petitioners, the Department acted in accordance with its well established methodology with respect to model matching.⁶

Analysis of Allegations

After analyzing the interested parties' allegations and rebuttal comments, we find, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), that with respect to Nan Ya's first allegation, the Department did, indeed, inadvertently use the incorrect sales datasets to calculate Nan Ya's antidumping duty margin for the *Final Results*. In its May 27, 2010 supplemental questionnaire to Nan Ya, the Department requested that Nan Ya and its three U.S. affiliates provide a single, consolidated constructed export price (CEP) sales dataset to report their sales in the U.S. market.⁷ However, the three U.S. affiliates stated that they are not affiliated with Nan Ya, and each submitted an individual CEP sales dataset.⁸ Subsequently, the Department requested that Nan Ya and its three U.S. affiliates provide several revised sales datasets for home market, export price (EP) and CEP sales. While the correct datasets were used for the CEP sales for the *Final Results*, we erroneously used an older version of the home market and U.S. EP sales datasets submitted by Nan Ya. Thus, the Department has determined that the use of the wrong datasets constitutes a ministerial error, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.224(e). For these amended final results, we recalculated Nan Ya's antidumping duty margin using the correct sales datasets.

Regarding Nan Ya's second allegation with respect to model matching, the Department disagrees that it made a ministerial error as defined by section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

⁶ See Petitioners' Rebuttal Comments at 1-3.

⁷ See the Department's Letter to Nan Ya dated May 27, 2010 at 1.

⁸ See, e.g., Letters to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the section C questionnaire responses of Forplax LLC and Forplax Los Angeles, Inc. dated July 7, 2010 at C-2, and Letter to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the section C questionnaire response of Rocheux International dated July 9, 2010 at C-1.

¹ See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From Taiwan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 9745 (February 22, 2011) (*Final Results*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).

² See Nan Ya's Letter to the Secretary of Commerce dated March 8, 2011 (Allegation of Ministerial Errors).

³ See Petitioners' Letter to the Secretary of Commerce dated March 14, 2011.

⁴ See also 19 CFR 351.224(f).

⁵ See Allegation of Ministerial Errors at 1-3.