

they are coordinated with the appropriate census operations. This is particularly important because the dress rehearsal is the first time in the 2010 census cycle that CCM operations for housing units will be conducted. The CCM operations planned for the dress rehearsal, to the extent possible, will mirror those that will be conducted for the 2010 Census to provide estimates of net coverage error and coverage error components (omissions and erroneous enumerations) for housing units and persons in housing units (see Definition of Terms). The data collection and matching methodologies for previous coverage measurement programs were designed only to measure net coverage error, which reflects the difference between omissions and erroneous inclusions.

The Independent Listing Operation is the first step in the CCM process. It will be conducted to obtain a complete housing unit inventory of all the addresses within the CCM sample block clusters before the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal enumeration commences. In both dress rehearsal sites, enumerators will canvass every street, road, or other place where people might live in their assigned block clusters and constructs a list of housing units. Enumerators will contact a member (or proxy) of each housing unit to ensure all units at a given address are identified. They also identify the location of each housing unit by assigning map spots on block cluster maps provided with their assignment materials. If an enumerator is uncertain whether a particular living quarters is a housing unit, it will be listed and flagged for followup (this will be a part of the Initial Housing Unit Followup). Following the completion of each block cluster, the listing books are keyed for matching against the census Decennial Master Address File (DMAF) for the same areas.

Completed Independent Listing Books are subject to Quality Control (QC) wherein QC listers return to the field to check 12 units per cluster to ensure that the work performed is of acceptable quality and to verify that the correct blocks were visited. If the cluster fails the QC, then the QC lister reworks the entire cluster.

The Independent Listing results will be computer and clerically matched to the DMAF from the census in the same areas. As the result of the matching an additional relisting operation can occur for block clusters suspected of high levels of geocoding errors in the original independent listing. The methods and procedures for relisting will be the same as those for the listing operation. There will be one Independent Listing Form,

DX-1302, that will be used for listing, QC, and relisting.

The addresses that remain unmatched or unresolved after matching will be sent to the field during the next field operation of the CCM, Initial Housing Unit Followup, to collect additional information that might allow a resolution of any differences between the independent listing results and the census DMAF. Cases will also be sent to resolve potential duplicates and unresolved housing unit/group quarter status. The forms and procedures to be used in the Initial Housing Unit Followup phase of the CCM in the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal and all subsequent CCM phases will be submitted separately.

II. Method of Collection

The independent listing and relisting operations will be conducted using person-to-person interviews.

Definition of Terms

Components of Coverage Error—The two components of census coverage error are census omissions (missed persons or housing units) and erroneous inclusions (persons or housing units enumerated in the census that should not have been). Examples of erroneous inclusions are: persons or housing units enumerated in the census that should not have been enumerated at all, persons or housing units enumerated in an incorrect location, and persons or housing units enumerated more than once (duplicates).

Net Coverage Error—Reflects the difference between census omissions and erroneous inclusions. A positive net error indicates an undercount, while a negative net error indicates an overcount.

For more information about the Census 2000 Coverage Measurement Program, please visit the following page of the Census Bureau's Web site: <http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/refroom.html>.

III. Data

OMB Number: Not available.

Form Number: DX-1302.

Type of Review: Regular.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 40,000 Housing units (HUs) for Independent Listing, 4,000 HUs for Independent Listing QC, 400 HUs for Relisting, and 40 HUs for Relisting QC.

Estimated Times per Response: 2 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,480.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to the Public: No cost to the respondent except for their time to respond.

Respondent Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: Title 13, U.S. Code, Sections 141, 193, and 221.

IV. 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 agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection; (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 the information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 3, 2007.

Madeleine Clayton,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E6-16618 Filed 10-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration (A-549-813)

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand

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

SUMMARY: On August 30, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit (CPF) from Thailand. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 71 FR 51573 (August 30, 2006) (*Initiation Notice*). In that notice, the Department did not initiate a review of Tropical Food Industries Co. Ltd. (TROFCO) because the company's request for review was untimely filed. After considering the facts on the record, the Department is now initiating a review of TROFCO.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 10, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magd Zalok or Howard Smith, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4162 and (202) 482-5193, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On July 3, 2006, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on CPF from Thailand. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 71 FR 37890 (July 3, 2006). The Department received a request for review from one producer/exporter, Vita Food Factory (1989) Ltd. (Vita), by the July 31, 2006 deadline, and initiated a review of Vita on August 30, 2006 (*see Initiation Notice*, 71 FR 51573).

On August 9, 2006, the Department received an untimely request for a review from the exporter/producer TROFCO. On September 5, 2006, we notified TROFCO that its review request was untimely filed, and thus we did not initiate a review of TROFCO. On September 18, 2006, the Department received a letter from DHL Express, the company used by TROFCO to transmit its review request, explaining that TROFCO sent its review request on July 22, 2006, and it should have been delivered to the Department, at the latest, by July 26, 2006; however, due to a delivery error by DHL, the request was not delivered to the Department until August 9, 2006. On September 20, 2006, TROFCO submitted a letter to the Department with a copy of the shipment/airwaybill and DHL tracking information showing that the request for review was correctly addressed but was initially delivered to the wrong address by DHL.¹ On September 26, 2006, petitioners² submitted a letter to the Department contending that the Department may not now initiate an administrative review of TROFCO because neither statutorily-required condition precedent to conducting an administrative review was satisfied; namely, the Department did not receive

a timely review request from TROFCO, and did not publish a notice initiating a review of TROFCO.³ *See* section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Act) and 19 CFR § 351.103(b).

Initiation of Review

Although TROFCO's review request was not received by the Department until after the deadline for requesting an administrative review, the record of this proceeding indicates that if not for an error by DHL, TROFCO's review request would have been received by the Department on or before the deadline. Specifically, in DHL's September 18, 2006 letter to the Department a DHL official certified that TROFCO's review request was sent to the Department via DHL on July 22, 2006 and, under normal circumstances, should have been delivered to the Department by July 26, 2006 (five days before the July 31, 2006 deadline). Moreover, the tracking information supplied to the Department by TROFCO shows that the review request was received at a location near Washington D.C. on July 25, 2006 (*i.e.* Arlington Virginia), six days before the deadline for requesting a review.⁴ Lastly, we note that TROFCO sent its review request to the petitioners' counsel via DHL on the same day that it sent the request to the Department via DHL, and the request was delivered to the petitioners' counsel in the Washington D.C. area on July 25, 2006, six days before the review request was to be filed with the Department. While TROFCO's service of its review request on petitioners' counsel does not constitute an official filing, and the Department is not initiating a review of TROFCO based upon that service, delivery of that request before the July 31, 2006 deadline provides further support to conclude that TROFCO's request would have been delivered to the Department in a timely fashion but

for the delivery error acknowledged by DHL. Although the Department's practice is to reject untimely requests for review, it nonetheless retains some flexibility to, where appropriate, relax its procedural rules. *See Ferro Union, Inc. and Asoma Corporation v. United States*, 44 F. Supp. 2d 1310, 1316 (CIT 1999) citing *American Farm Lines v. Black Ball Freight Service*, 397 U.S. 532, (1970) ("it is always within the discretion of a court or an administrative agency to relax or modify its procedural rules adopted for the orderly transaction of business before it when in a given case the ends of justice require it."). *See also Notice of Initiation of Expedited Reviews of the Countervailing Duty Order: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada*, 67 FR 59252 (September 20, 2002) (accepting untimely filed requests for expedited reviews because the respondents made a good faith effort to properly file the requests and the requests were untimely for reasons beyond their control). Given the facts in this case, we have determined that it is appropriate to initiate an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand, for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006, with respect to TROFCO. We intend to issue the final results of this administrative review no later than July 31, 2007.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping order under 19 CFR § 351.211 or a determination under 19 CFR § 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, consistent with *FAG Italia v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed. Cir. 2002), as appropriate, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR § 351.305.

This initiation and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and 19 CFR § 351.221(c)(1)(i).

¹ The Department rejected TROFCO's earlier attempt to file this submission because it was improperly filed. *See* the memorandum to the file from Magd Zalok dated concurrently with this notice.

² The petitioners are Maui Pineapple Company Ltd. and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

³ In support of their argument, the petitioners cite, among other cases, *Cosco Home and Office Products v. United States*, 350 F. Supp. 2d 1294 (Dec. 7, 2004), in which the Court of International Trade affirmed the Department's decision not to initiate an administrative review where there was no evidence that an exporter had filed a review request with the Department's Docket Center. Petitioners also cite to *Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from Canada; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 24530 (May 10, 2005), in which the Department rejected an exporter's review request filed one day late but continued the review based on petitioner's timely review request.

⁴ DHL apparently initially delivered the review request to the wrong address, despite the fact that the shipment/airway bill lists "Import Administration Central Records Unit, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, N.W. Washington D.C. 20230" as the delivery address.

Dated: October 4, 2006.

Thomas F. Futtner,

Acting Office Director, AD/CVD Operations,
Office 4, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-16815 Filed 10-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-570-848)

Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of the 2004/2005 Administrative and New Shipper Reviews

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is currently conducting the 2004/2005 administrative and new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value ("NV") with respect to certain exporters who participated fully and are entitled to a separate rate in the administrative and new shipper reviews. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of these reviews, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on entries of subject merchandise during the period of review ("POR") for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. We will issue the final results no later than 120 days from the date of publication of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 10, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scot Fullerton or Erin Begnal, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1386 or (202) 482-1442, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 15, 1997, the Department published an amended final determination and antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC. *See Notice of Amendment*

of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China, 62 FR 48218 (September 15, 1997).

On September 1, 2005, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC. *See Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation*, 70 FR 52072 (September 1, 2005).

Based on timely requests from various interested parties, the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC with respect to the following companies: China Kingdom Import & Export Co., Ltd. (aka China Kingdome Import & Export Co., Ltd. and Zhongda Import & Export Co., Ltd.) ("China Kingdom"), Jiangsu Hilong International Trading Company, Ltd. ("Jiangsu Hilong"), Jiangsu Jiushoutang Organisms-Manufactures Co., Ltd. ("Jiangsu JOM"), Shanghai Sunbeauty Trading Co., Ltd. ("Shanghai Sunbeauty"), Ningbo Nanlian Frozen Foods Company, Ltd. ("Ningbo Nanlian"), Qingdao Jinyongxiang Aquatic Foods Co., Ltd. ("Qingdao JYX"), Qingdao Wentai Trading Co., Ltd. ("Qingdao Wentai"), Qingdao Zhengri Seafood Co., Ltd. ("Qingdao Zhengri"), Weishan Zhenyu Foodstuff Co., Ltd. ("Weishan Zhenyu"), Xuzhou Jinjiang Foodstuffs Co., Ltd. ("Xuzhou Jinjiang"), Yancheng Haiteng Aquatic Products & Foods Co., Ltd. ("Yancheng Haiteng"), Yancheng Hi-King Agriculture Developing Co., Ltd. ("Yancheng Hi-King"), and Yancheng Yaou Seafood Co., Ltd. ("Yancheng Yaou"). *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 70 FR 61601 (October 25, 2005) ("Initiation Notice"). The period of review ("POR") for all respondents subject to this administrative review is September 1, 2004, through August 31, 2005.¹

¹ On July 3, 2006, the Department issued its notice of rescission of antidumping duty new shipper reviews of Jiangsu JOM, Shanghai Sunbeauty and Qingdao Wentai, for the period September 1, 2004, and February 28, 2005. *See Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China*, 71 FR 37902 (July 3, 2006) ("Rescission of New Shipper Review"). Accordingly, this administrative review only covers these companies' entries not already covered by the above-referenced new shipper reviews. Therefore, this administrative review, for Jiangsu JOM, Shanghai Sunbeauty and Qingdao

Additionally, on September 21, 2005, and September 30, 2005, Xiping Opeck Food Co., Ltd. ("Xiping Opeck") and Xuzhou Jinjiang, respectively, requested new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(c). On November 4, 2005, the Department initiated new shipper reviews of Xuzhou Jinjiang and Xiping Opeck covering the period September 1, 2004, through August 31, 2005. *See Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews*, 70 FR 67138 (November 4, 2005). The POR for the new shipper review of Xiping Opeck is September 1, 2004, through August 31, 2005. The POR for Xuzhou Jinjiang's new shipper review is September 1, 2004, through October 5, 2005. *See Memorandum to the File*, though Christopher D. Riker, Program Manager, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, from Scot T. Fullerton, International Trade Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, regarding *Expansion of the Period of Review in the New Shipper Review of Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Xuzhou Jinjiang Foodstuffs Co. Ltd.* (September 22, 2006) expanding the POR to include an entry related to Xuzhou Jinjiang's sale(s) to the United States made during the normal POR.

On February 15, 2006, the administrative review was rescinded for China Kingdom, Jiangsu Hilong, Qingdao Zhengri, Weishan Zhenyu, Yancheng Haiteng, Yancheng Yaou, and Ningbo Nanlian, because the requesting parties, the Crawfish Processors Alliance ("Petitioners"), the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry, and Bob Odom, Commissioner (collectively, the Domestic Interested Parties) and Ningbo Nanlian withdrew their requests for administrative review pursuant to section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations. *See Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 7915 (February 15, 2006) ("Partial Rescission of Administrative Review"). Jiangsu JOM, Shanghai Sunbeauty, Qingdao JYX, Qingdao Wentai, Xuzhou Jinjiang, and Yancheng Hi-King remain subject to the administrative review.

On February 16, 2006, and February 21, 2006, Xuzhou Jinjiang and Xiping Opeck, respectively, in accordance with section 351.214(j)(3) of the Department's regulations, agreed to waive the

Wentai, covers entries from March 1, 2005, through August 31, 2005.