482–5831 or (202) 482–0065, respectively; Import Administration, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Background

On August 24, 2004, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part,* 69 FR 52857 (August 30, 2004). The period of review is July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department shall make a preliminary determination in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend that 245-day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period. The preliminary results of this antidumping duty administrative review of silicon metal from Brazil are currently scheduled to be completed on April 2, 2005. However, the Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results in this administrative review of silicon metal from Brazil within this time limit because additional time is needed to fully address issues relating to affiliation, treatment of value added taxes, reconciliation of costs to financial statements and the calculation of the total cost of manufacturing, as well as to conduct mandatory verifications of the questionnaire responses and supplemental questionnaire responses.

Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this review until August 1, 2005, which is the next business day after 365 days from the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. The deadline for the final results of this administrative review continues to be 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 7, 2005.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5–1027 Filed 3–10–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–851]

Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination: Live Swine from Canada

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce has made a final determination that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to producers or exporters of live swine from Canada.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 11, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melani Miller Harig, Stephen Cho, Daniel J. Alexy, and Marc Rivitz, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0116, (202) 482–3798, (202) 482–1540, and (202) 482–1382, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Petitioners

The petitioners in this investigation are the Illinois Pork Producers Association, the Indiana Pork Advocacy Coalition, the Iowa Pork Producers Association, the Minnesota Pork Producers Association, the Missouri Pork Association, the Nebraska Pork Producers Association, Inc., the North Carolina Pork Council, Inc., the Ohio Pork Producers Council, and 119 individual producers of live swine[1] (collectively, ''the petitioners'').

Case History

The following events have occurred since the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** on August 23, 2004. *See Preliminary Negative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination: Live Swine from Canada*, 69 FR 51800 (August 23, 2004) (''Preliminary Determination'').

On September 9, 2004, the petitioners submitted comments on the upcoming verifications.

On September 14, 2004, the petitioners submitted arguments relating to certain requests made by the Government of Canada (''GOC'') for business proprietary treatment in its questionnaire responses. The GOC filed a response to this submission on September 22, 2004.

On September 17 and 27, 2004, Sureleen–Albion Agra Inc. (''Sureleen'')/Bujet Sow Group (''BSG'') and Hytek Ltd. (''Hytek''), respectively, submitted new factual information and corrections to their previous responses. The GOC also submitted revised information from its questionnaire responses on October 5, 2004.

From September 27, 2004 through October 8, 2004, and October 18, 2004 through October 21, 2004, we conducted verification of the questionnaire responses submitted by the GOC; the Governments of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta; Sureleen/BSG; Hytek; Premium Pork Canada Inc.; Hart Feeds Limited; Elite Swine Inc./Maple Leaf Foods Inc.; Park View Colony Farms Ltd.; and Willow Creek

---

[1] Alan Christensen, Alicia Prill-Adams, Aulis Farms, Baarsch Pork Farm, Inc., Bailey Terra Nova Farms, Bartling Brothers Inc., Belstra Milling Co. Inc., Berend Bros. Hog Farm LLC, Bill Tempel, BK Pork Inc., Blue Wing Farm, Bornhorst Bros, Brandt Bros., Bredehoeft Farms, Inc., Bruce Samson, Bryant Premium Pork LLC, Buhl's Ridge View Farm, Charles Rossow, Cheney Farms, Chinn Hog Farm, Circle K Family Farms LLC, Cleland Farm, Clougherty Packing Company, Coharie Hog Farm, County Line Swine Inc., Craig Mensick, Daniel J. Pung, David Hansen, De Young Hog Farm LLC, Dean Schrag, Dean Vantiger, Dennis Geinger, Double ''M'' Inc., Dykhuis Farms, Inc., E & L Harrison Enterprises, Inc., Erle Lockhart, Ernest Smith, F & D Farms, Fisher Hog Farm, Fitzke Farm, Fultz Farms, Gary and Warren Oberdiek Partnership, Geneseo Pork, Inc., GLM Farms, Greenway Farms, H & H Feed and Grain, H & K Enterprises, LTD, Ham Hill Farms, Inc., Harrison Creek Farm, Harty Hog Farms, Heartland Pork LLC, Heritage Swine, High Lean Pork, Inc., Hilman Schroeder, Holden Farms Inc., Huron Pork, LLC, Hurst AgriQuest, J D Howerton and Sons, J. L. Ledger, Inc., Jack Rodibaugh & Sons, Inc., JC Howard Farms, Jesina Farms, Inc., Jim Kemper, Jorgensen Pork, Keith Berry Farms, Kellogg Farms, Kendale Farm, Kessler Farms, L.L Murphrey Company, Lange Farms LLC, Larson Bros Dairy Inc., Levelvue Pork Shop, Long Ranch Inc., Lou Stoller & Sons, Inc., Luckey Farm, Mac-O-Cheek, Inc., Martin Gingerich, Marvin Larrick, Max Schmidt, Maxwell Foods, Inc., Mckenzie-Reed Farms, Meier Family Farms Inc., MFA Inc., Michael Farm, Mike Bayes, Mike Wehler, Murphy Brown LLC, Ned Black and Sons, Ness Farms, Next Generation Pork, Inc., Noecker Farms, Oaklane Colony, Orangeburg Foods, Oregon Pork, Pitstick Pork Farms Inc., Prairie Lake Farms, Inc., Premium Standard Farms, Inc., Prestage Farms, Inc., R Hogs LLC, Rehmeier Farms, Rodger Schamberg, Scott W. Tapper, Sheets Farm, Smith-Healy Farms, Inc., Square Butte Farm, Steven A. Gay, Sunnycrest Inc., Trails End Far, Inc., TruLine Genetics, Two Mile Pork, Valley View Farm, Van Dell Farms, Inc., Vollmer Farms, Walters Farms LLP, Watertown Weaners, Inc., Wen Mar Farms, Inc., William Walter Farm, Willow Ridge Farm LLC, Wolf Farms, Wondraful Pork Systems, Inc., Wooden Purebred Swine Farms, Woodlawn Farms, and Zimmerman Hog Farms.

Colony Ltd. We also verified the information submitted by M & F Trading Inc., Maximum Swine Marketing, and Excel Swine Services, the three trading companies/cooperatives covered by this investigation, as part of the verification of the GOC and the provincial governments.

We received case briefs from the petitioners and the Government of Saskatchewan on January 7, 2005. The respondents (collectively) and the petitioners submitted rebuttal briefs on January 14, 2005. We held a hearing in this investigation on January 19, 2005. Public transcripts from this hearing are available in the Department of Commerce's (''Department'') Central Records Unit in Room B–099 of the main Department building (''CRU'').

Period of Investigation

The period for which we are measuring subsidies, or the period of investigation, is calendar year 2003.

Scope of Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation is all live swine (''swine'' or ''subject merchandise'') from Canada except breeding stock swine. Live swine are defined as four–legged, monogastric (single–chambered stomach), litter–bearing (litters typically range from 8 to 12 animals), of the species *sus scrofa domesticus*. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized *Tariff Schedule of the United States* (''*HTSUS*'') subheadings 0103.91.00 and 0103.92.00.

Specifically excluded from this scope are breeding stock, including U.S. Department of Agriculture (''USDA'') certified purebred breeding stock and all other breeding stock. The designation of the product as ''breeding stock'' indicates the acceptability of the product for use as breeding live swine. This designation is presumed to indicate that these products are being used for breeding stock only. However, should the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than this application, end–use certification for the importation of such products may be required.

Although the *HTSUS* headings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

Scope Comments

In the *Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Live Swine From Canada*, 69 FR 19818 (April 14, 2004), we invited comments on the scope of this proceeding. On May 4, 2004, we received a request from the GOC to amend the scope of this investigation and the companion antidumping duty (''AD'') investigation. Specifically, the GOC requested that the scope be amended to exclude hybrid breeding stock. According to the GOC, domestic producers use hybrid breeding stock instead of purebred stock to strengthen their strains of swine. The GOC stated that no evidence was provided of injury, or threat of injury, to the domestic live swine industry from the importation of hybrid breeding stock. Furthermore, the GOC noted that the petition excluded USDA certified purebred breeding swine from the scope of the above–mentioned investigations. The GOC argued that the documentation which accompanies imported hybrid breeding swine makes it easy to distinguish hybrid breeding swine from other live swine.

On August 4, 2004, the petitioners submitted a response to the GOC's scope exclusion request and proposed modified scope language. The petitioners stated they did not oppose the GOC's request to exclude hybrid breeding stock, but were concerned about the potential for circumvention of any AD or countervailing duty (''CVD'') order on live swine from Canada through non–breeding swine entering the domestic market as breeding stock. Thus, the petitioners proposed modified scope language that would require end–use certification if the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than this application. Moreover, on July 30, 2004, the petitioners submitted a request to the International Trade Commission (''ITC'') to modify the *HTSUS* by adding a statistical breakout that would separately report imports of breeding animals other than purebred breeding animals, allowing the domestic industry to monitor the import trends of hybrid breeding stock.

On August 9, 2004, both the GOC and the respondent companies submitted comments to respond to the petitioners' proposed revised scope. Both the GOC and the respondent companies stated that they generally agreed with the petitioners' modified scope language, with the two following exceptions: 1) they contended that the petitioners' language setting forth the mechanics of any end use certification procedure was premature and unnecessary, and 2) they argued that the petitioners' language stating that ''all products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope'' was unnecessary because the physical description of the merchandise in scope remains determinative.

On August 12, 2004, the petitioners submitted a response to the August 9, 2004 comments from the GOC and the respondents. The petitioners reiterated their support for their proposed modification to the scope language. They argued that 1) their proposed language had been used before by the Department in other proceedings; 2) since U.S. importers bear the burden of paying the duties, the importers should be required to certify to the end use of the product; and 3) with the petitioners' concerns about circumvention, the ''physical description'' language provided an important clarification that all live swine except for the excluded products are included in the scope.

As further discussed in the August 16, 2004 memorandum entitled ''*Scope Exclusion Request: Hybrid Breeding Stock*'' (on file in the Department's CRU), we preliminarily revised the scope in both the CVD and companion AD proceedings based on the above scope comments. *See Preliminary Determination*, 69 FR 81800, 51801–51802, and *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Live Swine from Canada*, 69 FR 61639, 61640–61641 (October 20, 2004). No further scope comments were received from any party subsequent to these preliminary determinations. Thus, we have adopted the revised scope from the *Preliminary Determination* for this final determination. The revised scope language is included in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section, above.

Injury Test

Because Canada is a ''Subsidies Agreement Country'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act effective January 1, 1995 (''the Act''), the ITC is required to determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Canada materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry. On May 10, 2004, the ITC transmitted to the Department its preliminary determination that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured by reason of imports from Canada of the subject merchandise. *See Live Swine From Canada*, 69 FR 26884 (May 14, 2004).

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this investigation are addressed in the March 4, 2005 ''Issues and Decision Memorandum'' from Barbara E. Tillman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration (''*Decision Memorandum*''), which is hereby adopted by this notice. Attached to this notice as an appendix is a list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded in the *Decision Memorandum*. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this investigation and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the CRU. In addition, a complete version of the *Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the Internet at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/ under the heading ''Canada.'' The paper copy and electronic version of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Suspension of Liquidation

In the *Preliminary Determination*, the total net countervailable subsidy rate was de minimis and, therefore, we did not suspend liquidation. For the final determination, because the rate remains *de minimis*, we are not directing U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend liquidation of live swine from Canada.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination.

Return or Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to Administrative Protective Order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to sections 705(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 4, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

List of Comments and Issues in the Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: Specificity
Comment 2: Green Box Claims
Comment 3: Agricultural Income Disaster Assistance Program Recurring vs. Nonrecurring
Comment 4: Quebec Farm Income Stabilization Insurance/Agricultural Revenue Stabilization Insurance Program
Comment 5: Saskatchewan Short–Term Hog Loan Program
Comment 6: Saskatchewan Livestock and Horticultural Facilities Incentives Program

[FR Doc. E5–1030 Filed 3–10–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[Docket No. 970424097–5061–08]

Market Development Cooperator Program (MDCP)

AGENCY: International Trade Administration (ITA), Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice and request for applications.

SUMMARY: ITA is soliciting U.S. export promotion projects to be conducted by eligible entities for periods of up to three years. Project award periods normally begin between October 1, 2005 and January 1, 2006, but may begin as late as April 1, 2006. MDCP awards help to underwrite the start-up costs of new export ventures that export multipliers are often reluctant to undertake without Federal Government support. MDCP aims to develop, maintain and expand foreign markets for non-agricultural goods and services produced in the United States.

DATES: Proposals must be received by ITA no later than 5 p.m. EST, April 25, 2005. A public meeting to discuss the competition will be held on March 18, 2005, at 2 p.m. in Room 6059 at the address indicated below.

ADDRESSES: Proposals must be submitted to ITA, U.S. Department of Commerce, HCHB 3215; Washington, DC 20230, or via e-mail to *MDCPMail@ita.doc.gov*. The full funding opportunity announcement and the application kit for this request for applications are available at *http://www.export.gov/mdcp*, or by contacting Brad Hess at 202–482–2969.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Interested parties who are unable to access information via Internet or who have questions may contact Mr. Brad Hess by mail (see **ADDRESSES**), by phone at 202–482–2969, by fax at 202–482–4462, or via Internet at *Brad_Hess@ita.doc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access: The full funding opportunity announcement for MDCP is available at *http://www.export.gov/mdcp.*

Funding Availability: Approximately $2,000,000 will be available through this announcement for fiscal year 2005. Awards are limited to $400,000 each. ITA anticipates making five to nine awards, depending on the amounts requested and the availability of funds.

Statutory Authority: 15 U.S.C. 4723.

CFDA: 11.112, Market Development Cooperator Program.

Eligibility: Trade associations, state departments of trade and their regional associations, and non-profit industry organizations, including export multiplier organizations such as World Trade Centers, centers for international trade development and small business development centers are eligible to apply for an MDCP award.

Cost Sharing Requirements: Two dollars for every federal dollar. The first dollar must be cash. The rest of the match may be cash or in kind.

Intergovernmental Review: Applications under this program are not subject to Executive Order 12372, ''Intergovernmental Review of federal programs.''

Evaluation and Selection Procedures: After receiving the applications, ITA will screen each one to determine the applicant's eligibility to receive an award. After receiving all applications, a selection panel composed of ITA managers will review the applications using the evaluation criteria below, score them, and forward a ranked funding recommendation to the Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing and Services. The Assistant Secretary makes the final selection of award winners, justifying any deviation from the selection panel's ranked recommendation.

Evaluation Criteria: The selection panel reviews each eligible application based on five evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria scores assigned by the panel determine which applications are recommended for funding. The evaluation criteria are listed below.

(1) Export Success Potential (20%). This is the potential of the project to generate export success stories and/or export initiatives in both the short-term and medium-term.

(2) Performance Measures (20%). Applicants must provide quantifiable estimates of how the project will increase or enhance the U.S. industry's export presence in the foreign market(s).