

U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Postponement of Due Date for Preliminary Determination

On February 7, 2005, the Department initiated an antidumping duty investigation of imports of certain orange juice from Brazil. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Orange Juice from Brazil*, 70 FR 7233 (Feb. 11, 2005). The notice of initiation stated that we would issue our preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of initiation. *See Id.* Currently, the preliminary determination in this investigation is due on June 27, 2005.

On June 2, 2005, the petitioners made a timely request pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e) for a 50-day postponement, pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act. The petitioners stated that a postponement of this preliminary determination is necessary in order to permit the Department and the petitioners to fully analyze the information that has been submitted in this investigation and to analyze cost information that will be submitted shortly. The petitioners also noted that the postponement will permit the Department to seek additional information from respondents prior to the preliminary determination.

Under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act, if the petitioner makes a timely request for an extension of the period within which the preliminary determination must be made under subsection (b)(1), then the Department may postpone making the preliminary determination under subsection (b)(1) until not later than the 190th day after the date on which the administering authority initiated the investigation. Therefore, for the reasons identified by the petitioners and because there are no compelling reasons to deny the request, the Department is postponing the preliminary determination in this investigation until August 16, 2005, which is 190 days from the date on which the Department initiated this investigation.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f).

Dated: June 7, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 05-11652 Filed 6-10-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

International Trade Administration, North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of decision of panel.

SUMMARY: On June 7, 2005 the binational panel issued its decision in the review of the injury determination made by the International Trade Commission, respecting Hard Red Spring Wheat from Canada Final Injury Determination, Secretariat File No. USA-CDA-2003-1904-06. The binational panel remanded the decision to the Commission with one partial dissenting opinion. Copies of the panel decision are available from the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caratina L. Alston, 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 has been conducted in accordance with these Rules.

Panel Decision: The panel remanded the International Trade Commission's final injury determination respecting Hard Red Spring Wheat from Canada with one partial dissenting opinion. The panel remanded the opinion as follows:

1. Explain why record evidence regarding pre- and post-petition prices

is not sufficient to rebut the statutory presumption of 19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(I), insofar as post-petition price data is concerned. If the Commission finds that such information is sufficient to rebut the presumption, then it must make a new determination on all factors that gives full weight to the evidence previously discounted.

2. Explain how post-petition volume and price data were factored into the Commission's final determination and provide analysis that gives such data some weight, rather than no weight, in its determination. If the Commission finds that either category of evidence is not discounted, then it must make a new determination that gives such undiscounted evidence full weight in its analysis of the relevant factor.

3. Explain how instances of underselling caused adverse trends in price or industry performance in the domestic industry.

4. Analyze how increased volumes of the subject imports caused the domestic industry to suffer depressed prices taking into account all contradictory evidence and render a new determination based on the analysis.

5. Provide a new analysis of the impact of subject imports on the domestic industry, explaining and analyzing (a) how fluctuating yields may leave the domestic industry vulnerable as a result of price depression of the subject imports, (b) how yield fluctuations were accounted for, and (c) why yields per acre and farm prices are the most relevant factors in determining the financial state of the domestic industry.

6. Provide detail as to which prices have been used by the Commission in its analysis and whether prices have been used that are not at the level of sales to domestic milling operations. Having regard to the substantial evidence requirements discussed above, if prices that are not at the level of sales to domestic milling operations have been used, the Commission must explain how such prices show sales in competition with sales of imports at the same level of trade, or how they have been adjusted to reflect the same trade level as imports. If price comparisons could not be made at the same level of trade, the Commission must explain what link exists between prices at the different levels that supports the conclusions of the Commission. If some prices chosen do not involve comparisons at the same level of trade and cannot be adjusted, the Commission is instructed to reject them and reconsider its analysis of price underselling.

7. Examine the economic conditions of the grain trading companies and elevators to explain how the effect of imports was passed upstream to the farmers.

8. Examine the exports of domestically-produced HRS wheat and explain how the Commission has found injury by reason of the subject imports, rather than by reason of competition in third-country markets.

9. Analyze and explain how average farm prices for HRS wheat are based on the outcome of downstream transactions, and subject imports are large enough to impact HRS wheat prices on the futures market of the MGE, specifically taking into account the proprietary information found at page 56 of the CWB's Brief.

The Commission is to provide the determination on remand within 90 days of the panel decision or not later than September 6, 2005.

Dated: June 7, 2005.

Caratina L. Alston,

U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. E5-3015 Filed 6-10-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free-Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On May 31, 2005, West Fraser Mills, Ltd. filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Second requests were filed on June 1, 2005 on behalf of Ontario Forest Industries Association, the Ontario Lumber Manufacturers Association and Tembec, Inc; Weyerhaeuser Company Limited; Cascadia Forest Products, Ltd.; International Forest Products Ltd.; and a third request was received on June 7, 2005 on behalf of Abitibi-Consolidated Company of Canada (formerly known as Donohue Forest Products Inc.) Produits Forestiers Petit Paris Inc., Produits Forestiers la Tuque Inc., and Societe en Commandite Scierie Opitciwan. Panel review was requested of the Notice of Determination Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreement Act:

Antidumping Measures on Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada made by the United States Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration. This determination was published in the **Federal Register**, (70 FR 22636) on May 31, 2005. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA-CDA-2005-1904-04 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Caratina L. Alston, 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).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on May 31, 2005, requesting panel review of the final determination described above.

The Rules provide that:

(a) A Party or interested person may challenge the final determination in whole or in part by filing a Complaint in accordance with Rule 39 within 30 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Complaint is June 30, 2005);

(b) A Party, investigating authority or interested person that does not file a Complaint but that intends to appear in support of any reviewable portion of the final determination may participate in the panel review by filing a Notice of Appearance in accordance with Rule 40 within 45 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Notice of Appearance is July 15, 2005); and

(c) The panel review shall be limited to the allegations of error of fact or law,

including the jurisdiction of the investigating authority, that are set out in the Complaints filed in the panel review and the procedural and substantive defenses raised in the panel review.

Dated: June 7, 2005.

Caratina L. Alston,

United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. E5-3019 Filed 6-10-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Observer Providers of the North Pacific

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before August 12, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Patsy A. Bearden, 907-586-7008 or patsy.bearden@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The main focus of this information collection continues to be the documentation required by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) from an observer provider. Observer providers are permitted by NMFS to hire and deploy qualified individuals as observers in the North Pacific groundfish fisheries. Observer candidates are required to meet specified criteria in order to qualify as an observer and must successfully complete an initial certification training course, as well as meet other criteria, prior to being certified.