conditioning or refrigeration unit is being serviced. Frontseating service valves rely on an elastomer seal when the stem cap is removed for servicing and the stem cap metal to metal seat to create this seal to the atmosphere during normal operation.[1]

For purposes of the scope, the term ''unassembled'' frontseating service valve means a brazed subassembly requiring any one or more of the following processes: the insertion of a valve core pin, the insertion of a valve stem and/or O ring, the application or installation of a stem cap, charge port cap or tube dust cap. The term ''complete'' frontseating service valve means a product sold ready for installation into an air conditioning or refrigeration unit. The term ''incomplete'' frontseating service valve means a product that when sold is in multiple pieces, sections, subassemblies or components and is incapable of being installed into an air conditioning or refrigeration unit as a single, unified valve without further assembly.

The major parts or components of frontseating service valves intended to be covered by the scope under the term ''certain parts thereof'' are any brazed subassembly consisting of any two or more of the following components: a valve body, field connection tube, factory connection tube or valve charge port. The valve body is a rectangular block, or brass forging, machined to be hollow in the interior, with a generally square shaped seat (bottom of body). The field connection tube and factory connection tube consist of copper or other metallic tubing, cut to length, shaped and brazed to the valve body in order to create two ports, the factory connection tube and the field connection tube, each on opposite sides of the valve assembly body. The valve charge port is a service port via which a hose connection can be used to charge or evacuate the refrigerant medium or to monitor the system pressure for diagnostic purposes.

The scope includes frontseating service valves of any size, configuration, material composition or connection type. Frontseating service valves are classified under subheading 8481.80.1095, and also have been classified under subheading 8415.90.80.85, of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). It is possible for frontseating service valves to be manufactured out of primary materials other than copper and brass, in which case they would be classified under HTSUS subheadings 8481.80.3040, 8481.80.3090, or 8481.80.5090. In addition, if unassembled or incomplete frontseating service valves are imported, the various parts or components would be classified under HTSUS subheadings 8481.90.1000, 8481.90.3000, or 8481.90.5000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, but the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

[1] The frontseating service valve differs from a backseating service valve in that a backseating service valve has two sealing surfaces on the valve stem. This difference typically incorporates a valve stem on a backseating service valve to be machined of steel, where a frontseating service valve has a brass stem. The backseating service valve dual stem seal (on the back side of the stem), creates a metal to metal seal when the valve is in the open position, thus, sealing the stem from the atmosphere.

Antidumping Duty Order

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') to assess, upon further information from the Department, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the export price (or the constructed export price) of the merchandise for all relevant entries of FSVs from the PRC. These antidumping duties will be assessed on all entries of FSVs entered, or withdrawn from the warehouse, for consumption on or after October 22, 2008, the date on which the Department published its notice of preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. *See Frontseating Service Valves from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, Preliminary Negative Determination of Critical Circumstances, and Postponement of Final Determination*, 73 FR 62952 (October 22, 2008) (''*Preliminary Determination*'').

Cash Deposits

On and after the date of publication of the ITC's notice of final determination in the **Federal Register**, CBP will require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, cash deposits for the subject merchandise equal to the estimated weighted–average antidumping margins listed below.

Exporter/Producer Combination	Percent Margin
Exporter: Zhejiang Sanhua Co., Ltd.. Producer: Zhejiang Sanhua Co., Ltd. ..... Exporter: Zhejiang DunAn Hetian Metal Co., Ltd..	28.44
Producer: Zhejiang DunAn Hetian Metal Co., Ltd.	12.95
PRC–Wide Entity	55.62

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to FSVs from the PRC, pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Department's Central Records Unit, Room 1117 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect. This order is issued and published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.211(b).

Dated: April 22, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9–9660 Filed 4–27–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–847, A–570–934]

1–Hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–Diphosphonic Acid from India and the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: Based on affirmative final determinations by the Department of Commerce (the Department) and the International Trade Commission (the Commission), the Department is issuing antidumping duty orders on 1–Hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–Diphosphonic Acid (HEDP) from India and the People's Republic of China (PRC). On April 17, 2009, the Commission notified the Department of its affirmative determination of threat of material injury to a U.S. industry. *See 1–Hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–Diphosphonic Acid from China and India* (Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1146 and 731–TA–1147 (Final), USITC Publication 4072, April 2009).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 28, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian C. Smith (India) or Shawn Higgins (PRC), AD/CVD Operations, Offices 2 and 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202)

482–1766 or (202) 482–0679, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 11, 2009, the Department published its affirmative final determinations of sales at less–than-fair–value in the antidumping duty investigations of HEDP from India and the PRC. *See 1–Hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–Diphosphonic Acid from India: Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 74 FR 10543 (March 11, 2009); and *1–Hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 74 FR 10545 (March 11, 2009).

On April 17, 2009, the Commission notified the Department of its final determination pursuant to section 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of less–than-fair–value imports of HEDP from India and the PRC. *See* section 735(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Act.

Scope of the Orders

The merchandise subject to these orders includes all grades of aqueous, acidic (non–neutralized) concentrations of 1–hydroxyethylidene–1, 1–diphosphonic acid,[1] also referred to as hydroxethlylidenediphosphonic acid, hydroxyethanediphosphonic acid, acetodiphosphonic acid, and etidronic acid. The CAS (Chemical Abstract Service) registry number for HEDP is 2809–21–4. The merchandise subject to these orders is currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheading 2931.00.9043. It may also enter under HTSUS subheading 2811.19.6090. While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only, the written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive.

Antidumping Duty Orders

On April 17, 2009, in accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, the Commission notified the Department of its final determination that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury within the meaning of section 735(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Act by reason of less–than-fair–value imports of HEDP from India and the PRC.

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess, upon further advice by the Department, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the export price (or constructed export price) of the merchandise for all relevant entries of HEDP from India and the PRC.

Pursuant to section 736(b)(2) of the Act, duties shall be assessed on subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the Commission's notice of final determination if that determination is based on the threat of material injury, other than threat of material injury described in section 736(b)(1) of the Act. Section 736(b)(1) states that ''{i}f the Commission, in its final determination under section 735(b), finds material injury or threat of material injury which, but for the suspension of liquidation under section 733(d)(2) would have led to a finding of material injury, then entries of the subject merchandise, the liquidation of which has been suspended under section 733(d)(2), shall be subject to the imposition of antidumping duties under section 731.'' In addition, section 736(b)(2) of the Act requires CBP to release any bond or other security, and refund any cash deposit made of estimated antidumping duties posted since the Department's preliminary antidumping duty determinations.

Because the Commission's final determination is based on the threat of material injury and is not accompanied by a finding that injury would have resulted but for the imposition of suspension of liquidation of entries since the Department's preliminary determinations, section 736(b)(c) of the Act is applicable. According to section 736(b)(2) of the Act, duties shall only be assessed on subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the Commission's notice of final determination. In addition, section 736(b)(2) of the Act requires CBP to refund any cash deposits or bonds of estimated antidumping duties posted since the preliminary antidumping determinations and prior to the Commission's notice of final determination.

Therefore, with the exception of HEDP manufactured and exported by Nanjing University of Chemical Technology Changzhou Wujin Water Quality Stabilizer Factory Ltd. (a company excluded from the PRC order), these antidumping duties will be assessed on all unliquidated entries of HEDP from India and the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after April 23, 2009, the date of publication of the Commission's notice of final determination of threat of material injury in the **Federal Register**, in accordance with the following dumping margins.

Country	Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted–Average Margin (percent)
India	Aquapharm Chemicals Private Limited	3.10
	All–Others	3.10
PRC	Changzhou Wujin Fine Chemical Factory Co., Ltd.[2]	36.21
	Jiangsu Jianghai Chemical Group Co., Ltd.[3]	36.21
	PRC–Wide Rate[4]	72.42

[2] Changzhou Wujin Fine Chemical Factory Co., Ltd. manufactures and exports subject merchandise.
[3] Jiangsu Jianghai Chemical Group Co., Ltd. manufactures and exports subject merchandise.
[4] The PRC-wide entity includes Changzhou Kewei Fine Chemical Factory.

On or after the date of publication of the Commission's notice of final determination in the **Federal Register**, CBP must require, pursuant to section 736(a)(3) of the Act, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated dumping margins listed above. The PRC–wide rate applies to all PRC exporters of subject merchandise not specifically listed.

The Department will also instruct CBP to terminate the suspension of liquidation for entries of HEDP from India and the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption prior to April 23, 2009,

[1] $C_2H_8O_7P_2$ or $C(CH_3)(OH)(PO_3H_2)_2$

and refund any cash deposits made and release any bonds posted between the publication of the Department's preliminary determinations[5] on October 18, 2008, and the publication of the Commission's final determination on April 23, 2009.

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty orders with respect to HEDP from India and the PRC, pursuant to section 736(a) of the Act. Interested parties may contact the Department's Central Records Unit, Room 1117 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

These orders are issued and published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.211(b).

Dated: April 22, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9–9679 Filed 4–27–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

[5] *See 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from India: Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*,73 FR 62465 (October 21, 2008); and *1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 73 FR 62470 (October 21, 2008).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–580–816

Certain Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Amended Final Results of the Fourteenth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On March 16, 2009, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final results of the fourteenth administrative review for certain corrosion–resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea (Korea) for the period from August 1, 2006, through July 31, 2007. We are amending our final results to correct ministerial errors made in the calculation of the dumping margins for Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd., (Dongbu), Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO), and Pohang Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (POSCO) and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS) (collectively, the POSCO), pursuant to section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 28, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Hargett, 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) 482–4161.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 16, 2009, the Department published its final results of the fourteenth administrative review for CORE from Korea for the period from August 1, 2006, through July 31, 2007. *See Certain Corrosion–Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Final Results of the Fourteenth Administrative Review and Partial Rescission*, 74 FR 11082 (March 16, 2009) (*Final Results*).

On March 17, 2009, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(c), United States Steel Corporation (U.S. Steel), POSCO, and HYSCO submitted comments alleging ministerial errors, and requested that the Department correct these alleged ministerial errors. On March 23, 2009, U.S. Steel and Nucor Corporation (Nucor) submitted responses to the ministerial error allegations made by HYSCO and POSCO.

On March 17, 2009, U.S. Steel alleged that, with respect to Dongbu, the Department inadvertently used the difference between the payment date and the date of sale as the credit period for the calculation of credit expense in the home market instead of using Dongbu's submitted customer–specific credit period. Further, U.S. Steel alleged that, with respect to HYSCO, the Department used the incorrect beginning and ending day for the period reviewed for calculation of the comparison market and margin programs.

On March 17, 2009, POSCO alleged that: 1) the Department did not use the whole month for the beginning and ending window period of the comparison market and margin programs; 2) the Department inadvertently included the variable for indirect selling expenses incurred in Korea on export sales (''DINDIRSU'') to be converted from Korean Won to U.S. Dollars, when DINDIRSU was reported in U.S. Dollars and did not need to be converted; and 3) the Department should have included negative dumping margins in the calculation of the weighted–average dumping margin, instead of applying the methodology which denies offsets for non–dumped sales.

On March 17, 2009, HYSCO alleged that the Department incorrectly applied an interest expense ratio based on the 2006 consolidated financial statement for calculation of the 2007 interest expense. HYSCO argued that there is information on the record that would allow the Department to calculate the actual interest expenses for fiscal year 2007. HYSCO also alleged that the Department did not make the full deductions of transportation expenses and ''other expenses'' in its calculation of the general and administrative (G&A) expense ratio for 2007.

On March 23, 2009, U.S. Steel and Nucor responded to POSCO's ministerial error allegations arguing: 1) that the Department intended to apply the zeroing methodology to POSCO's margin calculations, and that it is not a ministerial error, and 2) that the change of the window period in the comparison market and margin programs, and the change to the treatment of DINDIRSU will have no appreciable difference on the margin. Thus, the Department should not publish an amended Final Results.

On March 23, 2009, U.S. Steel also responded to HYSCO's ministerial error allegations. U.S. Steel argued that: 1) the Department intended to make changes to the G&A expense ratio by applying the 2006 movement expense ratio to total selling expenses, and to exclude the ''others'' category from the non–operating income, and thus, the changes are not ministerial errors; 2) the Department intended to apply the calculated ratio of long–term to short–term interest rates using 2006 data to the 2007 calculation of interest expenses, and thus, the changes are not ministerial errors; and 3) HYSCO's proposed changes are based on new factual information, not previously on the record of this proceeding.

On March 25, 2009, Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. filed a summons and complaint with the Court of International Trade (CIT) challenging various aspects of the *Final Results*.

Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 351.224(e), due to the number of ministerial error allegations, and the number of submissions regarding the ministerial error allegations, the Department has not found it practicable to analyze comments received and correct any potential errors within 30 days of the publication of the *Final Results*.

Scope of the Order

This order covers cold–rolled (cold–reduced) carbon steel flat–rolled carbon steel products, of rectangular shape, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion–resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron–based alloys, whether or not