

sunset limit would require within five years of approval admission into the site of foreign non-duty paid material for a *bona fide* customs purpose. Experience in administering the framework could also reveal a need to adjust practice for usage-driven sites to implement intermediate benchmarks (such as progress towards activation) rather than a single deadline date at the end of a five-year period.

10. Magnet sites and usage-driven sites would also be subject to ongoing "recycling" whereby activation at a site during the site's initial sunset period would serve to push back the sunset date by another five years (when the sunset test would again apply). Finally, if all of a grantee's sites were due to sunset based on lack of activation, the grantee would need to apply to the FTZ Board at least 12 months in advance of the ultimate sunset termination to request designation of at least one site for the period beyond the sunset of the previously approved sites.

11. An optional five-year transitional phase would be available for grantees of zones with existing configurations that differ from the general parameters envisioned in the proposal. For the optional transitional phase, an individual grantee could apply to reorganize its zone and request continued FTZ designation for existing sites that the grantee determines warrant further opportunity to demonstrate a need for FTZ status. For the transition period, there would be no specific goal in terms of numbers of existing sites which could be proposed for magnet designation. However, sites proposed for a zone's transitional phase would need to comply with the framework's limit of 2,000 floating acres within the zone's site (see further discussion below).

12. For the transitional phase for a particular zone, the grantee would have the option of requesting usage-driven designation for any site where a single entity is conducting (or ready to conduct) FTZ activity. For sites that the grantee believes are better suited to a magnet (multi-user) role, the grantee could request magnet designation. Any usage-driven sites would have the standard five-year sunset period for such sites. The FTZ Board would establish sunset limits for individual magnet sites based on the facts of the case (particularly as they pertain to each site). For the transition phase, the default sunset limit for magnet sites would be five years but the FTZ Board would be able to establish longer sunset limits for specific sites if warranted by the facts and circumstances present.

13. The five-year transition period for a specific grantee would begin with approval of the grantee's reorganization application by the FTZ Board. During the final year of the transition period, the FTZ Board staff would initiate a review of all of the zone's sites for which the sunset limits align with the end of the transition period. The staff review would examine whether each of those sites had been activated during the transition period and, for activated sites, the specific FTZ activity which had taken place (including the operator(s)/user(s) for each site). The staff review of a zone's transition period would result in a report noting any sites subject to the review which had remained unactivated during the period (for which FTZ designation would self-remove at the end of the period). The staff report would also make preliminary recommendations regarding magnet or usage-driven designation going forward for sites activated during the period. The FTZ Board staff would provide its preliminary recommendations to the zone's grantee and allow a period of 30 days for the grantee to provide any response to the staff's recommendations. After the end of the 30-day period, the staff would create a final report taking into account any response from the grantee regarding the preliminary recommendations. Where appropriate, the Board's Executive Secretary would be able to take action on a recommended transition of a site from magnet to usage-driven designation via the minor boundary modification process.

14. The transitional phase for any zone would be limited by the defining 2,000 acre limit inherent in the proposed framework. In this context, if existing sites which a grantee wishes to propose for a transitional phase cumulatively exceed 2,000 acres in their current configuration, the grantee would need to determine the amount of "floating" acreage to propose within the boundaries of each such existing site. (For example, if an existing site is the 340-acre Acme Industrial Park, the grantee could propose 200 floating acres within the 340-acre Acme Industrial Park.) A grantee might opt for a simple mechanism to apportion a certain total amount of floating acreage among sites it is proposing for the transitional phase (after making allowance for the amount of acreage the grantee determines it needs to keep in reserve for possible future minor boundary modifications; a grantee retaining a minimum of 200 acres in reserve is advisable).

It is important to note that the elements of the proposal support each other in furthering the goals of

flexibility and focus for FTZ site designation (with important resulting resource- and efficiency-related benefits for the government). As such, a framework incorporating these types of elements would include the package of elements as an available alternative to the Board's current practice. FTZ grantees opting to manage their zones under the Board's current framework would be unaffected by this proposal. As is currently the case, minor boundary modification actions would be approved by the Board's staff while modifications to a zone's "plan" (e.g., increase in authorized FTZ acreage, modifications to service area) would be matters for the FTZ Board's consideration.

In addition, in order to help the FTZ Board evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the alternative framework after actual experience with FTZ grantees, the FTZ staff would report to the Board on a periodic basis regarding the actual usage of the alternative framework. The staff's reporting regarding implementation of the framework at individual participating FTZs would result from staff-initiated reviews and would not require any request or application from the grantee.

Public comment on this proposal is invited from interested parties. We ask that parties fax a copy of their comments, addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary, to (202) 482-0002. We also ask that parties submit the original of their comments to the Board's Executive Secretary at the following address: U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2111, 1401 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230. The closing period for the receipt of public comments is October 31, 2008. Any questions about this request for comments may be directed to the FTZ Board staff at (202) 482-2862.

Dated: September 8, 2008.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-21232 Filed 9-10-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Ralph Michel

**Ralph Michel, 41 Rosewood Drive,
Easton, CT 06612, U.S., Respondent;
Order**

On November 12, 2003, having approved the terms of a settlement

agreement between the Bureau of Industry and Security, United States Department of Commerce ("BIS"), and Respondent Ralph Michel ("Michel"), then-Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement Julie L. Myers issued an Order (68 FR 65032, Nov. 18, 2003) resolving an administrative proceeding against Michel pursuant to Section 13(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended ("Act"),¹ and the Export Administration Regulations ("Regulations"),² based on allegations in a proposed charging letter that Michel had committed six violations of the Regulations.

Among other things, the November 12, 2003 Order provided a non-standard denial of export privileges that prohibited Michel, for a period of five years from the date of that Order, from participating in any way in any transaction involving the export from the United States to Pakistan of any item subject to the Regulations or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves Pakistan.

Whereas, the November 12, 2003 Order lists Michel as "Ralph Michel, Vice President, Omega Engineering, Inc., One Omega Drive, Stamford, Connecticut 06907";

Whereas, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of Commerce ("OEE"), has confirmed that this address is no longer correct, and that Michel's current address is "41 Rosewood Dr., Easton, CT 06612"; and

Whereas, as a result of the information OEE obtained regarding Michel's current address, OEE has requested that an order be issued amending the November 12, 2003 Order to reflect that new address for Michel;

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that the November 12, 2003 Order denying Michel for five years from participating in any way in any transaction involving the export from the United States to Pakistan of any item subject to the Regulations or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves

Pakistan is amended by deleting the address "Vice President, Omega Engineering, Inc., One Omega Drive, Stamford, Connecticut 06907", and by adding the address "41 Rosewood Dr., Easton, CT 06612". In all other aspects, the November 12, 2003 Order remains in full force and effect.

This Order shall be effective immediately upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Entered this 4th day of September 2008.

Darryl W. Jackson,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. E8-21229 Filed 9-10-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-427-801, A-428-801, A-475-801, A-588-804, A-412-801]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Rescission of Reviews in Part

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

SUMMARY: On May 7, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on ball bearings and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom. The reviews cover 27 manufacturers/exporters. The period of review is May 1, 2006, through April 30, 2007.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes, including corrections of certain programming and other ministerial errors, in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Reviews."

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 11, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Catherine Cartsos or Richard Rimlinger, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1757 or (202) 482-4477, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 7, 2008, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on ball bearings and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom. See *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Intent to Rescind Reviews in Part*, 73 FR 25654 (May 7, 2008) (*Preliminary Results*). For these administrative reviews, the period of review covered is May 1, 2006, through April 30, 2007.

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. At the request of certain parties, we held a hearing for Japan-specific issues on July 1, 2008, a hearing for Germany-specific issues on July 10, 2008, a hearing for France-specific issues on July 11, 2008, and a hearing for general issues on July 15, 2008. The Department has conducted these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of Orders

The products covered by the orders are ball bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof. These products include all antifriction bearings that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following *Harmonized Tariff Schedules* (HTS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.2580, 8482.99.6595, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.6000, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.3100, 8708.99.4000, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.58, 8708.99.8015, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

As a result of changes to the HTS, effective February 2, 2007, the subject merchandise is also classifiable under the following additional HTS item numbers: 8708.30.50.90, 8708.40.75.00, 8708.50.79.00, 8708.50.8900,

¹ 50 U.S.C. app. 2401-2420 (2000). Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of July 23, 2008 (73 FR 43603 (July 25, 2008)), has continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706 (2000)) ("IEEPA").

² The Regulations are currently codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 15 CFR parts 730-774 (2008). The current version of the Regulations govern the procedural aspects of this case. The charged violations occurred in 1997. The Regulations governing the charged violations are found in the 1997 version of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 730-774 (1997)).