

dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse FA, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. See, e.g., *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 49567, 49568 (September 26, 1995) (the Department disregarded the highest margin as best information available because that margin was based on an extraordinarily high business expense resulting from uncharacteristic investment activities, which resulted in the high margin).

In the absence of information on the administrative record that application of this 60.84 percent rate would be inappropriate, that the margin is not relevant, or that leads us to re-examine this rate as adverse FA in the instant review, we find the margin reliable and relevant. Therefore, we have satisfied the corroboration requirements under section 776(c) of the Act and have applied, as FA, the 60.84 percent margin from the 1990-91 Final Results.

Accordingly, we are applying a single dumping rate—the highest rate established in any segment of this proceeding—to all exporters in the PRC. The weighted-average dumping margin is as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
PRC-wide rate	60.84

The Department will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. See section 351.224(b) of the Department's regulations. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication date of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication. See sections 351.309 and

351.310 of the Department's regulations. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results.

Duty Assessment Rates

Upon completion of the final results in this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We intend to issue assessment instructions to Customs based on the dumping rate stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of barium chloride from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for all Chinese exporters will be the rate established in the final results of this review; and (2) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to their PRC suppliers. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 351.402(f) of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this POR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. section 1675(a)(1)), section 777(i) of the Act (19 U.S.C. section 1677f(i)), and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: July 2, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-17645 Filed 7-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-791-802]

Furfuryl Alcohol From the Republic of South Africa; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review and revocation of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On March 8, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on furfuryl alcohol from the Republic of South Africa and intent to revoke in part. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period June 1, 1997–May 31, 1998. We have analyzed comments submitted regarding the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle or Kris Campbell, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0650 or 482-3813, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On March 8, 1999, we published the preliminary results of this review and intent to revoke in part. See *Furfuryl Alcohol from the Republic of South Africa; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke Order in Part*, 64 FR 10983. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. On April 7, 1999, respondent Illovo Sugar Limited

(ISL) and its related U.S. selling agent, Harborchem, filed a case brief and requested a hearing. We received no comments from any other party. On April 21, 1999, representatives for ISL met with Department officials in lieu of a hearing to discuss the preliminary results. See Memorandum from Case Analyst to the File, April 22, 1999.

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this order is furfuryl alcohol ($C_4H_5OCH_2OH$). Furfuryl alcohol is a primary alcohol and is colorless or pale yellow in appearance. It is used in the manufacture of resins and as a wetting agent and solvent for coating resins, nitrocellulose, cellulose acetate, and other soluble dyes. The product subject to this order is classifiable under subheading 2932.13.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Revocation of the Order

In the preliminary results, we indicated our intent to revoke the antidumping duty order in part, with respect to merchandise produced and exported by ISL, noting that record evidence indicated that a South African company unrelated to ISL has exported the subject merchandise to the United States under the order. On April 7, 1999, ISL filed a case brief in which the company argued that the Department should revoke the order in full because there has been no dumping of furfuryl alcohol by any South African producer or exporter for three consecutive reviews, and because the petitioner no longer has an interest in the order.

Based on a review of the relevant record evidence, including the facts pertaining to the shipments exported by the unrelated exporter, we have determined to revoke the order in full for the following reasons: (1) ISL has sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (NV) for three consecutive review periods, including this review; (2) there is no evidence to indicate that ISL or other persons are likely to sell the subject merchandise at less than NV in the future; and (3) the exports in question, which occurred over two years ago, represent isolated shipments of insignificant quantities of subject merchandise. We also note that there were no comments filed by any other party on this issue, with respect to either our preliminary results or ISL's

case brief.¹ Accordingly, we determine that a full revocation of the order is warranted under 19 CFR 351.222(b)(1) and section 751(d)(1) of the Act.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we determine that the following margin exists for the period June 1, 1997–May 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Illovo Sugar Ltd	0.00

We determine that ISL has met the requirements for revocation set forth in section 351.222(b) of our regulations.

This revocation applies to all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 1, 1998. The Department will order the suspension of liquidation ended for all such entries and will instruct the Customs Service to release any cash deposits or bonds. The Department will further instruct Customs to refund with interest any cash deposits on entries made after May 31, 1998.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 6, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-17647 Filed 7-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

¹ Although aware of our preliminary decision to revoke in part and of the possibility of a revocation of the order in full, the petitioner did not participate in this review. See Memorandum to the File from Richard Moreland dated May 21, 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film From Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Partial Recission of Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review, and partial recission of review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from one respondent and two U.S. producers, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1997 through May 31, 1998.

We preliminarily determine that there is a dumping margin for SKC Limited (SKC) during the period June 1, 1997 through May 31, 1998. We therefore preliminarily are denying SKC's request for revocation.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the United States Price (USP) and normal value (NV). STC Corporation (STC) made no sales or shipments during the POR. Accordingly, we are rescinding the review with respect to STC.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the arguments (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney or John Kugelman, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4475/0649.

Applicable statute: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are