

Circumstances Determination"), dated July 22, 1999.

On this basis, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist for Freeman, Desano and all other PRC exporters except Tiancheng, Nantong, San Jian, and Blue Science.

We will make a final determination concerning critical circumstances when we make our final determination of this investigation.

#### Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information relied upon in making our final determination.

#### Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In addition, for Desano and Freeman, as well as for companies subject to the PRC-wide rate, we are directing Customs to suspend liquidation of any unliquidated entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for

consumption on or after the date 90 days prior to the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the EP, as indicated in the chart below. These suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin percentage	Critical circumstances
Blue Science International Trading (Shanghai) Co., Ltd .....	121.36	No.
Nantong Medicines and Health Products Import and Export Co., Ltd .....	1.63	No.
Shanghai Desano International Trading Co., Ltd .....	58.82	Yes.
Shanghai Freeman International Trading Co., Ltd., and Shanghai Greenmen International Trading Co., Ltd .....	139.15	Yes.
Suzhou Sanjian Fine Chemical Co., Ltd .....	152.67	No.
Tianjin Tiancheng Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd .....	3.54	No.
PRC-wide Rate .....	153.70	Yes.

The PRC-wide rate applies to all entries of the subject merchandise except for entries from exporters/factories that are identified individually above.

#### ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

#### Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments in six copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than November 17, 1999, and rebuttal briefs no later than November 22, 1999. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Such summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on November 29, 1999 at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should

confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination not later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 22, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-19609 Filed 7-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-580-807]

#### Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from one respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper 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 July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998. We preliminarily determine that Hyosung Corporation (Hyosung) did not sell subject merchandise below normal value (NV) during the period of review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties for Hyosung for the period covered by this new shipper review.

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 issues and (2) a summary of the arguments (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 30, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael J. Heaney or John Kugelman, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4475-0649, respectively.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE:** 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On December 28, 1998, the Department received a request from Hyosung for a new shipper review pursuant to section 751(a)(2) of the Act and § 351.214(b) of the Department's regulations. On February 2, 1999, we published the notice of initiation for this new shipper review (64 FR 5030).

**Scope of the Review**

Imports covered by this review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

The review covers the period July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act.

**Fair Value Comparisons**

To determine whether sales of PET film in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared U.S. Price NV, as described in the "United States Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

**United States Price (USP)**

In calculating USP, the Department treated Hyosung's sales as export price (EP) sales, because the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of information and constructed export price (CEP) methodology was not otherwise indicated. See section 772(a) of the Act.

EP was based on the delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean inland freight, Korean brokerage charges, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage charges, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. customs duties. We made an addition to EP for duty drawback pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act.

**Normal Value (NV)**

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of PET film in the home market (HM) to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of HM sales of PET film to the volume of PET film sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C). Hyosung's aggregate volume of HM sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its respective aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on HM sales.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we adjusted NV, where appropriate, by deducting home market packing expenses and adding U.S. packing expenses. We also adjusted NV for differences in credit expenses, warehousing expenses, and postage fees. We made a deduction from NV for inland freight.

**Level of Trade**

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP or

CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting price sale, which is usually from the exporter to the importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sales from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP sales, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the differences in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(A)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). (See e.g., *Certain Carbon Steel Plate from south Africa, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).)

In implementing these principles in this review, we asked Hyosung to identify the specific differences and similarities in selling functions and/or support services between all phases of marketing in the home market and the United States. Hyosung identified one channel of distribution in the home market: sales to end-users. Hyosung performed a similar level of order processing, delivery arrangement, and customer liaison on each of its HM sales. Therefore, we determine that one LOT exists for all of Hyosung's HM sales.

For the U.S. market Hyosung reported one LOT, EP sales made directly to its U.S. customers. When we compared EP sales to HM sales, we determined that sales in both markets were made at the same LOT. For both EP and HM transactions Hyosung sold directly to the customer and provided similar levels of order processing, delivery arrangement, and customer liaison. Based upon the foregoing, we determined that Hyosung sold at the same LOT in the United States as it did in its home market, and consequently no LOT adjustment is warranted.

### Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that a margin of 0.00 percent exists for Hyosung for the period July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998. We will disclose calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results of review within 10 days after the date of any public announcement, or, if there is no public announcement, within 5 days of publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 5 days after the deadline for filing case briefs. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 2 days after the deadline for filing rebuttal briefs unless the Secretary alters the date. The Department will issue the final results of this new shipper review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments, within 90 days after the date of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of this new shipper review, the Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales as a percentage of the total value of those sales. These rates will be assessed uniformly on all entries made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Upon completion of this review, the posting of a bond, or security in lieu of cash deposit, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and § 351.214(e) of the Department's regulations, will no longer be permitted and, should the final results yield a margin of dumping, a cash deposit will be required for each entry of the merchandise.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this new shipper review for all shipments of PET film from the Republic of Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this new shipper review, as provided by

section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Hyosung will be the rate established in the final results of this new shipper review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of this review or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 21.5%, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also services as a preliminary 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 new shipper review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d).

Dated: July 23, 1999.

**Bernard T. Carreau,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-19606 Filed 7-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### International Trade Administration

[A-583-815]

#### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Welded ASTM A-312 Stainless Steel Pipe From Taiwan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 30, 1999.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review

of the antidumping order on Welded ASTM A-312 Stainless Steel Pipe from Taiwan, covering the period December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karla Whalen or Letitia Kress, AD/CVD Enforcement Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 7866, Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482-1391, or (202) 482-3362, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act, as amended (the Act), the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month for the relevant order. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the review within that statutory time limit. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, dated July 20, 1999. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results until November 1, 1999.

Dated: July 21, 1999.

**Barbara E. Tillman,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.*

[FR Doc. 99-19605 Filed 7-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### Minority Business Development Agency

[Docket No. 990713191-9191-01]

RIN 0640-ZA05

#### Identification of Currently Funded Projects Eligible to be Extended for an Additional Year of Funding in Light of MBDA's Intent to Revise Its Client Service-Delivery Programs

**AGENCY:** Minority Business Development Agency, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the Minority Business Development Agency's (MBDA) identification of certain currently funded Minority Business Development Centers (MBDC) and Native American Business Development Centers (NABDC) which will be eligible for an additional year of funding beyond the normal three years allowed between competitions.