Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
All Others	6.82

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year (''sunset'') review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 27, 1999.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–24298 Filed 9–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–814]

Pure Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of administrative review and determination not to revoke order in part.

SUMMARY: On May 11, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada and its notice of intent not to revoke the order with respect to pure magnesium produced by Norsk Hydro Canada Inc. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes for the final results.

This review covers one producer/exporter of pure magnesium to the United States during the period August 1, 1997, through July 31, 1998. The review indicates no dumping margins during the review period.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 17, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zak Smith, Import Administration, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office 1, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), as amended. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute 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's regulations are to those codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

Background

On May 11, 1999, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada and notice of the intent not to revoke the order in part (64 FR 25276) (''*Preliminary Results*''). The producer/exporter in this review is Norsk Hydro Canada Inc. (''NHCI''). We received case briefs from NHCI and petitioner, Magnesium Corporation of America (''Magcorp''), and a rebuttal brief from NHCI (*see Interested Party Comments,* below).

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this review is pure magnesium. Pure unwrought magnesium contains at least 99.8 percent magnesium by weight and is sold in various slab and ingot forms and sizes. Granular and secondary magnesium are excluded from the scope of this review. Pure magnesium is currently classified under subheading 8104.11.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (''HTS''). The HTS item number is provided for convenience and for customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part

The Department ''may revoke, in whole or in part'' an antidumping duty order upon completion of a review under section 751 of the Act. While Congress has not specified the procedures that the Department must follow in revoking an order, the Department has developed a procedure for revocation that is described in 19 CFR 351.222. This regulation requires, inter alia, that a company requesting revocation must submit the following: (1) A certification that the company has sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (''NV'') in the current review period and that the company will not sell at less than NV in the future; (2) a certification that the company sold the subject merchandise in each of the three years forming the basis of the request in commercial quantities; and (3) an agreement to reinstatement of the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1). Upon receipt of such a request, the Department may revoke an order, in part, if it concludes that (1) the company in question has sold subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) it is not likely that the company will in the future sell the subject merchandise at less than NV; and (3) the company has agreed to its immediate reinstatement in the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2).

In our *Preliminary Results,* we determined that ''NHCI does not qualify for revocation of the order on pure magnesium because it does not have three consecutive years of sales in commercial quantities at not less than normal value'' (*see Preliminary Results* at 25277).

After consideration of the various comments that were submitted in response to the *Preliminary Results,* we determine that NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation. Specifically, NHCI made one sale in one of the relevant years and two sales in another. One or two sales to the United States during a one year period is not consistent with NHCI's selling activity prior to the order, nor is it consistent with NHCI's selling activity in the home market (*see* Memorandum from Team to Susan Kuhbach, ''Commercial Quantities,'' dated September 8, 1999 (''Commercial Quantities Memorandum''), for a discussion of NHCI's selling activity). Therefore, we find that NHCI does not qualify for revocation of the order on pure magnesium under 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1)(ii).

We note that on January 29, 1999, a panel established by the Dispute

Settlement Body (''DSB'') of the World Trade Organization (''WTO'') determined that the ''not likely'' standard contained in 19 CFR 353.25(a)(2) was inconsistent with the United States' obligations under Article 11.2 of the WTO Antidumping Agreement. *See United States—Anti-Dumping Duty on Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors (DRAMS) of One Megabit or Above From Korea,* WTO Doc. WT/DS99/R (January 29, 1999) (''*DRAMS Panel*''). The panel recommended that the United States ''bring section 353.25(a)(2)(ii) of the DOC regulations * * * into conformity with its obligations under Article 11.2 of the AD Agreement.'' The DSB adopted the panel report on March 19, 1999. On April 15, 1999, the United States announced its intention to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB. Consistent with section 123(g) of the URAA, which governs the Department's implementation of adverse panel reports, the Department is revising 19 CFR 351.222(b). The determination not to revoke in the instant case is not premised upon the interpretation or application of the ''not likely'' standard currently found in 19 CFR 351.222(b).

Comparisons

We calculated export price and normal value based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results,* with the following exceptions:

Based upon comments received from respondent, when determining the appropriate home market sales to use for comparison purposes the Department is now matching to sales of identical merchandise. Also based upon comments received from respondent, we have corrected the currency conversions applied to home market freight charges.

Interested Party Comments

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.309, we invited interested parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results.* On June 10, 1999, the petitioner and the respondent submitted case briefs and the respondent submitted a rebuttal brief on June 15, 1999.

Comment 1: Appropriateness of Commercial Quantities Analysis

NHCI argues that the Department erred in conducting a commercial quantities analysis because its request for revocation was based on an absence of dumping over three consecutive years, not over a period of time in which there was an unreviewed intervening year. According to the respondent, section 351.222(b)(2) of the Department's regulations neither authorizes nor instructs the Department to conduct a commercial quantities analysis. NHCI contends that such analyses are only for revocations based on unreviewed intervening years. In support of this contention, NHCI cites the Department's notice of proposed rule in which the Department stated that, with respect to the new changes concerning intervening years, it would require a certification regarding sales in commercial quantities. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Proposed Rule,* 61 FR 7308, 7320 (February 27, 1996) (''*Proposed Rule*''). The respondent notes that the certification was promulgated into the final regulations with respect to revocations based on an intervening year through section 351.222(d)(1), which states that the Department ''must be satisfied that, during each of the three (or five) years, there were exports to the United States in commercial quantities. * * *''

NHCI agrees that such an analysis is reasonable in the case of a request based on unreviewed intervening years because a revocation of the antidumping duty order is weaker when based on only two, rather than three, years of sales above normal value. The respondent notes that the Department has reasoned that if sales are made in commercial quantities during an intervening year in which no review was requested, it is reasonable to conclude that the sales were not dumped because, if they had been, the domestic industry would have requested a review. Thus, according to the respondent, if reviews have taken place in each year upon which a revocation request is made, a commercial quantities analysis has no relevance. Rather, the fact that sales have been made above normal value each year is the relevant factor.

Magcorp argues that the Department's requirement that sales have been made in commercial quantities applies to all respondents requesting revocation of an antidumping order, regardless of whether an unreviewed intervening year has taken place. The petitioner cites to section 351.222(e)(1)(ii) of the Department's regulations which states that a request for revocation must include the person's certification that, during each of the consecutive years, the person sold the subject merchandise to the United States in commercial quantities. According to the petitioner, the Department's regulations create a first step that must be met before the Department will consider revocation and is not limited to the situation of an unreviewed year. Magcorp cites to the fifth administrative review of this antidumping order (*see Pure Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part,* 64 FR 12977 (March 16, 1999) (''*Fifth Review*'')) and to *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination to Revoke in Part* (64 FR 2173 (January 13, 1999)) (''*Corrosion-Resistant Steel from Canada*''), in which the Department did not revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to companies that had sold above normal value for three consecutive years because such sales were not made in commercial quantities. While the petitioner recognizes that the Department's prior regulations did not address the volume of subject imports with respect to revocation, Magcorp argues that the Department now views sales in commercial quantities to be essential for revoking an order.

Department's Position: As noted above, we have developed a procedure for revocation that is described in 19 CFR 351.222. This regulation requires that a company requesting revocation must submit a certification that the company sold the subject merchandise in commercial quantities in each of the three years forming the basis of the request. Therefore, we must determine, as a threshold matter, in accordance with our regulations, whether the company requesting revocation sold the subject merchandise in commercial quantities in each of the three years forming the basis of the request. See *Fifth Review* at 12978. In the *Preliminary Results,* we found that NHCI does not qualify for revocation of the order on pure magnesium because it did not have three consecutive years of sales in commercial quantities at not less than normal value. We based this finding on the fact that two of the three years of sales NHCI is relying upon to support its request for revocation were not made in commercial quantities. Specifically, in the *Fifth Review* we determined that NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in any of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation. Because NHCI has used two of those three years to support its current request for revocation and the facts have not otherwise changed, we determine that NHCI has not met the threshold criterion outlined in section 351.222 of our regulations requiring sales in commercial quantities in each of the

three years forming the basis of the revocation request. *See* Commercial Quantities Memorandum.

We also note that while the regulation requiring sales in commercial quantities may have developed from the unreviewed intervening year regulation, its application in all revocation cases based on an absence of dumping is reasonable and mandated by the regulations. The application of this requirement to all such cases is reflected not only in the provision for unreviewed intervening years (*see* 19 CFR 351.222(d)(1)), but also in the new general requirement that parties seeking revocation certify to sales in commercial quantities in each of the years on which revocation is to be based. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1)(ii). This requirement ensures that the Department's revocation determination is based upon a sufficient breadth of information regarding a company's normal commercial practice. In this case the number of sales and the total sales volumes for at least two of the three years are so small, both in absolute terms and in comparison with the period of investigation and other review periods, that we do not have sufficient information regarding the company's normal commercial behavior to make a revocation decision. If sales levels are not reflective of a company's normal commercial activities, they can offer no basis upon which to make a revocation determination, regardless of whether we conducted a review of the sales in question or the sales took place in an intervening year. *See, e.g., Corrosion-Resistant Steel from Canada* at 2175.

Comment 2: Impermissible Change in Revocation Procedure

NHCI argues that the Department's practice of reviewing whether sales have taken place in commercial quantities in all three revocation review years constitutes an impermissible substantive change to the Department's longstanding revocation practice. According to the respondent, the Department expressly stated in its *Proposed Rule* (at 7319) that it intended there to be no substantive change in its new revocation regulations. NHCI notes that this understanding was also reflected in the *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part: Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabyte or Above From the Republic of Korea,* 62 FR 39809, 39810 (July 24, 1997) (''*DRAMS from Korea*''), where the Department said that its final regulations did not change the previous revocation requirements.

The respondent further argues that, up to this point, the development of the Department's revocation procedure has been in the direction of examining positive evidence indicating the absence of unfair price discrimination. According to NHCI, the Department must review sales to make this evaluation but the number of sales or sales volume from one year to the next has nothing to do with whether specific sales are evidence of unfair price discrimination. The respondent notes that when the Department has considered the volume of a respondent's shipments it has done so in the context of determining whether future dumping was likely. NHCI contends that the Department's threshold criterion of requiring sales in commercial quantities results in the Department ignoring positive evidence of unfair price discrimination and that this approach constitutes an impermissible substantive change to the Department's longstanding revocation practice.

Department's Position: As noted in the preamble, our substantive criteria for revocation (*i.e.*, an absence of dumping for three years and no continuing necessity for application of the order—the likelihood issue) have not changed. However, the new regulations do establish a new criterion for requesting revocation. Specifically, we now require a company requesting revocation to have sold the subject merchandise in commercial quantities during the three periods on which the revocation request is based, and to certify to that effect. Unless this criterion is met, we do not consider the revocation request. However, where it is met, we consider all relevant positive evidence in making our revocation decision.

Comment 3: Meeting the Commercial Quantities Threshold

NHCI argues that, even if a commercial quantities analysis is warranted, it has made sales to the United States in commercial quantities for at least three consecutive years. Specifically, the respondent contends that the term ''commercial quantities'' refers not to the number or volume of sales, but to whether any individual sale was a normal size transaction for the industry. In support of this argument, respondent points to the proposed regulations in which the Department states that it will ''establish whether sales were made in commercial quantities based upon examination of the normal sizes of sales by the producer/exporter and other producers of subject merchandise.'' (*See Proposed Regulations* at 7320.) Respondent believes that the Department never intended to consider the aggregate volume of sales made throughout the POR. Rather, NHCI argues, the concept of commercial quantities was included in the regulations to ensure that individual sales were bona fide sales that demonstrated the exporter's ability to sell to U.S. customers without dumping in ordinary transactions (as opposed to sales of samples or prototypes).

Given this interpretation of commercial quantities, the respondent argues that its sales were made in commercial quantities because they were characteristic of NHCI's normal commercial practice and the industry standard. Specifically, NHCI states that its spot sales in both the U.S. and home markets involved commercial volumes consistent with the normal size of sales within the industry in general. Furthermore, NHCI argues that the sales examined in the last three years of this proceeding were found by the Department to be sales made in the ordinary course of trade and were not found to be samples nor prototypes nor ''noncommercial'' in any other sense.

Magcorp argues that NHCI's sales to the United States during the last three review periods were far too small to be considered commercial quantities. The petitioner contends that the concept of commercial quantities refers to the aggregate volume of sales made by a respondent over the course of the entire period of review (''POR'') and not to the size of a single sale. In support of this argument, petitioner claims that there would be no reason for the requirement of commercial quantities in 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1)(ii) if the term merely referred to the existence of any sale recognizable as a U.S. sale for calculating an antidumping margin because there would be no reason for the Department to ask a respondent to certify a fact that has already been established. Under this definition of commercial quantities, the petitioner states that NHCI's sales during the three years in question have been negligible throughout the period, noting that in one of the years NHCI only had one U.S. sale.

The petitioner further argues that only if a respondent's sales are sufficiently large will a zero dumping margin offer any valid indication that the respondent can continue to export the subject merchandise to the United States at normal prices if the antidumping duty order were revoked. The petitioner refers to the preamble of the final regulations in which the Department states that a revocation based on the absence of dumping is based on the fact

that when a respondent sells in commercial quantities without dumping it has demonstrated that it will not resume dumping if the order is revoked (*see Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule* (''*Final Regulations*''), 62 FR 27296, 27326 (May 19, 1997)).

Department's Position: In the *Fifth Review,* we determined that NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in any of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation. Specifically, NHCI made one sale in two of the relevant years and two sales in the other. We determined that one or two sales to the United States during a one year period was neither consistent with NHCI's selling activity prior to the order nor NHCI's selling activity in the home market. Specifically, we stated that,

> for each year, the volume of merchandise sold was less than one-half of one percent of the volume of merchandise sold in the last completed fiscal year prior to the order. These sales and volume figures are so small, both in absolute terms and in comparison with the period of investigation, that we cannot reasonably conclude that the zero margins NHCI received are reflective of the company's normal commercial experience. More specifically, the abnormally low level of sales activity does not provide a reasonable basis for determining that the discipline of the order is no longer necessary to offset dumping.

(See *Fifth Review* at 12978.) Two of the 3 years examined in the *Fifth Review* have been cited by NHCI in support of its current request for revocation. Because no party has submitted information indicating that the facts relied upon in the *Fifth Review* have changed, we continue to find that NHCI does not qualify for revocation because it does not have three consecutive years of sales in commercial quantities.

We disagree with NHCI's argument that the commercial quantities criterion requires only that there be a *bona fide* commercial transaction during a given period. As the Department recently explained, ''sales during the POR which, in the aggregate, are an abnormally small quantity do not provide a reasonable basis for determining that the discipline of the order is no longer necessary to offset dumping'' (*see Corrosion-Resistant Steel from Canada* at 2175). As the record of this case demonstrates, NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in at least two of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation. Regardless of the *bona fide* nature of each transaction, these sales, in the aggregate, are abnormally small in quantity and do not provide the Department with a reasonable basis to make a revocation determination. Furthermore, we agree with the petitioner that if commercial quantities related to the *bona fide* nature of the sales, the commercial quantities requirement in our regulations would be redundant.

Comment 4: Revocation Following a Drop-Off in Sales

NHCI argues that the Department is effectively disqualifying companies from revocation if there is a sales drop-off following the imposition of an antidumping duty order. NHCI contends that, in situations where a sales drop-off has occurred, aggregate sales will appear ''abnormally small'' when compared to the aggregate sales made prior to the imposition of the order. However, the respondent states that there is no requirement in the Department's regulations that a company maintain a certain number of sales, market share, or sales volume after imposition of an order to qualify for revocation and that such a requirement is unreasonable and inappropriate because it has nothing to do with a company's pricing practice.

Department's Position: The Department's threshold requirement does not mean, as NHCI suggests, that the Department is effectively disqualifying companies from revocation if there is a sales drop-off following the imposition of an antidumping order. The issue that is analyzed by the Department is the magnitude of the drop-off. In this regard, the Department has expressed its intent to revoke an antidumping duty order even where the sales drop-off has been substantial so long as the sales used to demonstrate a lack of price discrimination are reflective of the companies' normal commercial experience. *See, e.g., Professional Electric Cutting Tools from Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review and Intent to Revoke in Part,* 64 FR 43346, 43351 (August 10, 1999).

When determining whether a company's sales have been made in commercial quantities we must look at each case on an individual basis. In many instances, when making such an assessment we will use the original period of investigation as a benchmark for a company's normal commercial behavior. The period of investigation is a logical and reasonable benchmark for this assessment, especially given that it is the only time period for which we have evidence concerning the company's normal commercial behavior with respect to exports to the United States without the discipline of an antidumping duty order. As demonstrated in the Commercial Quantities Memorandum, we have determined that NHCI's sales during the fourth and fifth review periods were not reflective of its normal commercial behavior.

Comment 5: Commercial Quantities Threshold Conflicts with WTO Agreement

The respondent argues that the Department's preliminary analysis is inconsistent with the 1994 WTO Antidumping Agreement because Article 11.1 of this agreement states that an antidumping duty ''shall remain in force only as long as and to the extent necessary to counteract dumping which is causing injury.'' Respondent supports this position by noting that in a recent decision a WTO panel found that the ''continued imposition [of an antidumping duty] must * * * be essentially dependent on, and therefore assignable to, a foundation of positive evidence that circumstances demand it'' (*see DRAMS Panel*). NHCI states that the Department's application of a commercial quantities threshold in this proceeding is in direct violation of the positive evidence rule set forth in the *DRAMS Panel* because the Department has determined to keep the order in place after refusing to consider any positive evidence.

Department's Position: The Department's revocation procedures are fully consistent with Article 11 of the WTO Antidumping Agreement. Consistent with the Agreement, under U.S. law, the Department is not required to review whether application of an order continues to be necessary unless there is positive evidence that such a review is warranted. Under the Department's regulations, three years of sales in commercial quantities at not less than normal value is the minimum evidence required to establish that a revocation review is warranted. This evidentiary threshold is reasonable because, as discussed above, absent commercially meaningful sales, we do not have a sufficient basis to make a reasoned judgement as to revocation. Moreover, while this specific evidentiary threshold was not at issue in the *DRAMS Panel,* it is in no way inconsistent with the Panel's findings.

Comment 6: Likelihood of Future Dumping

In addition to their arguments respecting the commercial quantities threshold requirement, both the petitioner and the respondent submitted

comments, in the alternative, on the likelihood of future dumping.

Department's Position: Because we have determined that NHCI is not eligible for revocation, based on the fact that it did not make sales in commercial quantities during the three year period being analyzed, we do not reach the likelihood of future dumping issue.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we find that the following margin exists for the period August 1, 1997, through July 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
Norsk Hydro Canada Inc	8/1/96–7/31/97	0

The results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the review and for future deposits of estimated duties for the manufacturers/exporters subject to this review. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this new shipper administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate indicated above; (2) for companies not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original less-than-fair-value investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the most recent rate established for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be the ''all others'' rate of 21 percent established in the amended final determination of sales at less than fair value (58 FR 62643 (November 29, 1993)).

These deposit requirements will remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (''APOs'') of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.306. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this administrative review and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 771(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 8, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–24302 Filed 9–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–549–502]

Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is extending the time limit for the final result for the 1997–1998 antidumping duty administrative review for the antidumping order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. This review covers the period March 1, 1997 through February 28, 1998. The extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATES: September 17, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Totaro at (202) 482–1374; AD/CVD Enforcement Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''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.

Postponement of Final Results

On April 13, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results for this review. *See* 64 FR 17998. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to complete an administrative review within 120 days of publication of the preliminary results. If it is not practicable to complete the review within the 120-day time limit, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit to 180 days from the date of publication of the preliminary results. On August 18, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an extension of the time limit for the final results of this review until September 10, 1999. *See* 64 FR 44892. However, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to issue its final results within this time limit (*See* Decision Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa dated September 10, 1999). We are therefore fully extending the deadline for the final results in this review to 180 days from the date on which the notice of preliminary results was published. The fully extended deadline for the final results is October 12, 1999.

Dated: September 10, 1999.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 99–24299 Filed 9–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P