

## Statute and Regulations

Pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act, an antidumping ("AD") or countervailing duty ("CVD") order will be revoked, or the suspended investigation will be terminated, unless revocation or termination would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of (1) Dumping or a countervailable subsidy, and (2) Material injury to the domestic industry.

The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*"). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

## Filing Information

As a courtesy, we are making information related to sunset proceedings, including copies of the *Sunset Regulations* and *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department's schedule of sunset reviews, case history information (e.g., previous margins, duty absorption determinations, scope language, import volumes), and service lists, available to the public on the Department's sunset internet website at the following address: "[http://www.ita.doc.gov/import\\_admin/records/sunset/](http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/sunset/)".

All submissions in the sunset review must be filed in accordance with the Department's regulations regarding format, translation, service, and certification of documents. These rules can be found at 19 CFR 351.303 (1998). Also, we suggest that parties check the Department's sunset website for any updates to the service list before filing any submissions. We ask that parties notify the Department in writing of any additions or corrections to the list. We also would appreciate written notification if you no longer represent a party on the service list.

Because deadlines in a sunset review are, in many instances, very short, we urge interested parties to apply for access to proprietary information under administrative protective order ("APO") immediately following publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation of the sunset review. The Department's regulations on submission of proprietary information and

eligibility to receive access to business proprietary information under APO can be found at 19 CFR 351.304–306 (see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Administrative Protective Order Procedures; Procedures for Imposing Sanctions for Violation of a Protective Order*, 63 FR 24391 (May 4, 1998)).

## Information Required From Interested Parties

Domestic interested parties (defined in 19 CFR 351.102 (1998)) wishing to participate in the sunset review must respond not later than 15 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation by filing a notice of intent to participate. The required contents of the notice of intent to participate are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(ii). In accordance with the *Sunset Regulations*, if we do not receive a notice of intent to participate from at least one domestic interested party by the 15-day deadline, the Department will automatically revoke the order without further review.

If we receive a notice of intent to participate from a domestic interested party, the *Sunset Regulations* provide that *all parties* wishing to participate in the sunset review must file substantive responses not later than 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation. The required contents of a substantive response are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3). Note that certain information requirements differ for foreign and domestic parties. Also, note that the Department's information requirements are distinct from the International Trade Commission's information requirements. Please consult the *Sunset Regulations* for information regarding the Department's conduct of sunset reviews.<sup>1</sup> Please consult the Department's regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) for definitions of terms and for other general information concerning antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings at the Department.

This notice of initiation is being published in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c).

<sup>1</sup> A number of parties commented that these interim-final regulations provided insufficient time for rebuttals to substantive responses to a notice of initiation (*Sunset Regulations*, 19 CFR 351.218(d)(4)). As provided in 19 CFR 351.302(b) (1998), the Department will consider individual requests for extension of that five-day deadline based upon a showing of good cause.

Dated: September 27, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99–25622 Filed 9–30–99; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–357–007]

### Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Carbon Steel Wire Rod From Argentina

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Carbon Steel Wire Rod from Argentina.

**SUMMARY:** On May 28, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on carbon steel wire rod from Argentina (64 FR 28975) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from both domestic and respondent interested parties. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of this order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 1, 1999.

## Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*") and in 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-*

year ("Sunset") *Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

### Scope

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order is carbon steel wire rod from Argentina. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers 7213.20.00, 7213.31.30, 7213.39.00, 7213.41.30, 7213.49.00, and 7213.50.00. Although the item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

### Background

On May 28, 1999, the Department issued the *Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Carbon Steel Wire Rod from Argentina* (64 FR 28975) ("Preliminary Results"). In our preliminary results, we found that revocation of the order would likely result in the continuation or recurrence of dumping. In addition, we preliminarily determined that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked was 119.11 percent for Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros S.A. ("Acindar") and all others.

On July 12, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.209(c)(1)(i), we received comments on behalf of Co-Steel (formerly Raritan River Steel), GS Industries, and North Star Steel Company (collectively, the "domestic interested parties"), the domestic participants in this review, and on behalf of Acindar, the respondent in this review. On July 15, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(d), the Department received rebuttal comments from the domestic interested parties. We have addressed the comment received below.

### Comment

*Comment 1:* Acindar, in its July 12, 1999, case brief, states that they disagree with the Department's *Preliminary Results* in this sunset proceeding. Acindar argues that the 119.11 percent dumping margin to be reported to the Commission by the Department is not representative of the rate likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Acindar asserts that in a situation where the rate determined in the original investigation is not a rate based on a respondent's own data, as exists in this case, that rate should not be reported by Department. Furthermore, Acindar argues that the only administrative

review conducted by the Department in which Acindar's own data was used resulted in a dumping margin of zero.

In addition, Acindar argues that this fifteen year old rate does not reflect the significant changes which have taken place in the industry and market for subject merchandise since the imposition of the order. According to Acindar, the intervention of numerous events—Mercosur, NAFTA, the changes in the Argentine currency, and the substantial changes in the wire rod industry in the United States and worldwide—all greatly weaken any inference that the rate of dumping "likely to recur" is the rate hypothesized for Acindar in the early 1980's.

The domestic interested parties, in their July 12, 1999, case brief, stated that they agree with the Department's *Preliminary Results* in this proceeding. With respect to Acindar's assertion, the domestic interested parties, citing the SAA in their July 15, 1999, rebuttal brief, state that the dumping margin from the original investigation is the only rate that properly reflects the behavior of exporters prior to the issuance of the antidumping duty order. According to the domestic interested parties, Acindar's request that the Department select another rate to report to the Commission is in direct contradiction to the SAA. They argue that the rate from the original investigation is the most appropriate to report to the Commission. Lastly, the domestic interested parties argue that the age of margin the Department reports to the Commission is irrelevant and that the rate from the original investigation, regardless of how long ago the order was created, is most probative of the rate likely to prevail because it is the only rate which reflects the behavior of producers and/or exporters absent the discipline of the order.

*Department Position:* The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties. The Department's *Sunset Regulations* state that we will normally provide the company-specific margin from the investigation for each company regardless of whether the margin was calculated using a company's own information or based on best information available or facts available. As stated in our *Preliminary Results*, the rate assigned to Acindar in the original investigation is the only one which reflects its behavior absent the discipline of the order and therefore is the most appropriate to report to the Commission as the margin likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. The Department finds no reason to

deviate from its stated policy in this proceeding.

As for the zero dumping margin attained by Acindar in the sole administrative review of this order, the Department does not find this rate probative of the margin likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. In its *Preliminary Results*, the Department noted that the establishment of this zero dumping margin was preceded by a significant reduction in import volumes of the subject merchandise. Furthermore, throughout the life of the order, import volumes have remained substantially below their pre-imposition of the order levels. This strongly suggests to the Department that Acindar had to dramatically reduce its exports of subject merchandise to the United States in order to eliminate dumping and would be unable to sell significant quantities (e.g. pre-imposition quantities) of subject merchandise in the United States and maintain a dumping margin of zero. Furthermore, the Department notes that a zero or *de minimis* dumping margin, in itself, does not require the Department to determine that continuation or recurrence of dumping is not likely nor does it indicate to the Department that a zero or *de minimis* margin is the margin likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. See section 772(c)(4)(A) of the Act.

### Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping for the reasons set forth in our preliminary results of review. Furthermore, for the reasons set forth in our preliminary results of review and as discussed above, we find that the margins calculated in the original investigation are probative of the behavior of Argentine producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. As such, the Department will report to the Commission the company-specific and all others rates from the original investigation listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Acindar .....	119.11
All Others .....	119.11

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: September 27, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-25626 Filed 9-30-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-815]

#### Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 1, 1999.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China, covering the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean Carey or Dana Mermelstein, 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, telephone: (202) 482-3964 or (202) 482-3208, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, 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 120 days after the date on which the notice of preliminary results was published in the **Federal Register**. In the instant case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa (September 22, 1999). Therefore, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department

is extending the time limit for the final results to no later than March 6, 2000, which is 180 days after the publication date in the **Federal Register** of the notice of preliminary results for this review. The preliminary results were published in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 1999. (64 FR 48788).

Dated: September 22, 1999.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.*

[FR Doc. 99-25488 Filed 9-30-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-054, A-588-604]

#### Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Intent to Revoke in-Part

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests by the petitioner and one respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings (TRBs) and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from Japan (A-588-604), and of the antidumping finding on TRBs, four inches or less in outside diameter, and components thereof, from Japan (A-588-054). The review of the A-588-054 finding covers two manufacturers/exporters and one reseller/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1997, through September 30, 1998. The review of the A-588-604 order covers three manufacturers/exporters and the period October 1, 1997, through September 30, 1998.

We preliminarily determine that sales of TRBs have been made below the normal value (NV) for all respondents except Fuji. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between United States price

and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 1, 1999.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charles Ranado (NSK), Stephanie Arthur (Koyo), Deborah Scott (NTN or Fuji), or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3518, (202) 482-6312, or (202) 482-2657, respectively.

#### 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 Rounds Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 18, 1976, the Treasury Department published in the **Federal Register** (41 FR 34974) the antidumping finding on TRBs from Japan, and on October 6, 1987, the Department published the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Japan (52 FR 37352). On October 9, 1998, the Department published the notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" for both TRB cases covering the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998 (63 FR 54440).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213 (b)(1), the petitioner, the Timken Company (Timken), requested that we conduct a review of Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. (Koyo) and NSK Ltd. (NSK) in both the A-588-054 and A-588-604 cases. Timken also requested that we conduct a review of NTN Corporation (NTN) in the A-588-604 TRB case. In addition, Fuji Heavy Industries (Fuji) requested that the Department conduct a review in the A-588-054 case, and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(e) requested that this finding be revoked with respect to Fuji. On November 30, 1998, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of these antidumping duty administrative reviews covering the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998 (63 FR 65748).