

entries of steel coil with an aluminum alloy lining and steel coil with a PTFE/lead-based lining entered or withdrawn from the warehouse for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this changed circumstances review, in accordance with section 778 of the Act.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to parties subject to administrative protection orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.34(d)(1997). 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 terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This changed circumstances review, partial revocation of the antidumping duty order, and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and sections 351.216, 351.221(c)(3), and 351.222(g) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: October 14, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**  
Assistant Secretary for Import  
Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-27687 Filed 10-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-601]

#### Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Tapered Roller Bearings From the People's Republic of China

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of full sunset review: tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China.

**SUMMARY:** On April 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings (64 FR 15727) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff

Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct a full (240-day) review. As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Preliminary Results of Review section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathryn B. McCormick 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, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1698 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 22, 1999.

#### Statute and Regulations

This review is being 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 CFR part 351 (1999) 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 covered by this antidumping duty order (52 FR 22667, June 15, 1987) includes tapered roller bearings ("TRBs") and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"); flange, take up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without

spindles, whether or not for automotive use. The subject merchandise was originally classified under item numbers 680.30, 680.39, 681.10, 692.32 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated ("TSUSA"); currently, according to the U.S. Customs Service, they are classifiable under item numbers 8482.20.00.10, 8482.20.00.20, 8482.20.00.30, 8482.20.00.40, 8482.20.00.50, 8482.20.00.60, 8482.20.00.70, 8482.20.00.80, 8482.91.00.50, 8482.99.15.00, 8482.99.15.40, 8482.99.15.80, 8483.20.40.80, 8483.20.80.80, 8483.30.80.20, 8708.99.80.15 and 8708.99.80.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") (see June 8, 1999, Memorandum to File: HTSUS Numbers for Tapered Roller Bearings). Although the above HTSUS and TSUSA subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

In the ninth administrative review (62 FR 61276, 61289, November 17, 1997), the Department clarified the scope of the order when it added two additional HTSUS numbers (8708.99.90.15 and 8708.99.80.80) applicable to imports of the subject merchandise which previously had not been included in the order. In addition, the Department clarified under the HTSUS numbers that should correspond to subject merchandise previously classified under TSUSA item number 692.32 in the original antidumping order. We note that scope rulings are made on an order-wide basis.

#### History of the Order

In the original investigation, covering the period September 1, 1985 through August 31, 1986 (55 FR 6669, February 26, 1990), the Department determined a margin of 0.97 for Premier Bearing & Equipment, Ltd. ("Premier"); 4.69 percent for China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation ("CMEC") and 2.96 percent for "all others."

There have been ten administrative reviews for the subject antidumping duty order. A summary of these reviews follows:

Review	Period of review ("POR")	Citation
(1) .....	6 Feb 1987–31 May 1988 .....	56 FR 66 (January 2, 1991).
(2) .....	1 June 1988–31 May 1989 .....	56 FR 66 (January 2, 1991).
(3) .....	2 May 1989–31 May 1990 .....	61 FR 29345 (June 10, 1996).
	1 June 1989–31 May 1990 .....	61 FR 29345 (June 10, 1996).
(4) .....	1 June 1990–31 May 1991 .....	61 FR 65527 (December 13, 1996).
(5) .....	1 June 1991–31 May 1992 .....	61 FR 65527 (December 13, 1996).
(6) .....	1 June 1992–31 May 1993 .....	61 FR 65527 (December 13, 1996).

Review	Period of review ("POR")	Citation
(7) .....	1 June 1993–31 May 1994 .....	62 FR 6189 (February 11, 1997).
(8) .....	1 June 1994–31 May 1995 .....	62 FR 6173 (February 11, 1997).
(9) .....	1 June 1995–31 May 1996 .....	62 FR 61276 (November 17, 1997).
(10) .....	1 June 1996–31 May 1997 .....	63 FR 63842 (December 28, 1998).

Over the life of this order the Department has investigated and/or reviewed imports from 21 different producers/exporters. Although all 21 had, at some point, established the right to a separate rate, three of these companies ceased participation in the more recent reviews, and therefore, are no longer entitled to a separate rate. Additionally, the order was revoked in part with respect to subject merchandise produced by Shanghai General Bearing Company, Ltd. (62 FR 6173, February 11, 1997).

### Background

On April 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on TRBs from the PRC (64 FR 15727), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of domestic interested parties, The Timken Company ("Timken") and The Torrington Company ("Torrington") ("domestic interested parties") within the applicable deadline (April 16, 1998) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. The domestic interested parties each claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a U.S. producer of a domestic like product. On May 3, 1999, Zheijiang Machinery Import & Export Corporation ("Zheijiang Machinery"); Liaoning Mec Group, Ltd. ("Liaoning"); Luoyang Bearing Corporation (Group) ("Luoyang"); Zheijiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co., Ltd. ("ZCCBC"); Zheijiang Wanxiang Group ("Wanxiang"); China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation ("CMC"); Xibei Bearing Group Import & Export Co., Ltd. ("Xibei"); and Xiangyang Bearing Factory ("Xiangyang"); and the China TRB Sunset Coalition ("China Coalition") (collectively "respondent interested parties") notified the Department that they intended to participate in this sunset review. CMC noted that it is a different and distinct company from CMEC.

We received complete substantive responses from the domestic and respondent interested parties on May 3, 1999. In response to a request from respondent interested parties, the Department, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.302, granted an extension of the deadline for filing substantive

responses, and, on May 7, 1999, the respondent interested parties submitted supplemental information to complete their substantive response.

Timken claims that it was a petitioner in the original investigation and a participant in the ten administrative reviews. Torrington, however, did not participate in the original investigation or any administrative review. The respondent interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(B) of the Act, as foreign producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. As an association of foreign producers/exporters of subject merchandise, the China Coalition claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(A) of the Act. None of the above respondent interested parties participated in the original investigation. However, Zheijiang and CMC participated in the seventh through tenth reviews; Liaoning and Luoyang participated in the third through tenth reviews; and Wanxiang participated in the ninth and tenth reviews. ZCCBC is currently the subject of a new shipper review.

On May 12, 1999, we received rebuttal comments from the domestic and respondent interested parties. On May 24, 1999, the Department determined to conduct an expedited sunset review of this order on the basis that respondent interested parties accounted for significantly less than 50 percent of the value of imports over the past five years.<sup>1</sup> On June 10, 1999, within the 70-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(e)(ii), respondent interested parties submitted comments on the Department's determination to conduct an expedited sunset review. On July 20, 1999, we notified the International Trade Commission that we had reconsidered our determination of adequacy and, on the basis of complete substantive responses from domestic and respondent interested parties to the notice of initiation, and pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A), the Department determined to conduct a full (240-day) sunset review of this order.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the

<sup>1</sup> See May 24, 1999, Memorandum for Jeffrey A. May, Re: Sunset Review of Tapered Roller Bearings from the People's Republic of China: Adequacy of Respondent Interested Party Response to the Notice of Initiation.

Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an order in effect on January 1, 1995). Accordingly, on July 20, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty investigation on TRBs from the PRC is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this review until not later than October 18, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.<sup>2</sup>

### Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping order, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's preliminary determination concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, the domestic and respondent interested parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

### Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994) ("the SAA"), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the

<sup>2</sup> See *Tapered Roller Bearings from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Five-Year Review* (July 20, 1999).

Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (see section II.A.2). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (see section II.A.3).

Domestic interested parties argue that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, domestic interested parties assert in their substantive response that TRB producers from the PRC have dumped subject merchandise into the United States prior to 1987 (see March 3, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 7). Further, the domestic interested parties assert that, throughout the history of the order, bearings producers in China have had to sell at less than fair value in order to export to the United States. *Id.* For example, the rate of dumping found for "all others" increased from 8.83 percent in the 1990/91 review, to 33.18 percent in the most recent 1996/97 review.

With respect to whether dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly, the domestic interested parties assert that the margins of dumping for PRC imports have increased over the life of the order, along with the volume of TRB imports. Further, the domestic interested parties assert that Chinese producers have continued to increase their exports of subject merchandise—despite increasing margins—because of incentives unique to the PRC market. Their examples include government incentives such as preferential loan and tax policies; triangular debt in the bearings industry, in which government policies requiring full employment with limited money supply result in a surge of exports to attract hard currency; and PRC government reform of state-owned enterprises ("SOEs"), in which their

sale or liquidation results in excess capacity that can be devoted to production for export. *Id.* at 8–9.

Respondent interested parties argue that revocation of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from China will not result in a continuation or recurrence of dumping. With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, the respondent interested parties assert that the weighted-average margins of dumping have declined significantly in recent years and that the margins of dumping for the 1997/98 review are likely to decline to a *de minimis* level (see May 3, 1999 Substantive Response of respondent interested parties at 21).

With respect to whether dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly, the respondent interested parties assert that, imports of subject merchandise from China are dramatically higher during the period following the issuance of the order. *Id.* at 20. Specifically, the respondent interested parties assert that annual imports of TRBs from China during the period from 1994 to 1998 averaged over twenty times the level in 1985, the year preceding the issuance of the order. *Id.* Moreover, they note that China's import market share is substantially higher during this more recent period than in 1985. *Id.* at 21.

In their rebuttal comments of May 12, 1999, domestic interested parties assert that the respondent interested parties' submission should not be deemed adequate because the Chinese government has not indicated its willingness to participate in the sunset review (see May 12, 1999 Rebuttal Comments of domestic interested parties at 5). The domestic interested parties argue that, absent government participation, the Department will not obtain the kind of data that would warrant a full review. Furthermore, domestic interested parties reassert that, in every review in every year since the order was put in place, the Department has found dumping. *Id.* at 7. As dumping has not been eliminated, and significant margins continued to be found, dumping is therefore likely to continue or recur.

In their May 12, 1999 rebuttal comments, respondent interested parties assert that the domestic interested parties' distort the effects of revocation and possible margins by using the PRC-wide review rates to total PRC imports, when a substantial portion of these imports are from Chinese companies that have received separate rates in past administrative reviews (see May 12,

1999 Rebuttal comments of respondent interested parties at 2).

With respect to the issue of government incentive programs raised by domestic interested parties, respondent interested parties argue that Chinese TRB producers and exporters do not receive benefits from any export incentive programs. They assert that the only benefit received by TRB producers and exporters is reimbursement of, and/or exemption from, VAT taxation for exporting. *Id.* at 3. However, the refunding of VAT is not deemed a subsidy under either U.S. law or under the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. Moreover, respondent interested parties argue that market economy countervailing duty principles should not be applied to non-market economies in the evaluation of fair market value. *Id.* at 4.

With respect to the issue of triangular debt raised by domestic interested parties, respondent interested parties assert that triangular debt (see May 3, 1999 Substantive Response of domestic interested parties) has no bearing on the Chinese TRB companies, which, as the Department has repeatedly recognized, are not state-owned (see May 12, 1999 Rebuttal Comments of respondent interested parties at 4).

Respondent interested parties dispute the domestic interested parties' assertion that there is reduced demand for TRBs in the PRC, arguing that, on the contrary, Chinese government policies and SOE reform are increasing the domestic demand for TRBs. *Id.* at 6. Moreover, they dispute the argument of the domestic interested parties that Chinese TRB producers maintain inventories of subject merchandise, which they are stockpiling for U.S. export. *Id.* at 7.

As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63–64, if companies continue to dump despite the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue were the discipline to be removed. In this case, the Department finds that, although the margins of four companies decreased below *de minimis* in the ninth and tenth reviews, dumping by other producers/exporters nonetheless continued since the issuance of an antidumping order. In addition, the PRC-wide rate has increased steadily every year since the third review, especially between the sixth and seventh reviews. Given that dumping has continued over the life of the order, the Department preliminarily determines that dumping is likely to continue if the order were revoked.

### Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination of the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation (see section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*). Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations (see sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

As noted above, the Department published a rate of 0.97 percent for Premier, 4.69 percent for CMEC and, 2.96 for "all others" in its final determination of sale at less than fair value (55 FR 6669, February 26, 1989). In addition, the Department has conducted ten administrative reviews of this order. Further, we note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

The domestic interested parties assert that the Department should select the highest calculated rate that corresponds to the review period in which the companies—Wanfandian, Jilin, Liaoning and Guizhou—had their highest import volumes. The domestic interested parties argue that, for these companies, the increases in the dumping margin correspond to increases in U.S. imports, indicating that these companies increased dumping in order to expand their market share. Furthermore, domestic interested parties argue that, because imports of Chinese TRBs and PRC-wide dumping margins have increased almost every year since the issuance of the order, the Department should determine that the most recent PRC-wide rate of 33.18 percent is the rate likely to prevail for imports from all producers that do not currently have a separate rate (see May 3, 1999 Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 13). Finally, the domestic interested parties argue that companies that lost their status as independent companies should be assigned the most recent PRC-wide rate.

Respondent interested parties argue that, in view of the dramatically increased level of imports from China from the period before the issuance of the antidumping order, and the declining weighted-average dumping margins in the most recent two reviews,

the Department should provide to the Commission the weight average of the most recent rates of 3.20 percent, 0.02 percent and 0.03 percent for Luoyang, Liaoning, and CMC, respectively (*i.e.*, rates from the 1996/97 administrative review) (see May 3, 1999 Substantive Response of respondent interested parties at 22), as the margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked.

In their May 12, 1999, rebuttal, the domestic interested parties reassert that as Chinese TRB imports have increased during the life of the subject order, margins have also increased, showing that producers/importers from the PRC have had to increase dumping in order to increase sales volume (see May 12, 1999 Rebuttal of domestic interested parties at 7). In addition, the domestic interested parties disagree with the respondent interested parties' argument that the Department should calculate the weight average of the margins of Luoyang, Liaoning, and China National in the 1996/97 review, as the margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked, because, allegedly, these respondents failed to identify extraordinary circumstances that would warrant such revised rates. *Id.* at 9.

With respect to the domestic interested parties' argument that the Department use the historical PRC-wide rate, respondent interested parties assert that this argument ignores the fact that over 23 different companies were not participants in the original investigation (see May 12, 1999 Rebuttal of respondent interested parties at 10). Moreover, in one or more annual reviews, nearly all companies received separate rates and lower margins than the determined PRC-wide rate. *Id.*

With respect to the issue of assignment of the PRC-wide rate to companies previously eligible for separate rate, respondent interested parties assert that certain companies dropped out of the review process because they decided to leave the U.S. market and for no other reason. *Id.* at 7.

As stated above, the Department normally will provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the original investigation. The SAA at 889–90 and the House Report at 63 state that declining (or no) margins accompanied by steady or increasing imports may indicate that foreign companies do not have to dump to maintain market share in the United States, and that dumping is less likely to continue or recur were the order to be revoked. Therefore, section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* states that in response to argument from an interested party, the Department may provide to the Commission a more recently

calculated margin for a particular company where, for that particular company, dumping margins declined or dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes remained steady or increased. Additionally, if a company chooses to increase dumping in order to increase or maintain market share, the Department may provide the Commission with a more recently calculated margin for that company.

Based on our review of information submitted by the interested parties, the U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports, and data from our original investigation and subsequent administrative reviews, the Department preliminarily determines that:

(1) With respect to Wafangdian, Jilin and Liaoning, the Department agrees with the domestic interested parties that company-specific export volumes and company-specific dumping margins peaked concurrently, during the 1994/95 period of review. Additionally, company-specific exports and the dumping margin for Guizhou Machinery peaked concurrently during the 1995/96 period of review. This trend shows that these companies may be willing to increase dumping in order to increase or maintain market share. Therefore, the Department, in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, preliminarily intends to report to the Commission company-specific rates from the periods of review during which their imports increased: 29.40 percent for Wafangdian, from the 1994/95 review period; 29.40 percent for Jilin, from the 1994/95 and 1995/96 periods of review; 9.72 percent for Liaoning, from the 1994/95 period of review, and 21.79 percent for Guizhou Machinery, from the 1995/96 period of review.

(2) At some time over the life of the order, CMEC, Guizhou Automotive and Tianshui Hailin were subject to separate rates, but were assigned the PRC-wide rate when they did not participate in subsequent reviews. The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties' argument that it is not appropriate to assign a rate to these companies based on a status they no longer enjoy. Therefore, the Department preliminarily intends to report to the Commission the 1995/96 review PRC-wide rate of 29.40 percent for CMEC, Guizhou Automotive and Tianshui Hailin.

(3) With respect to CMC and Luoyang, the Department agrees with respondent interested parties that as company-specific exports from these companies increased from the period prior to issuance of the order, their company-specific weighted-average dumping

margins have declined in the two most recent reviews. The Department finds the same trend for Zhejiang Machinery and Waxiang, which shows that each of these exporters are likely to continue dumping at the lower rates found in more recent reviews. Thus, the Department, in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, preliminarily intends to report to the Commission the company-specific margin of 0.03 percent for CMC, 3.20 percent for Luoyang, and 0.11 percent for Zhejiang Machinery, each from the 1996/97 period of review; and 0.03 percent for Waxiang from the 1995/96 review.

(4) Because three respondent interested parties—Xiangyang, Xibei and ZCCBC (a participant in the current new shipper review)—have never been determined eligible for a company-specific rate, the Department preliminarily intends to assign the PRC-wide rate of 29.40 percent to these companies.

(5) The margins for Premier, a company subject to the original investigation, have generally increased throughout the history of the order. Premier's original margin of 0.97 percent peaked at 25.56 percent in the 1993/94 review, and then decreased to 7.22 percent in the most recent 1996/97 review. Absent comments or information regarding the margin and import volumes for Premier from domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department, in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, preliminarily intends to report to the Commission a more recent rate of 5.43 percent for Premier. This rate is from the 1995/96 period of review, in which the overall volume of imports peaked and then began to decline.

(6) With respect to the PRC "all others" rate, the Department agrees with domestic interested parties' argument that, as import volumes generally increased, with the highest volumes in the years with the highest margins, companies have increased dumping in order to maintain or increase market share. We note that the total volume of imports less imports of those companies with separate rates increased from fiscal years 1994 through 1996, then declined in fiscal years 1997 through 1998. During this five-year period, the PRC rate increased approximately 30 percent, reaching a peak of 33.18 percent in FY 1997. Following this margin increase, imports declined approximately 60 percent. Because overall imports increased through 1996 and then began to decline, the Department preliminarily intends to report to the Commission a rate of 29.40

percent for "all others", in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*. This is the PRC-wide rate from the 1995/96 administrative review.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

Producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. ("CMC")	0.03
Zhejiang Wanxiang Group .....	0.03
Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corp .....	0.11
Luoyang .....	3.20
Premier .....	5.43
Liaoning .....	9.72
Guizhou Machinery .....	21.79
Wafangdian .....	29.40
Jilin .....	29.40
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. ("CMEC")	29.40
Guizhou Automotive .....	29.40
Tianshui Hailin .....	29.40
Xiangyang .....	29.40
Xibei .....	29.40
Zhejiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co. ("ZCCBC") .....	29.40
All Others .....	29.40

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on December 14, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than December 7, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than December 13, 1999. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such *Policy Bulletin*.

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

Dated: October 18, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-27686 Filed 10-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration [C-401-401]

#### Certain Carbon Steel Products From Sweden: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On July 12, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain carbon steel products ("Certain Steel Products") from Sweden for the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997. The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). For information on the net subsidy for each reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service ("Customs") to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 22, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tipten Troidl or Gayle Longest, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers SSAB Svenskt Stal AB ("SSAB"). This review also covers the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997 and seven programs.

We published the preliminary results on July 12, 1999 (64 FR 37507). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments from any of the parties.

##### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to