

merchandise immediately after the issuance of the order. According to Hercules, after the imposition of the antidumping order, imports of the subject merchandise fell to zero.<sup>4</sup> *Id.* The cessation of imports almost immediately after the issuance of the order, Hercules further argues, is highly probative of the likelihood of future dumping. *Id.*

Moreover, Hercules indicates that, for the past five years, the import volumes of the subject merchandise have been at zero.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* In conclusion, Hercules contends that Yugoslavian manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise have not been able to sell in the United States during the antidumping duty order regime; in other words, Yugoslavian manufacturers/exporters have to dump in order to export the subject merchandise to the United States.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department considered the import volumes of the subject merchandise before and after the issuance of the order. The data supplied by Hercules, the United States Census Bureau IM146s, and the United States International Trade Commission indicate that, since the imposition of the order, the import volumes of the subject merchandise have declined substantially.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, for the period 1994–1998, the United States International Trade Commission Data show a complete cessation of the import volumes for the subject merchandise.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the Department determines that the import volumes of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order.

As indicated in section II.A.3 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the SAA at 890, and House Report at 63–64, the Department also considered whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order. If companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue were the discipline removed. Because no

administrative review has been conducted since the issuance of the order, the margins from the original investigation are the prevailing and therefore effective margins. Thus, the Department determines that weighted-average dumping margins for the subject merchandise have continued above the *de minimis* level.

Given that the import volumes of the subject merchandise ceased completely after the issuance of the order, that dumping margins above the *de minimis* level have continued since the issuance of the order, and that respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in this review, the Department agrees with Hercules' contention that dumping is likely to continue if the order is 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 in 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.)

The Department, in its final determination of sales at less-than-fair-value, published a weighted-average dumping margin for Milan and all-others: 10.81 percent.<sup>8</sup> We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, Hercules urges the Department to report to the Commission the dumping margins from the original investigation as the margins likely to prevail. (See the July 1, 1999 Substantive Response of Hercules at 6.) Hercules argues that, since the Department has not conducted any administrative reviews pertaining to the instant order, the best and only possible recommendation the Department can make, regarding margins that are likely to prevail, is the ones from the original investigation. *Id.*

The Department agrees with Hercules' suggestion pertaining to the margin that is likely to prevail if the order were

revoked. Because the margins from the original investigation reflect the behavior of Yugoslavian producers/exporters without the discipline of an order in place, the Department will provide to the Commission the margins found in the original investigation. Absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department sees no reason to change its usual practice of selecting the rate from the original investigation. We will report to the Commission the company-specific and all-others rate contained in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

#### Final Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Milan Blagojevic .....	10.81
All Others .....	10.81

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: October 21, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–28066 Filed 10–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A–351–804]

#### Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Industrial Nitrocellulose From Brazil

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Industrial Nitrocellulose from Brazil.

<sup>4</sup> The order was imposed on October 16, 1990. (See footnote 1, *supra*.) In 1989 and 1990, imports of the subject merchandise were 748 and 1,041 metric tons, respectively; however, during the period from 1991 through 1998, the import volumes were as follows: 1991–312; 1992–47; 1993–0; 1994–0; 1995–0; 1996–0; 1997–0; and 1998–0 metric tons. (See Hercules' July 1, 1999 substantive response, Attachment 2.)

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 4, *supra*. During 1994–1998, the average import volume of the subject merchandise was 0 metric ton.

<sup>6</sup> See footnote 3, *supra*. The numbers supplied by Hercules exactly correspond with those of the U.S. International Trade Commission Data.

<sup>7</sup> See footnote 4.

<sup>8</sup> See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Industrial Nitrocellulose from Yugoslavia, 55 FR 34946 (August 27, 1990).

**SUMMARY:** On June 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on industrial nitrocellulose from Brazil (64 FR 29261) 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 response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited 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 at the levels indicated in the Final Result of Review section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eun W. Cho 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 27, 1999.

### Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752(c) 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 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 product covered by this order is industrial nitrocellulose ("nitrocellulose") from Brazil. Industrial nitrocellulose is a dry, white, amorphous synthetic chemical with a nitrogen content between 10.8 and 12.2 percent, and is produced from the reaction of cellulose with nitric acid. Industrial nitrocellulose is used as a film-former in coatings, lacquers, furniture finishes, and printing inks. The scope of this order does not include explosive grade nitrocellulose, which

has a nitrogen content greater than 12.2 percent. Industrial nitrocellulose is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") item number 3912.20.00. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

### History of the Order

The antidumping duty order on nitrocellulose from Brazil was published in the **Federal Register** on July 10, 1990 (55 FR 28266).<sup>1</sup> In that order, the Department determined that the weighted-average dumping margin for all entries of the subject merchandise was 61.25 percent.<sup>2</sup> Since that time, the Department has completed one administrative review.<sup>3</sup> We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case. The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

### Background

On June 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on nitrocellulose from Brazil (64 FR 29261), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of Hercules Incorporated ("Hercules") on June 9, 1999, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. Hercules asserts that it is not related to a foreign producer, foreign exporter, or domestic importer of the subject merchandise and that it is not an importer of the subject merchandise except on an occasional spot basis. (See Hercules' June 9, 1999 Intent to Participate at 2.)

We received a complete substantive response from Hercules on July 1, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the Sunset Regulations under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). Hercules claims interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a U.S. manufacturer, producer, and wholesaler of the subject merchandise. In its substantive response, Hercules indicates that it is the sole remaining U.S. producer of nitrocellulose, was the petitioner in the original investigation, and has participated in the only

administrative review proceeding. (See Hercules' July 1, 1999 Substantive Response at 1-2.)

We did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to this proceeding. Consequently, pursuant to section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C) of the Sunset Regulations, the Department determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day, review of this order.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order—an order which was in effect on January 1, 1995. See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act. The Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on industrial nitrocellulose from Brazil is extraordinarily complicated. Therefore, on October 12, 1999, the Department extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this review until not later than December 28, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.<sup>4</sup>

### Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted 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 determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins are discussed below. In addition, Hercules' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins 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 ("the SAA"),

<sup>1</sup> See Antidumping Duty Order: Industrial Nitrocellulose from Brazil, 55 FR 28266 (July 10, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> However, the underlying investigation and the subsequent administrative review dealt with only one Brazilian company, Companhia Nitro Quimica Brasileira ("Quimica").

<sup>3</sup> See Industrial Nitrocellulose From the Brazil; Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 58 FR 38750 (July 20, 1993).

<sup>4</sup> See Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews, 64 FR 55233 (October 12, 1999).

H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103-826, pt.1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the 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).

In addition to considering the guidance on likelihood cited above, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In the instant review, the Department did not receive a response from any respondent interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the Sunset Regulations, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

In its substantive response, Hercules asserts that the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping is high if the order is revoked. (See July 1, 1999 substantive response of Hercules at 3-6). To support its contention, Hercules points to a drastic decline in import volumes of the subject merchandise immediately after the issuance of the order. According to Hercules, after the imposition of the antidumping order, imports of the subject merchandise virtually stopped.<sup>5</sup> Id. The virtual cessation of imports in the years immediately after the issuance of the order, Hercules further argues, is highly probative of the likelihood of future dumping. Id.

Hercules also indicates that Brazilian producers/exporters, in an attempt to

achieve a reduced cash deposit rate in the forthcoming administrative review, made some small scale imports in 1991 and 1992. Id. Hercules notes that, soon thereafter, however, imports of the subject merchandise began to increase. Id. According to Hercules, this increasing trend stopped and the import volumes of the subject merchandise were reduced to zero after Hercules requested a second administrative review in 1996.<sup>6</sup> Id. In conclusion, Hercules argues that Brazilian producers/exporters of the subject merchandise could not sustain their level of exports after the issuance of the antidumping duty order; in other words, Brazilian producers/exporters have to dump in order to export the subject merchandise to the United States.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department considered the import volumes of the subject merchandise before and after the issuance of the order. The data supplied by Hercules and those of the United States Census Bureau IM146s and the United States International Trade Commission indicate that, immediately after the imposition of the order, the import volumes of the subject merchandise declined substantially.<sup>7</sup> However, for the period 1994-1998, it is unclear whether the import volumes have declined substantially, or declined at all, when compared to pre-order volume.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the Department determines that although the import volumes of the subject merchandise decreased significantly immediately after the issuance of the order, the Department cannot determine that import volumes of the subject merchandise decreased for the five-year period preceding the year of publication

<sup>6</sup> Hercules is suggesting that the Brazilian producers/exporters were dumping at an increased rate and only stopped exporting the subject merchandise entirely because of imminent imposition of a higher margin in a pending administrative review. Hercules states that it withdrew its request for the review after it recognized that Quimica, the only firm subjected to the investigation and review, had experienced an industrial accident and, as a consequence, would not be in position for some time to dump the subject merchandise in the United States. In other words, exports of the subject merchandise reduced to zero in 1998 because of an accident, which shut down Quimica's production facilities in Brazil. See Industrial Nitrocellulose From Brazil; Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 63666 (December 15, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> See footnote 4, *supra*. The numbers supplied by Hercules exactly correspond with those of the U.S. International Trade Commission Data.

<sup>8</sup> The average volume of imports of the subject merchandise between 1994 and 1998 was 564.4; however, if we exclude 1998 zero level, which was due to Quimica's production incapacitation, the average volume between 1994 and 1997 was 705.5. The average of 1989 and 1990 pre-order volume was 470.5; in 1989 alone, the pre-order volume was 734.

of this notice of initiation vis a vis pre-order imports volumes.

As indicated in section II.A.3 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the SAA at 890, and House Report at 63-64, the Department also considered whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order. If companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue were the discipline removed. After examining the published findings with respect to weighted-average dumping margins in the original investigation and from the previous administrative review,<sup>9</sup> the Department determines that, since the issuance of the order, weighted-average dumping margins for the subject merchandise have continued at above the *de minimis* level.

Given that dumping of the subject merchandise continued above the *de minimis* level after the issuance of the order, and that respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in this review, the Department agrees with Hercules' contention that dumping is likely to continue if the order is 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 in 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.)

The Department, in its final determination of sales at less-than-fair-value, published a weighted-average dumping margin for Quimica and all others: 61.25 percent.<sup>10</sup> We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, Hercules urges the Department to report to the

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 3, *supra*. In this Administrative Review, covering the period July 1991 through June 1992, the Department determined that the weighted-average dumping margin for Quimica was 5.81 percent and for all others was 61.25 percent.

<sup>10</sup> See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Industrial Nitrocellulose from Brazil, 55 FR 23120 (June 6, 1990).

<sup>5</sup> The order was imposed on July 10, 1990. (See footnote 1, *supra*.) In 1989 through 1990, imports of the subject merchandise were 734 and 207 metric tons, respectively; however, during 1991 and 1998, the imports volumes were as follows: 1991-7; 1992-13; 1993-0; 1994-228; 1995-635; 1996-1261; 1997-698; and 1998-0 metric tons. (See July 1, 1999 substantive response of the Hercules, Attachment 2.)

Commission the dumping margins from the original investigation as the margins likely to prevail. (See the July 1, 1999 Substantive Response of Hercules at 6–7.) Although the Department found a substantially reduced 5.81 percent dumping margin for a Brazilian producer in its administrative review, Hercules contends that the reduced dumping margin coincided with greatly declined import volumes of the subject merchandise.<sup>11</sup> Id. Therefore, the rates which would most accurately reflect the antidumping margins that are likely to prevail were the order revoked are the ones from the original investigation.

The Department agrees with Hercules' suggestion pertaining to the margins that are likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Because the margins from the original investigation reflect the behavior of Brazilian producers/exporters without the discipline of an order in place, the Department will provide to the Commission the margins found in the original investigation. Absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department sees no reason to change its usual practice of selecting the rate from the original investigation. We will report to the Commission the company-specific and all-others rate contained in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

#### Final Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
Companhia Nitro Quimica Brasileira .....	61.25
All Others .....	61.25

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: October 21, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-28067 Filed 10-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-802]

#### Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Industrial Nitrocellulose From People's Republic of China

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Industrial Nitrocellulose from People's Republic of China.

**SUMMARY:** On June 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on industrial nitrocellulose from People's Republic of China (64 FR 29261) 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 response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited 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 at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eun W. Cho 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) 482-1698 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 27, 1999.

#### Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752(c) 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 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 product covered by this order is industrial nitrocellulose ("nitrocellulose") from the People's Republic of China ("China"). Industrial nitrocellulose is a dry, white, amorphous synthetic chemical with a nitrogen content between 10.8 and 12.2 percent, and is produced from the reaction of cellulose with nitric acid. Industrial nitrocellulose is used as a film-former in coatings, lacquers, furniture finishes, and printing inks. The scope of this order does not include explosive grade nitrocellulose, which has a nitrogen content greater than 12.2 percent. Industrial nitrocellulose is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") item number 3912.20.00. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

#### History of the Order

The antidumping duty order on nitrocellulose from China was published in the **Federal Register** on July 10, 1990 (55 FR 28267).<sup>1</sup> In that order, the Department indicated that the weighted-average dumping margins for all entries of the subject merchandise is 78.40 percent. Since that time, the Department has completed only one administrative review. In that review, covering July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996, we found that China North Industries Guangzhou Corp. ("CNIGC") was the only exporter. In that review, the Department determined not to grant CNIGC a separate rate; instead, we established a rate of zero for all entries from the People's Republic of China ("PRC-wide rate") based on information submitted by CNIGC.<sup>2</sup> The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

<sup>1</sup> See Antidumping Duty Order: Industrial Nitrocellulose from the People's Republic of China, 55 FR 28267 (July 10, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> See Industrial Nitrocellulose From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 65667 (December 15, 1997). In the review, the Department found that the PRC-wide rate was zero for the period of review.

<sup>11</sup> See footnote 5 and 8, supra.