

(sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

For transition orders defined in section 751(c)(6) of the Act, the Secretary will apply paragraph (j)(1) of the Department's Regulations to any administrative review initiated in 1998 (19 C.F.R. 351.213(j) (1-2)).

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 351.305.

These initiatives and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: November 23, 1999.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Group II, AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 99-31415 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for final results of five-year ("sunset") Reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limit for the final results of seven expedited sunset reviews initiated on August 2, 1999 (64 FR 41915) covering various antidumping duty orders as well as a suspended countervailing duty investigation. Based on adequate responses from domestic interested parties and inadequate responses from respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting expedited sunset reviews to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders and suspended countervailing duty investigation would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy.

As a result of these extensions, the Department intends to issue its final results not later than February 28, 2000.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 3, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6397, or (202) 482-1560 respectively.

Extension of Final Results

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the 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; *see* section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act). The Department has determined that the sunset reviews of the following antidumping duty orders and suspended countervailing duty investigation are extraordinarily complicated:

A-588-815 Grey Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Japan

C-307-804 Grey Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Venezuela

A-588-817 Flat Panel Displays (Electroluminescent) from Japan

A-570-808 Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from the People's Republic of China

A-583-810 Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from Taiwan

A-557-805 Extruded Rubber Thread from Malaysia

A-823-802 Uranium from the Ukraine

Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews until not later than February 28, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.

Dated: November 29, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-31427 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-351-602, A-583-605, A-588-602, A-549-807, A-570-814]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and The People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset reviews: Certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and The People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On May 3, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("pipe fittings") from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and The People's Republic of China ("China") (64 FR 23596) 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 an adequate response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party and inadequate response (in these cases no response) from respondent interested parties in each of these reviews, the Department decided to conduct expedited reviews. As a result of these reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Reviews section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mark D. Young 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) 482-3207 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 3, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

These reviews were conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for conducting 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 (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 products covered by these reviews are pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China. Pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, and Japan are defined as carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings, other than couplings, under 14 inches in diameter, whether finished or unfinished form, that have been formed in the shape of elbows, tees, reducer, caps, etc., and, if forged, have been advanced after forging. These advancements may include any one or more of the following: coining, heat treatment, shot blasting, grinding, die stamping or painting. Such merchandise was classifiable under Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated ("TSUSA") item number 610.8800. These imports are currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") item number 7307.93.30.

Pipe fittings from Thailand and China are defined as carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings, having an inside diameter of less than 14 inches, imported in either finished or unfinished form. These formed or forged pipe fittings are used to join section in piping systems where conditions require permanent, welded connections, as distinguished from fittings based on other fastening methods (e.g., threaded grooved, or bolted fittings). These imports are currently classifiable under the HTSUS item number 7307.93.30. The TSUSA and HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and United States Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage for each of the orders.

These reviews cover imports from all manufacturers and exporters of pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China.

History of the Orders

Brazil

The Department published its final affirmative determination of sales at less than fair value ("LTFV") with respect to imports of pipe fittings from Brazil on October 24, 1986 (51 FR 37770). In this determination, the Department published one weighted-average dumping margin for all manufacturers

and exporters of pipe fittings. This margin was later affirmed when the Department published its antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from Brazil on December 17, 1986.¹ The Department has not conducted an administrative review of this order since its imposition. On at least five occasions, the Department published notices of intent to revoke the order, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(iii), on the grounds that four consecutive anniversary months had passed without a request for administrative review. On each occasion, an interested party, as defined under 19 CFR 353.2(k)(5), objected to our intent to revoke this antidumping duty order. Based on the objection, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(1)(i), the order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Brazil.²

Taiwan

On October 24, 1986, the Department issued its final affirmative determination of sales at LTFV regarding pipe fittings from Taiwan (51 FR 37772). The Department published its antidumping duty order on December 17, 1986.³ Since the order was issued, the Department has conducted two administrative reviews with respect to pipe fittings from Taiwan.⁴

In both reviews, the Department established four company-specific margins and an "all others" rate. The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Taiwan.

Japan

The Department published its final affirmative determination of sales at LTFV with respect to imports of pipe fittings from Japan on December 29, 1986 (51 FR 46892). In this determination, the Department published weighted-average dumping margins for two companies and an "all others" rate. These margins were later affirmed when the Department published its antidumping duty order

on pipe fittings from Japan on February 10, 1987.⁵ The Department has not conducted an administrative review of this order since its imposition. On at least five occasions, the Department published notices of intent to revoke the order, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4), on the grounds that four consecutive anniversary months had passed without a request for administrative review. On each occasion, an interested party under 19 CFR 353.2(k)(5) objected to our intent to revoke this antidumping duty order. Based on the objection, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(1)(i), the order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Japan.⁶

Thailand

On May 18, 1992, the Department issued its final affirmative determination of sales at LTFV with respect to imports of pipe fittings from Thailand (57 FR 21065). In this determination, the Department published weighted-average dumping margins for three companies as well as an "all others" rate. One of these companies' margin was found to be *de minimis*.⁷ These margins were later affirmed when the Department published its antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from Thailand on July 6, 1992.⁸ Since the order was issued, the Department has conducted one administrative review with respect to pipe fittings from Thailand.⁹ In that review, the Department calculated one company-specific margin. The order remains in effect for all Thai manufacturers and exporters of the

⁵ See Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Japan, 52 FR 4167 (February 10, 1987).

⁶ See Notices of Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Order, 58 FR 17380 (April 2, 1993); 59 FR 40006 (August 5, 1994); 60 FR 27720 (May 25, 1995); 61 FR 14291 (April 1, 1996); 62 FR 23218 (April 29, 1997).

⁷ Awaji Sangyo (Thailand) ("AST") was found to have a *de minimis* dumping margin and therefore was not included in the instant antidumping order. However, the Department commenced a separate LTFV investigation in 1994. In that investigation the Department concluded that AST was, at that time, dumping at levels above *de minimis*. However, an order was not imposed against AST as a result of the International Trade Commission's negative injury determination. See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand, 60 FR 10552 (February 27, 1995).

See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand, 60 FR 10552 (February 27, 1995).

⁸ See Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand, 57 FR 29702 (July 6, 1992).

⁹ See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of Administrative Review, 62 FR 40797 (July 30, 1997).

¹ See Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, 51 FR 45152 (December 17 1986).

² See Notices of Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Order, 57 FR 3994 (February 3, 1992); 59 FR 40006 (August 5, 1994); 60 FR 27720 (May 25, 1995); 61 FR 6973 (February 23, 1996); 62 FR 10523 (March 7, 1997).

³ See Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan, 51 FR 45152 (December 17, 1986).

⁴ See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Final Results of Administrative Review, 56 FR 20187 (May 2, 1991); Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Final Results of Administrative Review, 60 FR 49585 (September 26, 1995).

subject merchandise other than AST which was excluded from the order.

China

The Department published its final affirmative determination of sales at LTFV with respect to imports of pipe fittings from China on May 18, 1992 (57 FR 21058). In this determination, the Department published weighted-average dumping margins for six companies as well as an "all others" rate. These margins were subsequently amended when the Department published its antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from China on July 6, 1992.¹⁰ The Department has not conducted an administrative review of this order since its imposition. In 1994 the Department determined that China's antidumping duty order was being circumvented by parties that were shipping the subject merchandise to Thailand for finishing.¹¹ In that determination, the Department found that Chinese pipe fittings were being finished in Thailand by a Thai manufacturer and being sold to the United States as products of Thailand.¹² The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from China.

Background

On May 3, 1999, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China (64 FR 23596), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. We received Notices of Intent To Participate, in each of the five sunset reviews, on behalf of Trinity Fitting and Flange Group, Inc. ("TFFG"), Tube Forgings of America, Inc. ("TFA"), Mills Iron Works, Inc. ("Mills"), and Weldbend Corporation ("Weldbend") (collectively "domestic interested parties"), by May 18, 1999, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. Pursuant to section 771(9)(C) of the Act, the domestic

interested parties claimed interested-party status as U.S. manufacturers whose workers are engaged in the production of domestic like products. Moreover, the domestic interested parties stated that TFFG, TFA, and Mills were petitioners in the original investigation. The Department received complete substantive responses from the domestic interested parties by June 2, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the Sunset Regulations under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). We did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to these proceedings. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct expedited, 120-day, reviews of these orders.

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 (i.e., an order in effect on January 1, 1995). The reviews at issue concern transition orders within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, the Department determined that the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China are extraordinarily complicated and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews until not later than November 29, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.¹³

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted these reviews to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making these determinations, 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 duty order, and it shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins are discussed below. In

addition, parties' 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"), 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 duty 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 the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In these instant reviews, the Department did not receive a substantive 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 their substantive response, the domestic interested parties argue that the substantial decline (or cessation, with respect to Brazil) in the volume of imports of pipe fittings from the subject countries following the issuance of the orders demonstrates the inability of the producers from subject countries to sell in the United States at any significant volume without dumping. The domestic interested parties argue further that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by Brazilian, Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai,

¹⁰ See Antidumping Duty Order and Amendment to the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China, 57 FR 29702 (July 6, 1992).

¹¹ See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China; Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order, 59 FR 15155 (March 31, 1994).

¹² "Considered within the scope of the antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from the PRC are all imports from all producers into the United States of pipe fittings from Thailand, [which are exported in unfinished form from China to Thailand, where some finishing is performed] unless accompanied by a certificate stating that such pipe fittings have not been produced from unfinished Chinese pipe fittings." *Id.* at 15158.

¹³ See Tapered Roller Bearings, 4 Inches and Under From Japan, et. al.: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews, 64 FR 42672 (August 5, 1999).

and Chinese producers/manufacturers. They support this argument with evidence showing that, since the imposition of the orders, respondents have generally reduced their shipments to the United States. Therefore, they assert, were the antidumping duty orders revoked, it is likely that Brazilian, Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai, and Chinese producers would need to dump in order to sell their pipe fittings in any significant quantities in the United States.

Brazil

With respect to subject merchandise from Brazil, the domestic interested parties maintain that, in the years preceding the order, Brazil was a major foreign supplier of the subject merchandise to the U.S. market. Following the issuance of the order, they assert, Brazilian imports of the subject merchandise dropped sharply, and since 1992 have ceased completely. Furthermore, the domestic interested parties comment, deposit rates for Brazilian pipe fitting manufacturers continue to exist at 52.25 percent. In conclusion, they assert, cessation of imports and high dumping margins demonstrate that Brazilian manufacturers cannot maintain a presence in the U.S. market without dumping at levels above *de minimis*.¹⁴

Taiwan

The domestic interested parties assert that all four Taiwanese respondents have had dumping margins well above *de minimis* levels since the issuance of the order. In addition, they note that in the years preceding the order Taiwan was a leading exporter of the subject merchandise to the U.S. market. They argue that, following the issuance of the order, imports from Taiwan dropped to a level far below their pre-order level and have never been more than 55 percent of their pre-order level. The domestic interested parties conclude that Taiwanese importers need to dump pipe fittings in the U.S. market in order to sell at pre-order volumes. To corroborate this conclusion, the domestic interested parties note that the dumping margins for two Taiwanese manufacturers are extraordinarily high and they have never availed themselves of the administrative review process to demonstrate that their dumping has abated.¹⁵

¹⁴ See June 1, 1999, Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties regarding pipe fittings from Brazil at 7.

¹⁵ See June 1, 1999, Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties regarding pipe fittings from Taiwan at 7.

Japan:

The domestic interested parties argue that the imposition of the antidumping duty order had a dramatic effect on subject import volumes from Japan. They indicate that in the years following the order, imports of the subject merchandise from Japan dropped by nearly 95 percent. Moreover, they assert, import volumes of the subject pipe fittings from Japan have remained low, relative to the pre-order levels and the dumping margins for Japanese manufacturers remain very high, ranging from 30.83 to 65.81 percent. In sum, the domestic interested parties argue, the dramatic decline in import volumes following the imposition of the order in conjunction with the fact that Japanese manufacturers never availed themselves of the administrative review process to demonstrate that dumping has ceased or abated provides clear evidence that the Japanese producers are incapable of selling at fair value in the U.S. market.¹⁶

Thailand

With respect to imports of the subject merchandise from Thailand, the domestic interested parties assert that imports declined significantly after the imposition of the order and have remained at relatively low levels ever since. In fact, the domestic interested parties argue that by the time the order was published imports were only 68.3 percent of their pre-order levels. Therefore, despite the fact that one major manufacturer was originally exempt from the order, they contend that it is evident that Thai manufacturers need to dump pipe fittings in the U.S. market in order to sell at pre-order levels. To corroborate this conclusion the domestic interested parties argue that the only Thai supplier to have *de minimis* margins in the original investigation was forced to resort to dumping at a margin of 38 percent three years later in order to sell in the U.S. market.¹⁷

China

With respect to subject merchandise from China, the domestic interested parties maintain that, in the year the order was imposed, imports from China fell from approximately 30 million pounds the year before to 113,000 pounds. They argue further that, in the years following the imposition of the

order, average import volumes of the subject merchandise were more than 99.5 percent lower than in the years proceeding the issuance of the order. Therefore, the domestic interested parties argue that the near cessation of imports from China demonstrates that Chinese manufacturers need to dump pipe fittings in the U.S. market in order to sell at pre-order volumes. To support this conclusion the domestic interested parties assert that dumping margins from Chinese manufacturers are extraordinarily high, ranging from 35.06 to 182.90 percent. Yet, they contend, Chinese manufacturers never availed themselves of the administrative review process to demonstrate that their dumping has ceased or abated. They add that the Department's affirmative anti-circumvention determination¹⁸ shows that when Chinese manufacturers are confronted with the discipline of an order they resort to illegitimate means to participate in the U.S. market.¹⁹

General Discussion

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 dumping with the discipline of an order in place or imports ceased after the issuance of the order, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue or recur if the discipline were removed. As pointed out above, dumping margins at levels above *de minimis* continue to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China. With respect to Brazil, imports have ceased completely.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department also considers the volume of imports before and after issuance of the order. As outlined in each respective section above, the domestic interested parties argue that a significant decline in the volume of imports of the subject merchandise from Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China (and a cessation of imports with regard to Brazil) since the imposition of the orders provides further evidence that dumping would continue if the orders were revoked. In their substantive responses, the domestic interested parties provided statistics demonstrating the decline in import volumes of pipe fittings from Brazil,

¹⁸ See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China; Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order, 59 FR 15155 (March 31, 1994).

¹⁹ See June 1, 1999, Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties regarding pipe fittings from China at 7.

Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and China. The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties' arguments that imports of the subject merchandise fell sharply and ceased in Brazil's case after the orders were imposed and never regained pre-order volumes.

As noted above, in conducting its sunset reviews, the Department considered the weighted-average dumping margins and volume of imports in determining whether revocation of these antidumping duty orders would lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping. Based on this analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins at levels above *de minimis* and a reduction (or cessation) in export volumes after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. A deposit rate above *de minimis* continues in effect for exports of the subject merchandise by all known Brazilian, Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai,²⁰ and Chinese manufacturers/exporters. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the orders, import volumes have declined significantly or ceased after the imposition of the order, respondent parties have waived participation, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the orders were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

In the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department stated that normally it will 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.) To date, the Department has not issued any duty-absorption findings in any of these five cases.

²⁰ As noted above, AST was excluded from the 1992 order on pipe fittings from Thailand but was found to be dumping in a later investigation.

In their substantive response, the domestic interested parties recommended that, consistent with the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department provide to the Commission the company-specific margins from the original investigations. Moreover, regarding companies not reviewed in the original investigations, the domestic interested parties suggested that the Department report the "all others" rates included in the original investigations.

The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties. The Department finds that the margins calculated in the original investigations are probative of the behavior of Brazilian, Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai, and Chinese manufacturers/exporters if the orders were revoked as they are the only margins which reflect their actions absent the discipline of the order.

In the Sunset Policy Bulletin we indicated that, consistent with the SAA at 889-90 and the House Report at 63, declining imports accompanied by the continued existence of dumping margins, or the cessation of imports after the order, provides a strong indication that dumping would be likely to continue, because such evidence indicates that the particular exporter needs to dump to sell at pre-order volumes. Based on our review of the information submitted by the interested parties, data from our original investigations, and subsequent administrative reviews, we determine that Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai, and Chinese pipe fitting manufacturers have continued to dump with the discipline of the order in place. In contrast, Brazilian pipe fitting manufacturers have ceased exporting the subject merchandise completely. This implies that these pipe-fitting manufacturers could not sell the subject merchandise in the United States at pre-order volumes without resorting to dumping.

Therefore, the Department will report to the Commission the company-specific and all others rates from the original investigations as contained in the Final Results of Reviews section of this notice.

Final Results of Reviews

As a result of these reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Brazil:	
All Manufacturers/Producers/exporters	52.25
Taiwan:	
Rigid	6.84
C.M.	8.57
Gei Bay	87.30
Chup Hsin	87.30
All Others	49.46
Japan:	
Awajoi Sangyo, K.K.	30.83
Nippon Benkan Kogyo, Ltd. Co.	65.81
All Others	62.79
Thailand:²¹	
Thai Benkan Company	50.84
TTU Industrial Corp., Ltd.	10.68
Awaji Sangyo Co., Ltd.	38.41
All Others	39.10
China:	
China North Industries Corporation	154.72
Jilin Provincial Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.	75.23
Liaoning Machinery & Equipment Import Export Corp.	134.79
Liaoning Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	103.70
Shenyang Billiongold Pipe Fittings Co. Ltd.	110.39
Shandong Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	35.06
Shenyang Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp; Liaoning Metals; Shenzhen Machinery Industry Corp.; and All Others	182.90

²¹ AST was excluded from this order. Although a dumping margin was later found, an order was not imposed against AST as a result of the Commission's negative injury determination.

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: November 29, 1999.

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

[FR Doc. 99-31426 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P