

Brass, 57 FR 20460. Thus, if the record evidence, subject to verification, demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the former company, the Department may assign the new company a cash deposit rate of its predecessor. *See e.g. Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Final Results of Changes Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999). In addition, in the event that the Department concludes that expedited action is warranted, 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) permits the Department to combine the notices of initiation and preliminary results.

The Department concludes that it would be inappropriate to expedite this action pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) by issuing a preliminary determination prior to conducting an investigation in the instant case. The Department may need additional information regarding the Hyundai-LG Semicon merger which would make expedited action impracticable. Therefore, the Department is not issuing preliminary results of its changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review at this time.

The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i), which will set forth the factual and legal conclusions upon which our preliminary results are based, and a description of any action proposed based on those results. Interested parties may submit comment for consideration in the Department's preliminary results not later than 20 days after publication of this notice. Responses to those comments may be submitted no later than 10 days following submission of the comments. All written comments must be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303, and must be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** the final results of the changed circumstances review within 270 days after the date on which the changed circumstances review is initiated, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e). This initiation of review notice is in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 6, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-32227 Filed 12-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-489-805]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Pasta from Turkey

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

SUMMARY: On August 9, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Turkey. This review covers shipments to the United States by two respondents during the period of review July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998.

For our final results, we have found no margin or a de minimis margin for the two respondents.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 13, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Brinkmann, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4126.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Case History

This review covers two manufacturers/exporters of merchandise subject to the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Turkey: Pastavilla Kartal Makarnacilik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Pastavilla) and Maktas Makarnacilik ve Tic. A.S. (Maktas).

On August 9, 1998, the Department published the preliminary results of this review. *See Notice of Preliminary*

Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Pasta from Turkey, 64 FR 43157 (August 9, 1999) (*Preliminary Results*). On September 15, 1999, we received a case brief from Maktas. We did not receive any rebuttal briefs, and no public hearing was requested.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta in packages of five pounds (2.27 kilograms) or less, whether or not enriched or fortified or containing milk or other optional ingredients such as chopped vegetables, vegetable purees, milk, gluten, diastases, vitamins, coloring and flavorings, and up to two percent egg white. The pasta covered by this scope is typically sold in the retail market, in fiberboard or cardboard cartons, or polyethylene or polypropylene bags, of varying dimensions.

Excluded from the scope of this review are refrigerated, frozen, or canned pastas, as well as all forms of egg pasta, with the exception of non-egg dry pasta containing up to two percent egg white.

The merchandise subject to review is currently classifiable under item 1902.19.20 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)*. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under order is dispositive.

Scope Rulings

The Department has issued the following scope ruling to date:

(1) On October 26, 1998, the Department self-initiated a scope inquiry to determine whether a package weighing over five pounds as a result of allowable industry tolerances may be within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. On May 24, 1999, we issued a final scope ruling finding that, effective October 26, 1998, pasta in packages weighing or labeled up to (and including) five pound four ounces is within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. *See Memorandum from John Brinkmann to Richard Moreland*, dated May 24, 1999.

Price Comparisons

We calculated constructed export price (CEP), export price (EP), and normal value based on the same methodology used in the *Preliminary Results*, with the following exception.

Maktas

We did not make a claimed billing adjustment for foreign currency exchange gain. *See* Comment 1.

Cost of Production

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results*, we conducted an investigation to determine whether Maktas and Pastavilla made home market sales of the foreign like product during the period of review ("POR") at prices below their cost of production ("COP") within the meaning of section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

We calculated the COP for these final results following the same methodology as in the preliminary results. For both Maktas and Pastavilla, we found 20 percent or more of the sales of a given product during the 12 month period were at prices less than the weighted-average COP for the POR. Thus we determined that these below-cost sales have been made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time, and that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B), (C), and (D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of these final results, we disregarded these below-cost sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. As noted above, we received a case brief from Maktas.

Comment 1: Billing Adjustment

Maktas argues that for the sales to one of its customers, the Department incorrectly deducted a billing adjustment from Maktas' U.S. price in the preliminary results. Maktas contends that this billing adjustment reflects a foreign exchange gain based on a payment term, and therefore, should be added to its U.S. price.

DOC Position: We agree with Maktas, in part, that we should not deduct the "billing adjustment" from Maktas' U.S. price. However, we disagree with Maktas that this billing adjustment should be added to its U.S. price. For these final results, this alleged "billing adjustment" was neither subtracted from nor added to Maktas' U.S. price. Rather, because the sale price was originally set in U.S. dollars, we have used the agreed upon U.S. dollar price per ton for these final results. Since no currency conversion is involved under our methodology, the billing adjustment

in question becomes a moot issue. *See* memorandum from Cindy Robinson to the file, *Analysis Memorandum for Maktas Makarnacilik ve Tic. A.S.*, December 7, 1999.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we find that the following margins exist for the period July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Maktas Makarnacilik Sanayi ve Tic. A.S..	0.29 (de minimis)
Pastavilla Kartal Makarnacilik Sanayi Ticaret A.S..	0.00

The Department shall determine, and the United States Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212 (b)(1), we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates by dividing the dumping margin found on the subject merchandise examined by the entered value of such merchandise. We will direct the United States Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise entered during the POR, except where the assessment rate is zero or de minimis (*see* 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2)).

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales during the review period.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption upon publication of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(A) and (C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Maktas and Pastavilla will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any

previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 51.49 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey*, 61 FR 38545 (July 24, 1996).

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

This notice serves as final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred, and in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 7, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-32226 Filed 12-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-847]

Persulfates from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On August 6, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China. *See Persulfates from the People's*