

Bulletin, the Department's schedule of sunset reviews, case history information (e.g., previous margins, duty absorption determinations, scope language, import volumes), and service lists, available to the public on the Department's sunset internet website at the following address: "http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/sunset/".

All submissions in the sunset review must be filed in accordance with the Department's regulations regarding format, translation, service, and certification of documents. These rules can be found at 19 CFR 351.303 (1999). Also, we suggest that parties check the Department's sunset website for any updates to the service list before filing any submissions. The Department will make additions to and/or deletions from the service list provided on the sunset website based on notifications from parties and participation in this review. Specifically, the Department will delete from the service list all parties that do not submit a substantive response to the notice of initiation.

Because deadlines in a sunset review are, in many instances, very short, we urge interested parties to apply for access to proprietary information under administrative protective order ("APO") immediately following publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation of the sunset review. The Department's regulations on submission of proprietary information and eligibility to receive access to business proprietary information under APO can be found at 19 CFR 351.304-306 (see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Administrative Protective Order Procedures; Procedures for Imposing Sanctions for Violation of a Protective Order*, 63 FR 24391 (May 4, 1998)).

Information Required From Interested Parties

Domestic interested parties (defined in 19 CFR 351.102 (1999)) wishing to participate in the sunset review must respond not later than 15 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation by filing a notice of intent to participate. The required contents of the notice of intent to participate are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(ii). We note that the Department considers each of the orders listed above as separate and distinct orders and, therefore, requires order-specific submissions. In accordance with the *Sunset Regulations*, if we do not receive a notice of intent to participate from at least one domestic interested party by the 15-day deadline,

the Department will automatically revoke the order without further review.

If we receive an order-specific notice of intent to participate from a domestic interested party, the *Sunset Regulations* provide that *all parties* wishing to participate in the sunset review must file substantive responses not later than 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation. The required contents of a substantive response, on an order-specific basis, are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3). Note that certain information requirements differ for foreign and domestic parties. Also, note that the Department's information requirements are distinct from the International Trade Commission's information requirements. Please consult the *Sunset Regulations* for information regarding the Department's conduct of sunset reviews.¹ Please consult the Department's regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (1999) for definitions of terms and for other general information concerning antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings at the Department.

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

Dated: December 21, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-33963 Filed 12-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-428-802; A-475-802; A-599-802; A-588-807]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Industrial Belts From Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Industrial Belts from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan.

SUMMARY: On June 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated sunset reviews of

¹ A number of parties commented that these interim-final regulations provided insufficient time for rebuttals to substantive responses to a notice of initiation (*Sunset Regulations*, 19 CFR 351.218(d)(4)). As provided in 19 CFR 351.302(b) (1999), the Department will consider individual requests for extension of that five-day deadline based upon a showing of good cause.

the antidumping duty orders on industrial belts from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan (64 FR 29261) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of The Gates Rubber Company, a domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in these cases, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined 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 continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the *Final Results of Reviews* 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, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1698 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 30, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

These reviews were conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*"), and in 19 CFR Part 351 (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 the antidumping duty orders on Germany and Japan includes industrial belts other than V-belts and synchronous belts used for power transmission, in part or wholly of rubber or plastic, and containing textile fiber (including glass fiber) or steel wire, cord or strand, and whether in endless (i.e., closed loops) belts, or in belting in lengths or links from Germany and Japan.¹ The

¹ See *Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Industrial Belts and Components*

Continued

antidumping duty order on imports from Italy covers industrial V-belts and synchronous belts and components used for power transmission, in part or wholly of rubber or plastic, and containing textile fiber (including glass fiber) or steel wire, cord or strand, and whether in endless (*i.e.*, closed loops) belts, or in belting in lengths or links.² The antidumping duty order on imports from Singapore includes industrial V-belts used for power transmission. These include industrial V-belts, in part or wholly of rubber or plastic, and containing textile fiber (including glass fiber) or steel wire, cord or strand, and whether in endless (*i.e.*, closed loops) belts, or in belting in lengths or links.³

The above orders exclude conveyor belts and automotive belts as well as front engine drive belts found on equipment powered by internal combustion engines, including trucks, tractors, buses, and lift truck.

The subject merchandise was classifiable under Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated ("TSUSA") item numbers 358.0210, 358.0290, 358.0610, 358.0690, 358.0800, 358.0900, 358.1100, 358.1400, 358.1600, 657.2520,

773.3510, and 773.3520 in the orders for all four countries. Currently, subject merchandise is classifiable under item numbers 3926.90.55, 3926.90.56, 3926.90.57, 3926.90.59, 3926.90.60, 4010.10.10, 4010.10.50, 4010.91.11, 4010.91.15, 4010.91.50, 4010.99.11, 4010.99.15, 4010.99.19, 4010.99.50, 5910.00.10, 5910.00.90 and 7326.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS").⁴

In its substantive response, The Gates Rubber Company ("Gates") asserts that the HTSUS subheadings of Chapter 40 were significantly revised in 1996, and, as a result, the products covered by the orders became classifiable under HTSUS numbers 3626.90.55, 3926.90.56, 3926.90.57, 3926.90.59, 3926.90.60, 4010.21.30, 4010.21.60, 4010.22.30, 4010.22.60, 4010.23.30, 4010.23.41, 4010.23.45, 4010.23.50, 4010.23.90, 4010.24.30, 4010.24.41, 4010.24.45, 4010.24.50, 4010.24.90, 4010.29.10, 4010.29.20, 4010.29.30, 4010.29.41, 4010.29.45, 4010.29.50, 4010.29.90, 5910.00.10, 5910.00.90, and 7326.20.00.⁵ U.S. Customs officials confirmed the accuracy of the HTSUS numbers for subject merchandise

suggested by Gates.⁶ However, the above HTSUS and TSUSA subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes and the written description remains dispositive.

The Department has made the following scope rulings for the orders on imports from Germany, Italy, and Japan:

With respect to the order on subject imports from Germany, the Department's sole administrative review clarified that the scope of the order includes round belts and flat belts (56 FR 9672, March 7, 1991). Additionally, the Department determined in a 1991 scope ruling, that the scope of the order includes nylon core flat belts and excludes spindle belting.⁷

With respect to the order on subject imports from Italy, the Department, in the February 24, 1993, Scope Ruling, determined that "Panther" industrial belts from Pirelli Power Corp. are within the scope of the order (58 FR 11209).

With respect to the order on subject imports from Japan, the Department has made several scope rulings. The following products were determined within the scope of the order:

Product within scope	Importer	Citation
V-volt model 5L118	Japan Freight Consolidators (Calif.) Inc.	57FR 16602 (May 7, 1992).
Closed loop synthetic timing belt used in the Epson LX-800 desk-top personal computer printer.	Tower Group International, Inc. and Epson America, Inc.	58 FR 47124 (September 7, 1993).

The following products were determined to be not within the scope of the order:

Product outside scope	Importer	Citation
59011 series of belts	Kawasaki Motors Corp., USA	57 FR 19692 (May 7, 1992).
Certain round and flat belts which are composed of rubber or plastics but are not reinforced with a tensile member.	Matsushita Electric Corp., Matsushita Floor Care Company and Panasonic Company.	57 FR 57420 (December 4, 1992).
Conveyor Belts of five-series comprised of 30 models	Nitta Industries Corp., and Nitta International, Inc	58 FR 59991 (November 12, 1993).
Eight-drive and blade belts	Honda Power Equipment Manufacturing Inc	62 FR 30569 (June 4, 1997).
Twenty-two drive and blade belts	American Honda Motor Co	62 FR 30569 (June 4, 1997).

and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From the Federal Republic of Germany (54 FR 25316, March 17, 1991), and Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Japan, 54 FR 25314 (June 14, 1989).

² See Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Italy, 54 FR 25313 (June 14, 1989).

³ See Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Singapore, 54 FR 25315 (June 14, 1989).

⁴ Subject merchandise from Germany excludes item numbers 3926.90.55, 4010.10.10, and 4010.10.50; subject merchandise from Singapore excludes item numbers 3926.90.56, 3926.90.57, 3926.90.59, 3926.90.60, 4010.91.11, 4010.91.15, 4010.91.19, 4010.99.11, 4010.99.15, 4010.99.19, and 4010.99.50.

⁵ According to Gates, subject merchandise from Germany excludes item numbers 3926.90.55, 4010.21.30, 4010.21.60, 4010.22.30, 4010.22.60, 4010.23.30, 4010.23.41, 4010.23.45, 4010.23.50, 4010.23.90, 4010.24.30, 4010.24.41, 4010.24.45, 4010.24.50, 4010.24.90, 4010.29.10, and 4010.29.20 (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates at 3); and subject merchandise from Singapore

excludes item numbers 3926.90.56, 3926.90.57, 3926.90.59, 4010.23.30, 4010.23.41, 4010.23.45, 4010.23.50, 4010.23.90, 4010.24.30, 4010.24.41, 4010.24.45, 4010.24.50, 4010.24.90, 4010.29.30, 4010.29.41, 4010.29.45, 4010.29.50, 4010.29.90 for imports (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates at 3).

⁶ See Memo to File of telephone conversation with George Barthes, U.S. Customs official, regarding new HTSUS numbers for industrial belts.

⁷ See Scope Rulings, 56 FR 57320 (November 8, 1991).

History of the Orders

Germany

In the original investigation, covering the period January 1, 1988, through June 30, 1988, the Department determined the dumping margins to be 100.60 percent *ad valorem* for Optibelt Corporation ("Optibelt"), the Germany company investigated, and "all others" (54 FR 15505, April 18, 1989).

Since the issuance of the order, there has been one administrative review, covering the period February 1, 1989, through May 31, 1990, in which the Department determined a dumping margin of 100.60 percent *ad valorem* for Volkmann GmbH ("Volkmann"), the German respondent subject to the review.⁸

Italy

In the original investigation, covering the period January 1, 1988, through June 30, 1988, the Department determined a dumping margin of 74.90 percent *ad valorem* percent for Pirelli Trasmissioni Industriali, S.p.A. ("Pirelli"), and "all others."⁹

There have been two administrative reviews of this order. In the first review, covering the period from February 1, 1989, through May 31, 1990, the Department determined a dumping margin of 60.38 percent *ad valorem* for Pirelli;¹⁰ in the second review, covering the period June 1, 1990, through May 31, 1991, the dumping margin for Pirelli increased to 70.90 percent.¹¹

Singapore

In the original investigation, covering the period January 1, 1988, through June 30, 1988, the Department determined the dumping margin for Mitsuboshi Belting (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. ("MBS"), a subsidiary of Mitsuboshi Belting Ltd. of Japan, and "all others", to be 31.73 percent *ad valorem*.¹²

There have been two completed administrative reviews and one terminated review of this order. The Department determined a dumping margin of 31.73 percent *ad valorem* for MBS in the first review¹³ covering the period February 1, 1989, through May 31, 1990, and in the second review, covering the period June 1, 1990 through May 31, 1991.¹⁴ A third review, covering the period June 1, 1991, through May 31, 1992, was terminated before a preliminary determination was issued (58 FR 53707, October 18, 1993).

Japan

In the original investigation, covering the period January 1, 1988, through June 30, 1988, the Department determined a dumping margin of 93.16 percent *ad valorem* for Bando Chemical Industries ("Bando") and "all others" (54 FR 15485, April 18, 1989).

There have been five administrative reviews of this order. In the first review, covering the period June 7, 1989, through May 31, 1990, the Department determined a dumping margin of 93.16 percent *ad valorem* for Bando, and 52.60 percent for Nitta Industries ("Nitta") and Mitsuboshi Belting Limited ("MBL").¹⁵ In the second administrative review, covering the period June 1, 1990, through May 31, 1991, we determined that the dumping margin for MBL was 93.16 percent.¹⁶

In the third and fourth administrative reviews, covering the periods June 1, 1991, through May 31, 1992, and June 1, 1992, through May 31, 1993, respectively, the Department determined a dumping margin of 93.16 percent for MBL (59 FR 1373, January 10, 1994). The dumping margin continued at 93.16 for MBL in the fifth review, covering the period June 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994 (60 FR 39929, August 4, 1995).

At the request of Brecoflex Corporation ("Brecoflex"), the Department initiated a circumvention inquiry on October 18, 1993; however, the Department did not make a determination regarding the merits of

the inquiry because it determined that Brecoflex lacked standing as a domestic producer of a like-product (56 FR 23693, May 6, 1994).

Background

On June 1, 1999, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping orders on industrial belts from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan (64 FR 29261), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of Gates within the applicable deadline (June 16, 1998) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations* from all four countries. As the petitioner in the original investigations and a participant in each of the respective administrative reviews, Gates claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a U.S. producer of the domestic like product. Subsequently, we received Gates' complete substantive responses to the notice of initiation on July 1, 1999. Without a substantive response from respondent interested parties, the Department, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), determined to conduct expedited, 120-day reviews of these orders.

In accordance with 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). On October 12, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on industrial belts from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan are extraordinarily complicated and, therefore, the Department extended the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews until not later than December 28, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.¹⁷

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 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 duty order, and

⁸ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from the Federal Republic of Germany; Final Results of an Antidumping Administrative Review*, 56 FR 9672 (March 7, 1991).

⁹ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Italy; Amendment of Final Results of an Antidumping Administrative Review*, 57 FR 32196 (July 21, 1992).

¹⁰ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured from Italy; Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 8295 (March 9, 1992).

¹¹ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Italy; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 30938 (July 13, 1992).

¹² See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Singapore*, 54 FR 15489 (April 18, 1989).

¹³ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Singapore; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 41916 (September 14, 1992).

¹⁴ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Singapore; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 29469 (July 2, 1992).

¹⁵ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 30018 (May 25, 1993).

¹⁶ See *Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 44496 (August 23, 1993).

¹⁷ See *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 55233 (October 12, 1999).

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 margin are discussed below. In addition, Gates' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin for each of the orders 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 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 significantly (see section II.A.3).

In addition to consideration of 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 reviews, 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.

Gates argues that because manufacturers/exporters of industrial belts from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan have continued to dump the subject merchandise covered by the 1989 orders and dumping margins are consistently very high, the Department

should determine that revocation of the orders would likely lead to further dumping (see July 1, 1999 Substantive Responses of Gates (Germany and Singapore at 6; Japan and Italy at 7)).

With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, Gates notes that German manufacturers/exporters continue to dump, albeit at reduced volumes, and continue to be subject to high margin rates of 100.60 percent (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates at 8). Similarly, according to the Gates, Italian, Singaporean and Japanese manufacturers/exporters have continued to dump since the issuance of the respective orders. Gates notes the high margin rates of 74.90 percent, 31.73 percent and 93.16 percent for Italian, Singaporean, and Japanese manufacturers/producers, respectively (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Responses of Gates (Italy at 9; Singapore at 8; and Japan at 10)).

With respect to whether import volumes of the subject merchandise declined significantly, Gates notes that, although the average volume of imports industrial belts from Germany, Japan and Italy decreased following the imposition of the orders, dumping has not been entirely eliminated (see July 1, 1999, Substantive responses of Gates (Germany at 9; Japan and Italy, respectively, at 8)).

Finally, Gates asserts that dumping would likely become severe if the orders were revoked because the market for industrial belts is a mature market characterized by intense price competition (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Responses of Gates (Germany and Singapore at 9; Italy at 10 and Japan at 11)). Moreover, given that Asia remains in a recession, the U.S. market is an attractive target for manufacturers/exporters from Japan and Singapore (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Responses of Gates (Singapore at 9; Japan at 11)).

In conclusion, Gates argues that, in each case, the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would continue upon revocation of the orders because manufacturers/exporters have continued to import into the United States even as dumping margins remain very high.

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, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the

discipline were removed. In these cases, dumping margins above *de minimis* continue to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from all manufacturers/exporters from the subject countries.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department also considered the volume of imports before and after issuance of the orders. By examining U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports, the Department finds that, consistent with import statistics provided by Gates, imports of the subject merchandise from Germany, Italy and Japan decreased following the issuance of the orders, from 1989 through 1995. During this period, average imports from Germany and Japan decreased approximately 95 percent during this period, average imports from Italy decreased approximately 30 percent; and imports from Singapore ceased altogether. In 1996, imports from all four countries increased and remained generally steady until 1998; however, imports from Germany, Japan, and Singapore were significantly lower than pre-order levels. In contrast, Italian imports from 1996 to 1998 exceeded pre-order levels by approximately 25 percent.

Therefore, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the orders is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation of recurrence of dumping. Deposit rates for exports of the subject merchandise by all known manufacturers and exporters from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan are above *de minimis*. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the orders, respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in these reviews before the Department, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the orders 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 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 section II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

Gates asserts that the Department should provide to the Commission the company-specific margins and the "all others" rates determined in the original investigations of imports from Germany, Italy, Singapore, and Japan (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Responses of Gates (Germany and Singapore, respectively, at 10; Japan at 11; Italy at 12)) as the rates likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Specifically, Gates notes that, in the original investigation of subject imports from Germany, the Department determined a margin of 100.60 percent for Optibelt and "all others." Subsequently, in the sole administrative review, the Department determined a rate of 100.60 percent for Volkmann. Therefore, they argue that the Department should provide to the Commission the original margin of 100.60 percent for Optibelt and "all others" as determined in the investigation (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates (Germany) at 11).

For Italian manufacturers/exporters, gates asserts that the 74.90 percent margin in the final determination and most recent review of the order on imports from Italy demonstrates the high probability of continued dumping were the order were revoked. Gates concludes, therefore, that the original rate should be applicable to Pirelli and "all others" (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates (Italy) at 12).

For manufacturers/exporters from Singapore, Gates asserts that the Department should provide to the Commission the margin of 31.73 percent from the original investigation for MBS and "all others" (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates (Singapore) at 10). The Department also applied this rate to MBS in subsequent administrative reviews.

Finally, for Japanese manufacturers/exporters, Gates notes that the original margin of 93.16 percent continued in the administrative reviews of the order on imports from Japan. Therefore, Gates argues, a rate of 93.16 percent should be applicable to Bando and all other companies not specifically investigated in the investigation (see July 1, 1999, Substantive Response of Gates at 11).

The Department agrees with Gates' arguments concerning the choice of margins to report to the Commission for each of the countries. As noted in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the rates from the original investigation are the only rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the order. In these reviews, we find no

reason to deviate from our stated policy. Therefore, consistent with section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department finds that the original rates are probative of the behavior of manufacturers/exporters from Germany, Italy, Singapore and Japan were the orders revoked. As such, 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 Review

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

Country and manufacturer /exporter	Margin (percent)
Germany:	
Optibelt Corporation	100.60
All Others	100.60
Italy:	
Pirelli	74.90
All Others	74.90
Singapore:	
Mitsuboshi Belting (Singapore) Pte. Lte	31.73
All Others	31.73
Japan:	
Bando	93.16
All Others	93.16

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.

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

Dated: December 23, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-33976 Filed 12-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-412-805; A-428-807; A-570-805]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Sulfur Chemicals (Sodium Thiosulfate) From the United Kingdom, Germany, 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: sulfur chemicals (sodium thiosulfate) from the United Kingdom, Germany, and the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On July 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on sulfur chemicals (sodium thiosulfate) from the United Kingdom, Germany, and the People's Republic of China (64 FR 35588) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of Calabrian Corporation, a domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in these cases, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined 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 continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the *Final Results of Reviews* 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: December 30, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

These reviews were conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations"), and in 19 CFR Part 351 (1999) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the