Uruguay Round Agreements Act (245 days after the last day of the anniversary month), pursuant to section 751(a)(3)A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until August 4, 1999. *See* Memorandum from Bernard T. Carreau to Robert LaRussa, on file in the Central Records Unit located in room B–099 of the main Department of Commerce building (July 2, 1999).

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)A) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: July 7, 1999.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–17800 Filed 7–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–822]

Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that sales of certain helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China by Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd. were not made below normal value during the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 13, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or Vincent Kane, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3464 or 482-2815, respectively.

Applicable Statute

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, as amended (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 are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On October 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers (HSLWs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (58 FR 53914). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on October 9, 1998 (63 FR 54440). The petitioner, Shakeproof Industrial Products Division of Illinois Tool Works, Inc., and the respondent, Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co. (ZWG) (also known as Hangzhou Spring Washer Plant), requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of ZWG. These requests were received on October 29 and 30, 1998, respectively. The notice of initiation of this administrative review was published on November 30, 1998 (63 FR 65748). On December 14, 1998, we issued questionnaires to ZWG as well as to the President of China Chamber of Commerce for Machinery and Electronics' Products Import and Export and other PRC governmental entities. We received responses to our questionnaire from ZWG on February 11 and 17, 1999.

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with Section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are HSLWs of carbon steel, of carbon alloy steel, or of stainless steel, heat-treated or non-heat-treated, plated or non-plated, with ends that are off-line. HSLWs are designed to: (1) Function as a spring to compensate for developed looseness between the component parts of a fastened assembly; (2) distribute the load over a larger area for screws or bolts; and, (3) provide a hardened bearing surface. The scope does not include internal or external tooth washers, nor does it include spring lock washers made of other metals, such as copper.

HSLWs subject to this review are currently classifiable under subheading 7318.21.0030 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 scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers the period from October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998.

Separate Rates Determination

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this policy, exporters in nonmarket economies (NMEs) are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with the individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and, (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: (1) Whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and, (4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. (*See Silicon Carbide,* 59 FR at 22587 and *Sparklers,* 56 FR at 20589.)

In each of the previous administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on HSLWs from the PRC, covering successive review periods from October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1997, we determined that ZWG merited a separate rate. We have found that the evidence on the record of this review also demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to ZWG's export activities according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers,* and an absence of government control with respect to the additional criteria identified in *Silicon Carbide.* Therefore, we have continued to assign ZWG a separate rate.

Export Price

Because ZWG sold the subject merchandise to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and the constructed export price methodology is not otherwise indicated, we have used export price in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act.

We calculated export price based on the f.o.b. price to unaffiliated purchasers. From this price, we deducted amounts for foreign inland freight and brokerage and handling. We valued these deductions using surrogate country cost data. We selected India as the surrogate country for the reasons explained in the ''Normal Value'' section of this notice.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine normal value (NV) using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) The merchandise is exported from an NME, and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act. The Department has treated the PRC as an NME in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Moreover, parties to this proceeding have not argued that the PRC HSLW industry is a market-oriented industry and, consequently, we have no basis to determine that the information would permit the calculation of NV using PRC prices or costs. Therefore, we calculated NV based on factors of production (FOP) in accordance with sections 773(c)(3) and (4) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.408(c).

Under the FOP methodology, we are required to value the NME producer's inputs in a comparable market economy country that is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. We determined that India is at a comparable level of economic development to that of the PRC. Also, India is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. Therefore, for this review, we have used Indian prices to value the FOP except where the factor was purchased from a market economy supplier and paid for in a market economy currency. (*See* Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach from Jeff May, dated March 15, 1999, ''Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC: Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' which is on file in the CRU-Public File.)

We selected, where possible, publicly available values from India which were: (1) average non-export values; (2) representative of a range of prices within the POR or most contemporaneous with the POR; (3) product-specific; and, (4) tax-exclusive. We valued the factors of production as follows:

- ZWG purchased a meaningful amount of carbon steel wire rod from the United Kingdom, a market economy supplier, and paid for in a market economy currency. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.408(c)(1), we valued this factor using the price paid to the market economy supplier. Thus, for carbon steel wire rod values, we used the average cost per metric ton of carbon steel wire rod imported from the United Kingdom by ZWG during the period of review.
- For the value of chemicals used in the production and plating process of HSLWs, we used per kilogram values obtained from the Indian publication *Chemical Weekly* from the *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India-Imports* (*MFTI*). We adjusted these values, where appropriate, to reflect inflation through the POR using the Wholesale Price Index (WPI) as reported in the *International Financial Statistics* published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We also adjusted these values to account for freight costs incurred between the supplier and ZWG.
- To value coal, we used a per kilogram value obtained from the *MFTI*. We adjusted this value to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. We also adjusted this amount to account for freight costs incurred between the supplier and ZWG.
- To value electricity, we used the price of electricity for 1995 reported in *Energy Prices and Taxes, Fourth Quarter 1998,* a publication of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We adjusted the value to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value water, we used the 1997 *Water Utilities Data Book for the Asian and Pacific Region* published by the Asian Development Bank.
- For labor, we used the regression-based wage rate for the PRC in ''Expected Wages of Selected NME Countries,'' located on the Internet at http:0\\www.ita.doc.gov\ import__admin\ records\wages\. Because of the variability of wage rates in countries with similar per capita GDP's, 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3) requires the use of a regression-based wage rate. The source for the wage rates is ''Expected Wages of Selected NME Countries—1997 Income Data,'' *1998 Year Book of Labour Statistics,* International Labour Office, (Geneva: 1998) Chapter 5B: Wages in Manufacturing.
- For factory overhead, selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit values, we used information from the January, 1997 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin* for the Indian industry group ''Processing and Manufacturing: Metals, Chemicals, and Products Thereof.'' From this information, we were able to determine factory overhead as a percentage of the total cost of manufacturing, SG&A as a percentage of the total cost of manufacturing, and the profit rate as a percentage of the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A.
- For packing materials, we used the per kilogram values obtained from the *MFTI*. Where necessary, we adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. We also adjusted them to account for freight costs incurred between the PRC supplier and ZWG.
- To value foreign brokerage and handling, we used information reported in *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India* in a document dated May 12, 1998.
- To value truck freight, we used a rate derived from the April 20, 1994, issue of *The Times of India*. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value rail freight, we used rate information published by the Indian Railway Conference Association for rates in force from April 1, 1995. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.
- To value shipping freight, we used a rate reported to the Department in the August, 1993 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India which was submitted for and used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China,* 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993). We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation through the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

For a complete description of the factor values used, *see* ''Memorandum to File: Factor Values Used for the Preliminary Results of the Fourth Administrative Review,'' dated July 6, 1999 (Factors Memorandum) a public version of which is available in the Public File.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd.	10/01/97–09/30/98	0.00

Within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224, the Department will disclose its calculations. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held approximately 37 days after the publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written comments (case briefs) within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal comments (rebuttal briefs), which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised by the parties, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. If there is no change in the margin for the final results, we will instruct Customs to liquidate the entries made during the POR without regard to antidumping duties. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of HSLWs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for ZWG, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC rate, which is 128.63 percent, which is the All Other PRC Manufacturers, Producers and Exporters rate from the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the PRC*, 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993); and (3) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

These deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 6, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–17802 Filed 7–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Secretary Daley's Trade Mission To The Middle East

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of trade mission to the Middle East.

SUMMARY: This notice serves to inform the public of a Secretarial Trade Mission to the Middle East, October 9–18, 1999, and of the opportunity to apply for participation in the mission; sets forth objectives, procedures, and participation criteria for the mission; and requests applications.

DATES: Applications should be submitted to Lucie Naphin by August 18, 1999, in order to ensure sufficient time to obtain in-country appointments for applicants selected to participate in the mission. Applications received after that date will be considered only if space and scheduling constraints permit. The mission is scheduled to travel to Egypt, Israel, the West Bank, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

ADDRESSES: Request for and submission of applications—Applications are available from Lucie Naphin, Director of the office of Business Liaison, at (202) 482–1360 or via facsimile at (202) 482–4054. Numbers listed in this notice are not toll-free. An original and two copies of the required application materials should be sent to Ms. Naphin. Applications sent by facsimile must be immediately followed by submission of the original application to Ms. Naphin at the following address: Office of Business Liaison, Room 5062, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, N.W. Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lucie Naphin at (202) 482-1360. Information is also available via the International Trade Administration's (ITA) Internet home page at: ''http://www.ita.doc.gov'

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Trade Mission Description

Secretary of Commerce William M. Daley will lead two trade missions to the Middle East in October, 1999. He will lead a business development mission to Egypt, Israel, Gaza/West Bank, and Jordan October 9–15, 1999 and a business development mission to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.) October 15–18, 1999.

Egypt, Israel, Gaza/West Bank, and Jordan

In Jordan, Israel, Gaza/West Bank, and Egypt, the focus of the mission will be on commercial opportunities presented by the liberalization of these countries' economies and the privatization of key industry sectors. The delegation will include 10–15 U.S. company executives of large, medium and small firms representing the following key sectors: information technology, including computer hardware, software development, and telecommunications; energy; environmental technologies; agribusiness, including food processing and fertilizers; health care; tourism, including hotel construction and management; and insurance and banking.