(''HTSUS''). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

The administrative review covers one company, Mukand, while both Viraj and Panchmahal are reviewed as new shippers. The period of review for all three companies is December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997.

Final Results of Reviews

As a result of our reviews, we determine the dumping margins (in percent) for the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997, for the companies under review to be as follows:

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Mukand	0.00
Viraj	0.00
Panchmahal	0.00

The Department shall issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Mukand, Viraj, and Panchmahal will be the rates stated above; (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, 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, the cash rate will be 48.80 percent, which is the ''all others'' rate as established in the LTFV investigation. The deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification of Interested Parties

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR section 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 double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d), (1997). 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.

The administrative review and new shipper reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)).

Dated: December 22, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–246 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–068]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Steel Wire Strand from Japan

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: steel wire strand from Japan.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping finding on steel wire strand from Japan (63 FR 46410) 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 substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic industry and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping finding would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of the Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott E. Smith 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) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 6, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was 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*''). 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 subject to this antidumping finding is steel wire strand, other than alloy steel, not galvanized, which are stress-relieved and suitable for use in prestressed concrete. Such merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 7312.10.30.12. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

This review covers imports from all manufacturers and exporters of steel wire strand from Japan, other than imports produced by Sumitomo Electric Ind., Ltd. and exported by the Sumitomo Corp., for which the finding has been revoked (51 FR 30894, August 29, 1986), and imports produced by Kawasaki Steel Techno-Wire (formerly known as Kawatetsu Wire Products Co., Ltd.), for which the investigation was discontinued (43 FR 38495, August 28, 1978).

Background

On September 1, 1998, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping finding on steel wire strand from Japan (63 FR 46410), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of the American Spring Wire Corp., Florida Wire & Cable, Inc., Insteel Wire Products and Sumiden Wire Products Corp. (collectively ''the domestic industry'') on September 16, 1998,

within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations.* Each company claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a U.S. manufacturer of a domestic like product. In addition, American Spring Wire Corp and Florida Wire & Cable indicated that they were two of the original five petitioners and that the three other original petitioners are no longer producers of the subject merchandise. We received a complete substantive response from the domestic industry on October 1, 1998, 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 this proceeding. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day, review of this finding.

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping finding 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 finding, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission (''the Commission'') the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the finding is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin 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.3). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3).

The antidumping finding on steel wire strand from Japan was published in the **Federal Register** as Treasury Decision 78–487 (43 FR 57599, December 8, 1978). Prior to this finding, on August 28, 1978, Treasury discontinued the dumping investigation with respect to imports from Kawatetsu Wire Products Co., Ltd. (43 FR 38495, August 28, 1978). Since the Treasury finding, the Department has conducted several administrative reviews.[1] On August 29, 1986, the Department revoked the finding with respect to imports produced by Sumitomo Electric Ind., Ltd. and exported by the Sumitomo Corp. (51 FR 30894, August 29, 1986). On March 5, 1990, the Department issued the final results of a changed circumstances review, determining that Kawasaki Steel Techno-Wire was the successor to Kawatetsu Wire Products Co., Ltd. and, therefore, that the discontinuance issued to Kawatetsu Wire Products Co., Ltd. applied to Kawasaki Steel Techno-Wire (55 FR 7759, March 5, 1990). The finding remains in effect for all other manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

In its substantive response, the domestic industry argued that the actions taken by producers and exporters of Japanese steel wire strand during the life of the finding indicate that ''(w)ere the finding to be revoked, it is likely that dumping would continue because the evidence demonstrates that the Japanese producers and exporters need to dump to sell in any significant quantities in the United States' (*see* October 1, 1998, Substantive Response of the Domestic Industry). With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the finding, the domestic industry stated that, as documented in the final results of administrative reviews issued by the Department, a ''review of the behavior of Japanese producers following the imposition of the antidumping finding shows continued dumping by at least one producer, Tokyo Rope Manufacturing, at a rate of 4.5 percent following imposition of the order'' (*see* October 1, 1998, Substantive Response of the Domestic Industry).

With respect to whether imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the finding, the domestic industry, citing U.S. Department of Commerce reports and U.S. Census statistics for U.S. imports (IM146 reports), asserted that ''imports of PC Strand from Japan have fallen to insignificant commercial volumes'' since the imposition of the finding.[2] Furthermore, the domestic industry argued that decreasing import volumes together with the existence of an antidumping duty finding strongly supports the conclusion that dumping would continue if the finding were revoked and demonstrates that Japanese manufacturers of steel wire strand cannot sell in the United States without dumping.

In conclusion, the domestic industry argued that the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would continue were the finding revoked because (1) dumping margins have existed throughout the life of the finding, and (2) most companies

[1] *See Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 48 FR 45586 (October 6, 1983); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part;* 51 FR 30894 (August 29, 1986); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 52 FR 4373 (February 11, 1987); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 52 FR 37997 (October 13, 1987); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 53 FR 9787 (March 25, 1988); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 53 FR 11162 (April 5, 1988); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 55 FR 28796 (July 13, 1990); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 55 FR 46853 (November 7, 1990); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 56 FR 66840 (December 26, 1991); and *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 62 FR 60688 (November 12, 1997).

[2] The domestic industry provided information on U.S. imports of steel wire strand for prestressed concrete from Japan, on an annual basis, in short tons, from 1975 through 1998. The 1998 data was annualized based on data from January through July, 1998.

have dramatically reduced exports or ceased exports of the subject merchandise altogether.

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. A dumping margin above *de minimis* continues to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from the Tokyo Wire Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd.[3]

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department also considered the volume of imports before and after issuance of the finding. The import statistics provided by the domestic industry on imports of the subject merchandise between 1975 and 1998, and confirmed through the Department's examination of U.S. Census data (IM146 reports), demonstrate that in the two years following the imposition of the finding, imports of the subject merchandise fell by approximately 50,000 short tons (from approximately 80,000 in 1978 to approximately 30,000 short tons in 1980). Since that period, imports of subject merchandise have decreased every year, with few exceptions. The statistics demonstrate that imports of steel wire strand from Japan have not been above 1000 short tons per year since 1990. This is consistent with the Department's findings of no shipments by the reviewed companies in many of the administrative reviews conducted by the Department.[4]

Based on this analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the finding is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. A deposit rate above a *de minimis* level continues in effect for exports of the subject merchandise by at least one known Japanese manufacturer/exporter. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the finding, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the finding 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* sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin.*)

Treasury, in its final determination of sales at less than fair value, published weighted-average dumping margins for five Japanese manufacturers and exporters of steel wire strand (43 FR 38495, August 28, 1978). Of these five manufacturers, Treasury discontinued the investigation for one because of *de minimis* margins (Kawatetsu, 43 FR 38495, August 28, 1978) and the Department subsequently revoked the order with respect to another (Sumitomo, 51 FR 30894, August 29, 1986). Treasury did not publish an ''all others'' rate in its determination. The Department indicated in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* that, under these circumstances, the Department normally will provide to the Commission, as the margin for any new company not reviewed by Treasury, the first ''new shipper'' rate established by the Department for that finding (*see* section II.B.1). We note, that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, the domestic industry recommended that, consistent with the *Sunset Policy Bulletin,* the Department provide to the Commission the company-specific margins included in the Treasury determination published in the **Federal Register**. Further, the domestic industry stated that the Department should inform the Commission of the two companies for which this finding has been revoked, Kawasaki Steel Techno Wire and Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.

As for companies not reviewed in the original investigation, the domestic industry argued that the Department assign these companies a rate of 15.8 percent, the highest company-specific rate identified by Treasury in its determination. Citing the September 29, 1982, **Federal Register** notice *Clear Sheet Glass from Taiwan: Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Finding,* 47 FR 42769, the domestic industry stated that the Department should follow its practice of automatically assigning the highest rate for any of the investigated companies as the ''all others.'' Therefore, the all others rate should be the 15.8 percent calculated by Treasury for Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd. and published on August 28, 1978 (43 FR 38495, August 28, 1978). Alternatively, the domestic industry argued that, should the Department believe it should rely on its more recent practice of deriving the ''all others rate,'' the Department should use the weighted-average dumping margin from the original investigation as identified in the Commission's final injury determination of November 29, 1978. In its final determination, the Commission stated that ''[t]he weighted average dumping margin for all the sales compared was 9.76 percent''.[5]

The Department agrees with the domestic industry's assertion that it should report to the Commission the company-specific margins published in the original Treasury final determination. The Department noted, in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin,* that the margins from the original investigation are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the order in place. Therefore, the Department finds these rates are the most probative of the behavior of these companies if the finding were revoked absent

[3] *See Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 52 FR 4373 (February 11, 1987), as corrected by *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Correction;* 52 FR 37997 (October 13, 1987).

[4] *See Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 48 FR 45586 (October 6, 1983); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part;* 51 FR 30894 (August 29, 1986); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 52 FR 4373 (February 11, 1987); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 52 FR 37997 (October 13, 1987); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 53 FR 9787 (March 25, 1988); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 53 FR 11162 (April 5, 1988); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 55 FR 28796 (July 13, 1990); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 55 FR 46853 (November 7, 1990); *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 56 FR 66840 (December 26, 1991); and *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review;* 62 FR 60688 (November 12, 1997).

[5] *See Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan,* Inv. No. AA1921–188, USITC Pub. 928 at 4 (Nov. 1978) or *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan,* 43 FR 55826, November 29, 1978.

information and argument to the contrary.

The Department agrees with the domestic industry, in part, concerning the choice of the ''all others'' rate. We have no basis for applying the Department's early all others rate policy to the Treasury investigation. In fact, the Department itself abandoned the practice of applying the highest rate for responding firms as the all others rate. Currently, the all others rate is the weighted-average of the individual dumping margins calculated for those exporters and producers that are individually investigated. Therefore, we agree with the domestic industry that the weighted-average dumping margin for all sales of the subject merchandise, as calculated by Treasury and published by the Commission in its final injury determination for this proceeding, is an appropriate measure of the first ''all others'' rate. Thus, the Department will report to the Commission the company-specific and all others rates from the original investigation as contained in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Kawasaki Steel Techno-Wire Co, Ltd.	Investigation
(formerly Kawatetsu Wire Products Co., Ltd.).	Discontinued
Shinko Wire Co., Ltd	13.3
Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd. (and exported by Sumitomo Corp.).	Revoked
Suzuki Metal Industry Co., Ltd.	6.9
Tokyo Rope Manufacturing Co., Ltd.	4.5
All Others	9.76

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: December 30, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–247 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–583–008]

Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube From Taiwan; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Taiwan. The review covers two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise and the period May 1, 1997 through April 30, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martin Odenyo or John Kugelman, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5254 or 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 29, 1998, the Department initiated this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Taiwan (62 FR 40258). The current deadline for the preliminary results is January 30, 1999. We determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time frame. (*See* Memorandum to Robert S. LaRussa dated December 30, 1998.)

Accordingly, the deadline for issuing the preliminary results of this review is now May 28, 1999. The deadline for issuing the final results of this review will be no later than 120 days from the publication of the preliminary results.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: December 30, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III.

[FR Doc. 99–243 Filed 1–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–816]

Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination with Final Antidumping Duty Determination: Elastic Rubber Tape from India

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Kane or Suresh Maniam, Office I, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. 20230; telephone (202) 482–2815 or 482–0176, respectively.

Applicable Statute:

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act effective January 1, 1995 (the Act).

Supplementary Information:

On November 30, 1998, we completed the preliminary negative countervailing duty determination pertaining to elastic rubber tape from India. On December 4, 1998, the petitioners submitted a letter requesting alignment of the final determination in this investigation with the final determination in the companion antidumping duty investigation. Therefore, in accordance with section 705(a)(1) of the Act, we are aligning the final determination in this investigation with the final antidumping duty determination in the antidumping investigation of elastic rubber tape from India. See *Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Elastic Rubber Tape from India,* 63 FR 49549 (September 16, 1998). The final antidumping duty determination is currently due on April 12, 1999.

This notice is published in accordance with section 705(a)(1) of the Act.