will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 25.82 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: March 31, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–8486 Filed 4–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–428–811]

Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from Germany: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany in response to a request by the respondent, Saarstahl AG (''Saarstahl''). This review covers the period March 1, 1997, through February 28, 1998.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have not been made below normal value (''NV''). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on entries subject to this review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger or Rebecca Trainor, Office 5, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Import Administration, Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4136, or 482–4007, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Background

On March 22, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany (58 FR 15324).

On March 11, 1998, we published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 11868) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany covering the period March 1, 1997, through February 28, 1998.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), Saarstahl requested that we conduct an administrative review of its sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on April 24, 1998 (63 FR 20378).

On April 28, 1998, petitioners requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by Saarstahl. On January 29, 1999, the Department requested proof that unaffiliated purchasers will ultimately pay the antidumping duties to be assessed on entries during the review period.

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

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are hot-rolled bars and rods of nonalloy or other alloy steel, whether or not descaled, containing by weight 0.03 percent or more of lead or 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, in coils or cut lengths, and in numerous shapes and sizes. Excluded from the scope of this review are other alloy steels (as defined by the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) Chapter 72, note 1 (f)), except steels classified as other alloy steels by reason of containing by weight 0.4 percent or more of lead, or 0.1 percent or more of bismuth, tellurium, or selenium. Also excluded are semi-finished steels and flat-rolled products. Most of the products covered in this review are provided for under subheadings 7213.20.00.00 and 7214.30.00.00 of the HTSUS. Small quantities of these products may also enter the United States under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7213.31.30.00; 7213.31.60.00; 7213.39.00.30; 7213.39.00.60; 7213.39.00.90; 7213.91.30.00; 7213.91.45.00; 7213.91.60.00; 7213.99.00; 7214.40.00.10, 7214.40.00.30, 7214.40.00.50; 7214.50.00.10; 7214.50.00.30, 7214.50.00.50; 7214.60.00.10; 7214.60.00.30; 7214.60.00.50; 7214.91.00; 7214.99.00; 7228.30.80.00; and 7228.30.80.50. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Duty Absorption

On April 28, 1998, the petitioners requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties had been absorbed during the POR. Section 751(a)(4) of the Act provides for the Department, if requested, to determine during an administrative review initiated two or four years after the publication of the order, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by a foreign producer or exporter, if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an affiliated importer. In this case, Saarstahl sold to the United States through an importer that is affiliated within the meaning of section 751(a)(4) of the Act.

Section 351.213(j)(2) of the Department's regulations provides that for transition orders (*i.e.*, orders in effect on January 1, 1995), the Department will conduct duty absorption reviews, if requested, for administrative reviews initiated in 1996 or 1998. Because the order underlying this review was issued prior to January 1, 1995, and this review was initiated in 1998, we will make a duty absorption determination in this segment of the proceeding. As we have preliminarily found that there is no dumping margin for Saarstahl with respect to its U.S. sales, we have also preliminarily found that there is no duty absorption.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of the subject merchandise by Saarstahl to the United States were made at less than NV, we compared export price (''EP'') to the NV, as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice.

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weighted-average NV of the foreign like product where there were sales made at prices above the cost of production (COP), as discussed in the ''Cost of Production Analysis'' section, below and were otherwise in the ordinary course of trade.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by Saarstahl covered by the description in the ''Scope of the Review'' section, above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We compared U.S. sales to sales made in the home market within the contemporaneous window period, which extends from three months prior to the U.S. sale until two months after the sale. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondents in the following order: chemical composition, shape, cut (*i.e.,* coil or cut-to-length), size, and grade (*see* Model Match Methodology Memorandum from the Team to Irene Darzenta Tzafolias, dated March 22, 1999 (''Model Match Methodology Memorandum'')).

Consistent with our practice (*see, e.g., Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands,* 61 FR 48465, (September 13, 1996)), we compared prime quality models sold in the United States to identical prime quality models sold in the home market. Where no home market sales of identical prime quality models made in the ordinary course of trade existed, we compared the U.S. sales of prime quality models to the most similar prime quality foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the product characteristics listed above. There were no U.S. sales of second quality models during the POR.

The petitioners contend that the Department should also include casting type (*i.e.,* bloom or billet casting) as a product matching characteristic. When selecting model match criteria, we normally choose physical characteristics of the merchandise that are identifiable and/or quantifiable (*see, e.g., Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products From Indonesia,* 61 FR 43333, 43334, August 22, 1996). As discussed in the Model Match Methodology Memorandum, we did not use this production method characteristic in the model match hierarchy because, other than the petitioners' general contention that bloom-cast products are of better quality than billet-cast products, there is no information on the record indicating that merchandise produced by different casting methods results in any discrete, quantifiable differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise. In addition, while the petitioners have demonstrated a difference in costs between the two production methods, no party has demonstrated that there are differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise.

Because Saarstahl reported product costs and control numbers to distinguish between casting type, we have revised the weight-averaged costs of the products reported based solely on the matching criteria identified above.

Export Price

We based United States price on EP, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold directly by the exporter to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and constructed export price was not otherwise indicated by the facts of record. When sales are made prior to importation through an affiliated or unaffiliated U.S. sales agent to an unaffiliated customer in the United States, our practice is to examine several criteria in order to determine whether the sales are EP sales. Those criteria are: (1) Whether the merchandise was shipped directly from the manufacturer to the unaffiliated U.S. customer; (2) whether this was the customary commercial channel between the parties involved; and (3) whether the function of the U.S. selling agent was limited to that of a ''processor of sales-related documentation'' and a ''communications link'' with the unaffiliated U.S. buyer. Where all three criteria are met, indicating that the activities of the U.S. selling agent are ancillary to the sale, the Department has determined the sales to be EP sales (*see, e.g., Notice of Final Results of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Italy,* 63 FR 40422, 40424–25, July 29,1998). In the instant review, the above-referenced criteria have been met. As discussed in Saarstahl's questionnaire responses, Saarsteel, Inc., Saarstahl's affiliate in the United States, acts only as a communications link and a processor of sales-related documentation. It has no role in selling the merchandise and it does not inventory the subject merchandise. Accordingly, we have treated all U.S. sales as EP sales.

We calculated EP based on packed, delivered prices to customers in the United States. We made deductions, where applicable, for foreign inland freight and brokerage and handling expenses in Germany, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. Customs duties, brokerage and handling charges, merchandise processing fees, and U.S. inland freight charges, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, the Department compared Saarstahl's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to its volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with sections 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Because Saarstahl's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market provides a viable basis for calculating NV, in accordance with Section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404(b).

Saarstahl's home market sales listing included merchandise of steel grades that Saarstahl stated are outside the scope of this review. Based on Saarstahl's representations of the merchandise in its December 28, 1998, and January 29, 1999, submissions, we excluded these sales from our analysis.

Many of Saarstahl's home market sales were made to affiliated parties. It is the Department's practice, in situations where home market sales are made to affiliated parties, to determine whether sales to affiliated parties might be appropriate to use as the basis of NV by comparing prices of those sales to prices of sales to unaffiliated parties, on a model-by-model basis. *See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders; Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.,* 60 FR 10899, 10900, February 28, 1995; and 19 CFR 351.403(c). Because Saarstahl made home market sales to affiliated end-users during the POR, we tested these sales to ensure that, on

average, the affiliated-party sales were made at arm's length. To conduct this test, we compared the weighted-average unit prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, billing adjustments, and packing. As a result of our arm's-length test, we disregarded sales to the affiliated customers in the home market where the prices charged to an affiliated customer were on average less than 99.5 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated customers. *See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand,* 62 FR 53808, 53817, October 16, 1997.

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we based NV on sales at the same level of trade (''LOT'') as the EP sale.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (''SG&A'') expenses and profit. For EP, the LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. To determine whether NV sales are at a different level of trade than EP, we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

In this proceeding, Saarstahl reported three channels of distribution in the home market: (1) sales produced to order and shipped directly to the customer, (2) sales manufactured to order and maintained in a warehouse for ''just in time'' delivery, and (3) sales of secondary merchandise sold to resellers. In analyzing the data submitted, we found that the three home market channels differ significantly with respect to selling activities. Inventory maintenance is only offered to customers in the second channel. Freight and delivery services and technical advice are only offered to customers in the first and second channels. Further, we found that these channels constitute different stages in the marketing process. Based on this analysis, we find that the three home market channels of distribution comprise three LOTs.

In the United States, Saarstahl reported one channel of distribution, which involves sales produced to order and shipped directly to customers. The selling activities and functions associated with these sales are equivalent to those offered in the first home market channel discussed above. Accordingly, we have compared the U.S. sales to sales made at the same LOT in the home market.

Cost of Production Analysis

Pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, for this POR, we initiated an investigation of sales at less than the cost of production (''COP''). As discussed in the Memorandum to Joe Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement III from Edward Yang, Office Director, dated July 8, 1998, we initiated the COP investigation because, in the preliminary determination of the less-than-fair-value (''LTFV'') investigation, we disregarded some of Saarstahl's home market sales found to be below the COP (*see Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From Germany,* 57 FR 44551, September 28, 1992). Saarstahl subsequently failed both the sales and COP verifications and the Department relied on the best information available as the basis for the final determination (*see Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From Germany,* 58 FR 6205, January 27, 1993). Therefore, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales made at less than the COP may have occurred during this review period. Before making any NV comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below.

A. Calculation of COP

We calculated the COP based on the sum of Saarstahl's cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general and administrative (G&A) expenses and interest expenses. We made no adjustments to the data provided by Saarstahl in its questionnaire responses.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices permitted recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We compared the model-specific COP to the reported home market prices less any applicable movement charges, billing adjustments, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing.

For indirect selling expenses incurred in Germany, Saarstahl reported the actual expenses incurred during the POR by its affiliate Vertriebsgesellschaft Saarstahl m.b.H. (''VGS''), which handles all of Saarstahl's sales and distribution activities. Since the COP response is based on Saarstahl's expenses during its fiscal year, corresponding to the calendar year, we recalculated the indirect selling expenses to reflect the fiscal year, based on the ratio of VGS' expenses to sales revenue reported in its 1997 financial statement, which covers the 1997 calendar year. These expenses included commission payments to unaffiliated parties. To avoid double-counting, we did not deduct these commissions from the net home market price we compared to COP.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of the respondent's sales of a specific model were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of the respondent's sales of a specific model during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because we determined that the below-cost sales were made within an extended period of time in ''substantial quantities'' in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, and because, based on our comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the POR, we determined that the below-cost sales of the product were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, as defined in section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Based on this test, we disregarded certain below-cost home market sales made by Saarstahl.

Price-to-Price Comparisons

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual

transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product where there were sales at prices above COP, as discussed above. We based NV on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the home market, and to affiliated purchasers in the home market to the extent that prices were at arm's-length. We made adjustments to home market price, where applicable, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, for billing adjustments, inland freight, and warehousing expenses. We also made circumstance-of-sale adjustments for differences in credit expenses, interest revenue, bank fees (based on information in Saarstahl's February 26, 1999, response), warranties, and commissions paid to unaffiliated parties pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act.

Saarstahl paid commissions to unaffiliated parties on certain sales in the home market, but did not pay any commissions to unaffiliated parties on U.S. sales. Under 19 CFR 351.410 (e), where there is a commission paid in one market and none in the other market, we offset the commission with indirect selling expenses incurred in the other market to the extent of the lesser of the commission or the indirect selling expenses. Accordingly, where appropriate, we offset the weighted-average home market commission by deducting it from the weighted-average home market price and then adding the sale-specific U.S. indirect selling expenses. For U.S. indirect selling expenses, we used the recalculated indirect selling expenses incurred in Germany, as described in the ''Cost of Production Analysis'' section above. In addition, we calculated the selling expenses incurred by Saarstahl's U.S. affiliate, Saarsteel, Inc., based on the ratio of Saarsteel's selling expenses to sales revenue reported in its 1997 financial statement. We also included the reported inventory carrying expense amount on U.S. sales in the total amount of U.S. indirect selling expenses available to offset the weighted-average home market commissions.

In order to adjust for differences in packing between the two markets, we increased home market price by the amount of U.S. packing costs and reduced it by the amount of home market packing costs. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

For home market sales where the payment date was not reported as of the date of submission of the latest home market sales listing, we recalculated imputed credit expenses using the date of the latest sales listing submission as the payment date.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of EP and NV, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Saarstahl AG (Saarstahl)	3/1/97–2/28/98	0.00

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 80 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter.

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case briefs and rebuttal briefs. Case briefs from interested parties and rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted not later than 70 days and 77 days, respectively, from the date of publication of these preliminary results. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c) and (d). Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are also encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

The Department will subsequently issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or at the hearing, if held, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Room B–099, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine and the Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of this review. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties. We will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis*. For assessment purposes, we intend to calculate importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales examined and dividing this amount by the total entered value of the sales examined.

This notice 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 double antidumping duties.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent, and therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(d)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate 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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufactures or exporters will continue to be 85.05 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: March 31, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–8487 Filed 4–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–412–803]

Industrial Nitrocellulose From the United Kingdom: Notice of Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of industrial nitrocellulose from the United Kingdom.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is extending the time limits for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping order on industrial nitrocellulose from the United Kingdom. This review covers one producer/exporter of industrial nitrocellulose for the period July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

The Department initiated this administrative review on August 27, 1998 (63 FR 45796). Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit. Due to the complexity of a certain issue in this case, the Department determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the statutory time limit. *See* memorandum from Holly A. Kuga to Robert S. LaRussa, which is on file in Room B–099 at the Department's headquarters. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the aforementioned review to July 31, 1999. The final determination will occur within 120 days of the publication of the preliminary results.

This extension of time limits is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 30, 1999.

Louis Apple,

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

[FR Doc. 99–8484 Filed 4–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 032999B]

North Pacific Fishery Management Council; Notice of Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council and its advisory committees will hold public meetings.

SUMMARY: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) and its advisory committees will meet in Anchorage, AK.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific dates and times for the meetings.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Anchorage Hilton Hotel, 500 W. Third Avenue, Anchorage, AK.

Council address: North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 W. 4th Ave., Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501–2252.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Council staff, telephone: 907–271–2809.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Dates and Times for the Meetings

1. The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) will begin at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, April 19, continuing through Wednesday, April 21, 1999.

2. The Advisory Panel (AP) will begin at 8:00 a.m. on Monday, April 19, and continue through Thursday, April 22, 1999.

3. The Council's Enforcement Committee and Individual Fishery Quota (IFQ) Implementation Team will meet at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 20, to discuss a proposed weighmaster program for the halibut and sablefish IFQ fisheries.

4. The Council's Enforcement Committee will meet at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 21, to discuss enforcement issues related to the Federal and State definitions of 'pelagic trawl.'

5. The Council will begin at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, April 21, continuing through a portion of Monday, April 26, 1999.

Other workgroup or committee meetings may be held during the week. Notices of these meetings will be posted at the hotel. All meetings are open to the public with the exception of Council executive sessions, which may be held during the noon hour during the meeting week, if necessary, to discuss personnel, international issues, or litigation.

Agendas

Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC)

The SSC will address the following issues:

1. Reports on Federal and State research activities involving Steller sea lions, and review of an initial analysis of management measures for Steller sea lion protection for the years 2000 and beyond.

2. Initial review of amendments to Council fishery management plans designed to mitigate effects of recent