normally deposit estimated, cash deposits for the subject merchandise equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The ''All Others'' rate applies to all exporters of subject stainless steel sheet and strip in coils not specifically listed. The revised weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Acciai Speciali Terni, SpA	11.23
All Others	11.23

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Italy. Interested parties may contact the Department's Central Records Unit, room B–099 of the main Commerce building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: July 21, 1999.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 99–19129 Filed 7–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–601, A–583–603]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cookware From the Republic of Korea and Taiwan

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset reviews: top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan.

SUMMARY: On February 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware (''cookware'') from the Republic of Korea (''Korea'') and Taiwan (64 FR 4840) 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 substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic interested parties 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 orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott 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, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 27, 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*''). 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 these antidumping orders is top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from Korea and Taiwan. The subject merchandise is all non-electric cooking ware of stainless steel which may have one or more layers of aluminum, copper or carbon steel for more even heat distribution. The subject merchandise includes skillets, frying pans, omelette pans, saucepans, double boilers, stock pots, dutch ovens, casseroles, steamers, and other stainless steel vessels, all for cooking on stove top burners, except tea kettles and fish poachers. Excluded from the scope of the order are stainless steel oven ware and stainless steel kitchen ware. The Department has issued several scope clarifications for these two orders. For imports of the subject merchandise from Korea, certain stainless steel pasta and steamer inserts are within the scope (63 FR 41545, August 4, 1998), certain stainless steel eight-cup coffee percolators are within the scope (58 FR 11209, February 24, 1993), and certain stainless steel stock pots and covers are within the scope of the order (57 FR 57420, December 4, 1992). For imports of the subject merchandise from Taiwan, ''universal pan lids'' are not within the scope of the order (57 FR 57420, December 4, 1992) and Max Burton's StoveTop Smoker is within the scope of the order (60 FR 36782, July 18, 1995). Moreover, as a result of a changed circumstances review, the Department revoked the order on Korea in part with respect to certain stainless steel camping ware (1) made of single-ply stainless steel having a thickness no greater than 6.0 millimeters; and (2) consisting of 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 quart saucepans without handles and with lids that also serve as fry pans (62 FR 3662, January 24, 1997). Such merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 7323.93.00 and 9604.00.00. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

These reviews cover imports from all manufacturers and exporters of top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan.

Background

On February 1, 1999, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan (64 FR 4840), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received Notices of Intent to Participate on behalf of the Stainless Steel Cookware Committee, whose current members are Regal Ware, Inc., All-Clad Metalcrafters, Inc., and Vita Craft Corp. (collectively, the ''Committee''), on February 16, 1999, within the deadline specified in § 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations.* Pursuant to section 771(9)(E) of the Act, the Committee claimed interested party status as an association of U.S. manufacturers of a domestic like product. In addition, the Committee's individual members claimed domestic interested party status pursuant to section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as domestic producers of a like product. Moreover, the Committee stated that Regal Ware was a petitioner in the original investigation. The Department received complete substantive responses from the Committee on March 3, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under § 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 expedited, 120-day, reviews of these orders.

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted these reviews to determine whether revocation of the antidumping orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making these determinations, 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 order, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission (''the Commission'') the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the orders are revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins are discussed below. In addition, the Committee's comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins 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).

In addition to considering the guidance on likelihood cited above, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In these reviews, the Department did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party. Pursuant to § 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations,* this constitutes a waiver of participation.

The antidumping orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from Taiwan and the Republic of Korea were published in the **Federal Register** on January 20, 1987 (52 FR 2138, 2139). Since that time, the Department has conducted several administrative reviews of the order with respect to cookware from Korea.[1] However, since the imposition of the order, no administrative reviews of the antidumping order on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cookware from Taiwan have been conducted. The orders remain in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from both countries.

In its substantive responses, the Committee argued that the actions taken by Korean and Taiwanese producers/exporters of stainless steel cookware during the life of the order indicate that the likely effect of revocation of the orders in these cases would be that dumping of cookware would continue at significant margins (*see* March 3, 1999, Substantive Response of the Committee at 8 (Taiwan) and 9–10 (Korea)). With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above de minimis after the issuance of the orders, the Committee pointed out that, regarding the subject merchandise from Korea, the Department has found in its administrative reviews margins of dumping above de minimis, with rates as high as 31.23 percent (*see* March 3, 1999, Substantive Response of the Committee at 10). With respect to the merchandise from Taiwan, the Department has not conducted any administrative reviews. Therefore, the Committee argued, because the margins that were determined in the original investigation remain in effect, all of the margins applicable to imports of stainless steel cookware from Taiwan are significantly above de minimis (*see* March 3, 1999, Substantive Response of the Committee at 9).

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. As pointed out above, dumping margins above de minimis continue to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from both Korea and Taiwan.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department also considers the volume of imports before and after issuance of the order. The Committee argued that a significant decline in the volume of imports of the subject merchandise from both Korea and Taiwan since the imposition of the orders provides further evidence that dumping would continue if the orders were revoked. In their substantive responses, the Committee provided statistics demonstrating the decline in import volumes of stainless steel cookware from Korea and Taiwan (*see* March 3, 1999, Substantive Responses of the Committee at Attachment 1). The Department's statistics on imports of the subject merchandise from Taiwan and Korea confirm the Committee's arguments that imports of stainless steel cooking ware fell sharply after the orders were imposed. In fact, the volume of imports of cookware from Taiwan fell from approximately 15,208,000 units in 1986 to approximately 3,979,000 in 1987 and continued dropping to 1,774,000 in 1998.[2] As for the volume of imports from Korea, they also dropped dramatically after the imposition of the order, from approximately 35,540,000 units in 1986 to approximately 16,858,000 units in 1987 and continued dropping to 3,660,000 in 1998.[3]

As noted above, in conducting its sunset reviews, the Department considers the weighted-average dumping margins and volume of imports when determining whether revocation of an antidumping duty order would lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping. Based on this

[1] *See Certain Stainless Steel Cooking Ware from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 56 FR 38114 (August 12, 1991); *Certain Stainless Steel Cooking Ware from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 58 FR 9560 (February 22, 1993); *Stainless Steel Cooking Ware from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 59 FR 10788 (March 8, 1994); *Certain Stainless Steel Cooking Ware from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order,* 62 FR 3662 (January 24, 1997).

[2] *See* U.S. Census Bureau Report IM146 and the March 3, 1999, Substantive Response of the Committee at Attachment 1.

[3] *Id.*

analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins above *de minimis* levels and a reduction in export volumes after the issuance of the orders 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 all known Korean and all known Taiwanese producers/exporters. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the orders, import volumes declined significantly after the imposition of the orders, respondent parties waived participation, 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 normally will 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.*)

The Department, in its final determinations of sales at less than fair value, published weighted-average dumping margins for five Korean producers/exporters of stainless steel cookware (51 FR 42873, November 26, 1986, amended in 51 FR 46889, December 29, 1986) and three Taiwanese producers/exporters (51 FR 42882, November 26, 1986). Moreover, the Department published an ''all others'' rate in both of these determinations. We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in either of these cases.

In their substantive responses, the Committee recommended that, consistent with the *Sunset Policy Bulletin,* the Department provide to the Commission the company-specific margins from the original investigations. Moreover, regarding companies not reviewed in the original investigation, the Committee suggested that the Department report the all others rates included in the original investigations.

The Department agrees with the Committee. The Department finds the margins calculated in the original investigation are probative of the behavior of Korean and Taiwanese producers/exporters if the orders were revoked as they are the only margins which reflect their actions absent the discipline of the order. Therefore, 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 Review* section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

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

Producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Korea:	
Bum Koo	31.23
Dae Sung	6.11
Hai Dong	12.14
Kyung Dong	8.36
Namil	0.75
All Others	8.10
Taiwan:	
Golden Lion Metal Industry Co, Ltd.	15.08
Lyi Mean Industrial Co., Ltd.	26.10
Song Far Industry Co., Ltd.	25.90
All Others	22.61

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: July 21, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–19162 Filed 7–26–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 072099A]

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

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

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) and its Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Committee, Comprehensive Management Committee, Squid-Mackerel-Butterfish Committee and Squid-Mackerel-Butterfish Monitoring Committee, and Executive Committee will hold public meetings.

DATES: The meetings will be held on Monday, August 9, 1999, to Thursday, August 12, 1999. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for specific dates and times.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Sheraton Society Hill, One Dock Street, Philadelphia, PA; telephone: 215–238–6000.

Council address: Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19904; telephone: 302–674–2331.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; telephone: 302–674–2331, ext. 19.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Monday, August 9, 1999

10:00 a.m. until noon–-Squid-Mackerel-Butterfish Monitoring Committee

10:00 a.m. until noon—Comprehensive Management Committee

1:00 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.—Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Committee

3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m.—Squid-Mackerel-Butterfish Committee

Tuesday, August 10, 1999

8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.–-Council will meet.

Wednesday, August 11, 1999

8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.—Council will meet with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's (ASMFC) Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Board