workday thereafter, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20230. Individuals who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. Requests for a public hearing should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; (3) the reason for attending; and (4) a list of the issues to be discussed. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2). 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. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. If a hearing is held, an interested party may make an affirmative presentation only on arguments included in that party's case brief and may make a rebuttal presentation only on arguments included in that party's rebuttal brief. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

The Department will issue the final results of these administrative and new shipper reviews, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in the briefs, within 120 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of these administrative and new shipper reviews, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between export price and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. 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 the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties. For assessment purposes, we intend to calculate importer-specific assessment rates for freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC. For both EP and CEP sales, we will divide the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP (or CEP)) for each importer by the entered value of the merchandise. Upon the completion of this review, we will direct Customs to assess the resulting *ad valorem* rates against the entered value of each entry of the subject merchandise by the importer during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of freshwater crawfish tail meat 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) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed firms will be the rates indicated above; (2) for previously-reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters with separate rates, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) for all other PRC exporters, the rate will be the PRC-wide rate, which is 201.63 percent; and (4) for all other 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) of the Department's regulations 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 administrative review, these new shipper reviews, and this notice are published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and sections 351.213, 351.214 and 351.221 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: September 30, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–26589 Filed 10–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–837]

Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the respondents, Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho, Ltd. and Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., the Department of Commerce is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on large newspaper printing presses and components thereof, whether assembled or unassembled, from Japan. These reviews cover Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. and Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho, Ltd., manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The periods of review for Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. are September 5, 1996, through August 31, 1997, and September 1, 1997, through August 31, 1998. The period of review for Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho is September 1, 1997, through August 31, 1998.

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value for Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho, we have preliminarily determined that sales have not been made below normal value. 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. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dinah McDougall, Kate Johnson, or David J. Goldberger, Office 2, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration—Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202)

482–3773, 482–4929, or 482–4136, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

Background

On July 23, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register**, 61 FR 38139, the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on large newspaper printing presses and components thereof, whether assembled or unassembled (LNPP), from Japan. We published an antidumping duty order on September 4, 1996 (61 FR 46621).

On September 30, 1997, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. (MHI) requested that the Department defer for one year the initiation of its review of entries subject to the above-referenced order covering the period September 5, 1996, to August 31, 1997. *See Initiation of Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Request for Revocation in Part, and Deferral of Administrative Review,* 62 FR 58705 (October 30, 1997).

On September 16, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice advising of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order for the period September 1, 1997, through August 31, 1998 (63 FR 49543). The Department received a request for an administrative review of MHI and Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho, Ltd. (TKS) by MHI and TKS, respectively. We published a notice of initiation of the MHI reviews on October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58009). With respect to MHI's sale to the United States, we extended the period of review (POR) to reflect the extended period of time over which the entries and production processes occurred. The initiation of the TKS review was published on November 30, 1998 (63 FR 65748).

On November 17, 1998, and January 21, 1999, Goss Graphic Systems, Inc. (the petitioner) requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed during the POR. On February 5, 1999, the Department requested proof that unaffiliated purchasers will ultimately pay the antidumping duties to be assessed on entries during the review periods.

On March 4, 1999, the Department extended the time limit for the preliminary results in these reviews until September 30, 1999. *See Postponement of Preliminary Results of the First and Second Administrative Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Order,* 64 FR 10444.

On July 20, 1999, the Department published a *Notice of Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty Order* pursuant to a request by the petitioner to partially revoke the antidumping duty order on the subject merchandise for LNPPs that meet a specific set of criteria; namely, imports of the elements and components of LNPP systems, and additions thereto, imported to fulfill a contract for one or more complete LNPP systems which feature a 22 inch cut-off, 50 inch web width and a rated speed no greater than 75,000 copies per hour, utilizing exclusively the type of printing unit and color keyless inking system detailed in the petitioner's request, in a tower configuration coupled with folder, reel tension paster, conveyance and access apparatus, and computerized control system meeting all of the specifications described in Goss' request (*see* 64 FR 38888). The changed circumstances review is currently underway as a separate proceeding and the Department will make its preliminary determination in that proceeding after these preliminary results.

The Department is conducting these reviews in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Reviews

The products covered by these reviews are large newspaper printing presses, including press systems, press additions and press components, whether assembled or unassembled, whether complete or incomplete, that are capable of printing or otherwise manipulating a roll of paper more than two pages across. A page is defined as a newspaper broadsheet page in which the lines of type are printed perpendicular to the running of the direction of the paper or a newspaper tabloid page with lines of type parallel to the running of the direction of the paper.

In addition to press systems, the scope of these reviews includes the five press system components. They are: (1) A printing unit, which is any component that prints in monocolor, spot color and/or process (full) color; (2) a reel tension paster, which is any component that feeds a roll of paper more than two newspaper broadsheet pages in width into a subject printing unit; (3) a folder, which is a module or combination of modules capable of cutting, folding, and/or delivering the paper from a roll or rolls of newspaper broadsheet paper more than two pages in width into a newspaper format; (4) conveyance and access apparatus capable of manipulating a roll of paper more than two newspaper broadsheet pages across through the production process and which provides structural support and access; and (5) a computerized control system, which is any computer equipment and/or software designed specifically to control, monitor, adjust, and coordinate the functions and operations of large newspaper printing presses or press components.

A press addition is comprised of a union of one or more of the press components defined above and the equipment necessary to integrate such components into an existing press system.

Because of their size, large newspaper printing press systems, press additions, and press components are typically shipped either partially assembled or unassembled, complete or incomplete, and are assembled and/or completed prior to and/or during the installation process in the United States. Any of the five components, or collection of components, the use of which is to fulfill a contract for large newspaper printing press systems, press additions, or press components, regardless of degree of assembly and/or degree of combination with non-subject elements before or after importation, is included in the scope of these reviews. Also included in the scope are elements of a LNPP system, addition or component, which taken altogether, constitute at least 50 percent of the cost of manufacture of any of the five major LNPP components of which they are a part.

For purposes of these reviews, the following definitions apply irrespective of any different definition that may be found in Customs rulings, U.S. Customs law or the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS): (1) The term ''unassembled'' means fully or partially unassembled or disassembled; and (2) the term ''incomplete'' means lacking one or more elements with which the LNPP is intended to be equipped in order to fulfill a contract for a LNPP system, addition or component.

This scope does not cover spare or replacement parts. Spare or replacement parts imported pursuant to a LNPP contract, which are not integral to the

original start-up and operation of the LNPP, and are separately identified and valued in a LNPP contract, whether or not shipped in combination with covered merchandise, are excluded from the scope of these reviews. Used presses are also not subject to this scope. Used presses are those that have been previously sold in an arm's-length transaction to a purchaser that used them to produce newspapers in the ordinary course of business.

Further, these reviews cover all current and future printing technologies capable of printing newspapers, including, but not limited to, lithographic (offset or direct), flexographic, and letterpress systems. The products covered by these reviews are imported into the United States under subheadings 8443.11.10, 8443.11.50, 8443.30.00, 8443.59.50, 8443.60.00, and 8443.90.50 of the HTSUS. Large newspaper printing presses may also enter under HTSUS subheadings 8443.21.00 and 8443.40.00. Large newspaper printing press computerized control systems may enter under HTSUS subheadings 8471.49.10, 8471.49.21, 8471.49.26, 8471.50.40, 8471.50.80, and 8537.10.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these reviews is dispositive.

Duty Absorption

On November 17, 1998, and on January 21, 1999, the petitioner 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, both MHI and TKS 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)(1) of the Department's regulations provides that during any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping order, the Department will conduct a duty absorption review, if requested. Because these reviews were initiated two years after the publication of the order, we are making a duty absorption determination in this segment of the proceeding.

The Department's February 5, 1999, antidumping questionnaire requested proof that unaffiliated purchasers will ultimately pay the antidumping duties to be assessed on entries during the review periods. On March 8, 1999, MHI, instead of providing the requested data, argued that the object of a duty absorption inquiry—to ascertain whether a respondent changed its conduct after an antidumping duty order was imposed—is inapplicable in MHI's case because the sole U.S. sale under review in this segment of the proceeding, the Washington Post sale, was made prior to the imposition of an antidumping duty order. However, the fact that the date of sale occurred prior to the imposition of the order is not relevant in this case, where entries pursuant to this sale occurred during the POR. Moreover, based on MHI's contractual information on the record (*see* Memo to the File from the Team dated September 30, 1999), we cannot conclude that the unaffiliated purchaser in the United States will pay the ultimately assessed duty. Furthermore, because we have preliminarily determined that there is a dumping margin on MHI's U.S. sale entered during the POR, we preliminarily find that antidumping duties have been absorbed by MHI on its single U.S. sale. With respect to TKS, we preliminarily find that there is no duty absorption, as we have preliminarily determined that there is no dumping margin with respect to its U.S. sales.

Date of Sale

While the Department normally will use the date of invoice as the date of sale, we have determined in this case that the contract date better reflects the date on which the producer/exporter established the material terms of sale. Where the record demonstrates that the contract established the material terms of sale, we used the contract date as the date of sale for the transactions examined in this proceeding.

In the case of MHI's sale to the Washington Post, we used the April 26, 1996, revised contract date, rather than the May 16, 1995, date of the original contract, as the date of sale for currency conversion purposes. The Department has a longstanding practice which bases the date of sale on the date when all the essential terms (usually price and quantity) are firmly established and no longer within the control of the parties. *See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Polyvinyl Alcohol from Taiwan,* 61 FR 14064, 14067 (March 29, 1996). Based on our analysis of the information submitted for the record, we have determined that the essential terms of the sale were not established until the April 1996 contract date. In particular, the April 1996 contract made the following significant changes from the May 1995 contract: (a) Revised the contract price, (b) substantially altered the payment schedule, and (c) revised other terms, such as service agreements, that affected the net price to the customer.

With regard to TKS, we used the contract date as the date of sale. We determined that the contract date is more appropriate than the invoice date in this instance because the contract date reflects the date when the essential terms of the sale were established.

Product Comparisons

Although the home market was viable for both respondents, in accordance with section 773 of the Act, we based normal value (NV) on constructed value (CV) because we determined that the unique, custom-built nature of each LNPP sold does not permit proper price-to-price comparisons. (*See* September 30, 1999, Memorandum to Louis Apple from The Team Re: *Determining the Appropriate Basis for Normal Value.*)

Normal Value Comparisons

To determine whether MHI's and TKS's sales of LNPPs to the United States were made at less than normal value, we compared constructed export price (CEP) to the NV, as described in the ''Constructed Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice.

Constructed Export Price and Further Manufacturing

MHI

We calculated CEP, in accordance with sections 772(b) and (d) of the Act, for MHI's POR sale because MHI's affiliated U.S. sales agent engaged in a broad range of activities including coordination of installation, which we have classified as further manufacturing.

We calculated CEP based on the packed, installed price to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made deductions for the following charges: net trade-in allowance; foreign inland freight charges; foreign brokerage and handling charges; bonded warehouse expenses; international freight expenses; combined foreign inland, U.S. inland, and marine insurance expenses; Japanese export insurance and U.S. inland insurance expenses; combined U.S. brokerage and handling and inland freight charges; and U.S. Customs duty. We also made deductions for commissions, imputed credit, and direct training expenses.

We deducted those indirect selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States, including indirect training expenses.

As in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, we calculated an imputed credit expense by multiplying an interest rate by the net balance of production costs incurred and progress payments made during the construction period. MHI reported this expense using a Japanese yen-denominated, short-term interest rate for the portion of imputed credit expenses incurred prior to shipment. We recalculated MHI's reported imputed credit expense to reflect MHI's U.S.-dollar-denominated, short-term interest rate for the entire balance, consistent with our imputed credit expense methodology that relies on the interest rate applicable to the currency in which the sale is made. We also corrected the imputed credit expense calculation by converting the yen-denominated production costs into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rate in effect on the date of the MHI sale.

In addition, we deducted the cost of further manufacturing or assembly, including installation expenses. We classified installation charges as part of further manufacturing, because the U.S. installation process involves extensive technical activities on the part of engineers and installation supervisors. *See Mitsubishi Heavy Industries* v. *United States,* 15 F. Supp. 2d 807, 815–16 (CIT 1998) (*Mitsubishi*). As for the further manufacturing cost, we relied on MHI's reported amount with the exception that we recalculated the general and administrative (G&A) and interest expense rates based on the entire POR and not just part of the period as reported.

Further, we made an adjustment for CEP profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

TKS

We calculated CEP, in accordance with sections 772 (b) and (d) of the Act, for TKS's POR sale because this sale took place after importation by a seller affiliated with the producer/exporter and because the sale involved further manufacturing in the United States.

We calculated the CEP sale based on the packed price to an unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made deductions for the following charges: foreign inland freight to port in Japan; foreign brokerage and handling; international freight; combined marine and foreign insurance; U.S. brokerage and handling; U.S. Customs duty; unloading expenses; and cargo survey fees. We also deducted those selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States [1].

We also deducted the cost of any further manufacturing or assembly, including testing and technical service expenses. We classified testing and technical service expenses as part of further manufacturing, because the U.S. installation process involves extensive technical activities on the part of engineers and installation supervisors (*see Mitsubishi*). In accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we made an adjustment for CEP profit.

Cost of Production Analysis

The Department disregarded certain sales made by MHI and TKS during the LTFV investigation pursuant to a finding that sales were made below cost. Thus, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that respondents MHI and TKS made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise in the current review periods. As a result, the Department initiated investigations to determine whether the respondents made home market sales during the POR at prices below their COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act.

We compared the COP figures to home market sales of the foreign like product as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether: (1) Within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities; and (2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

The results of our cost tests for both MHI and TKS indicated that certain home market sales were at prices below COP, and would not permit the full recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we therefore excluded the below-cost sales from our analysis and used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis for determining selling expenses and profit.

Constructed Value

MHI

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales database. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A), we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country.

We relied on MHI's reported CV amounts with the following exception. We recalculated the G&A and interest expense rate, applied to the cost of manufacturing (COM) and included in the cost of production (COP) and CV, to include G&A and interest for all three years of production.

For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling and commission expense rate, calculated based on sales of the foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, and applied this rate to the U.S. COM. We excluded from this analysis a sale made to an affiliated party.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act, we added the U.S. packing costs to a CV net of packing.

TKS

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A and U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales database. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A), we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country.

We relied on the reported CV amounts with the following exceptions. We recalculated the G&A rate applied to COM in the calculation of COP and CV to include additional operating income and expenses. We also recalculated the G&A and interest expense rate to include G&A and interest for all fiscal years of the production period.

For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market direct and indirect selling expense rates, calculated based on sales of the foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, and applied these rates to the U.S. COM.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act, we added U.S. packing costs to a CV net of packing.

[1] Since TKS's calculated imputed credit amount reflected revenue rather than an expense, we appropriately added to CEP the amount that related to the economic activity in the United States

Price-to-CV Comparisons

For CEP to CV comparisons, we deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses, including imputed credit, pursuant to section 773(a)(8) of the Act. We calculated imputed credit for CV purposes in accordance with the methodology explained in the ''Constructed Export Price'' section of this notice. We imputed credit expenses for CV using the weighted-average, yen-based, short-term interest rate reported for the POR, since home market sales were denominated in yen.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

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 level of trade (LOT) as the export price (EP) or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV as is the case in these reviews, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from the exporter to an unaffiliated U.S. customer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to an affiliated importer, after the deductions required under section 772(d) of the Act.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP sales, we examine 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. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732 (November 19, 1997).

For CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). The CEP offset is calculated as the lesser of the following:

1. The indirect selling expenses on the comparison market sale, or
2. The indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP.

In their respective questionnaire responses, MHI and TKS each reported two different LOTs—one for the U.S. market and another for the comparison market—and both reported that comparison-market sales are made at a more advanced LOT than U.S. sales. Both respondents requested that the Department perform a CEP offset in lieu of a LOT adjustment, as they were unable to quantify the price differences related to sales made at the different LOTs. To determine whether a CEP offset was warranted, we compared the distribution systems used by the respondents for their comparison market and U.S. sales, including selling functions and class of customer, for each claimed LOT, after making the appropriate deductions under section 772(d) of the Act. Both respondents reported that they sold through one channel of distribution in the comparison market, and through a different channel in the United States. In the comparison market, MHI and TKS sold subject merchandise directly to unaffiliated customers, while in the United States, they both sold the subject merchandise through their affiliates, MLP U.S.A., Inc. and TKS (U.S.A), respectively, who then sold the subject merchandise directly to unaffiliated purchasers. For MHI, we compared the selling functions and the level of activity in each distribution channel, and found that several of the functions performed in the comparison-market either were not performed in connection with the U.S. sale at the export LOT, or were performed at a significantly lower level of activity on the part of MHI. These selling functions include: pre-sale consultations, advertising, market research and identifying potential customers, arranging for transportation of merchandise, receipt of proposal requests, customer invoicing, payment collection, and post-sale services.

For TKS, we compared the selling functions and the level of activity in each distribution channel, and found that several of the functions performed in the comparison-market either were not performed in connection with the U.S. sale at the export LOT, or were performed only by the affiliated company, TKS (U.S.A.). These selling functions included: contract negotiations, plant layout and design, after-sale service, parts inventory maintenance, and operator training.

As we have determined that installation expenses incurred on the U.S. sales should be treated as further manufacturing expenses (rather than movement expenses, as claimed by MHI, or direct selling expenses, as claimed by TKS), the CEP after deduction for all expenses under section 772(d) of the Act reflects an uninstalled LNPP. Supporting this contention is the fact that many of the same selling functions that are performed at the comparison-market LOT are performed not at the export LOT, but by the respondents' U.S. affiliates. Based on this analysis, we conclude that the comparison-market and U.S. channels of distribution and the sales functions associated with each are sufficiently different so as to constitute two different levels of trade, and we find that the comparison-market sales are made at a more advanced LOT than are CEP sales. As there is no comparison-market LOT that is comparable to that in the United States, we have no basis for determining the extent to which the difference in LOTs affects price comparability. Therefore, we performed a CEP offset to NV in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act by deducting the lesser of home market indirect selling expenses or the sum of the U.S. indirect selling expenses.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions, in accordance with section 773(A)(a) of the Act, based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of these reviews, we preliminarily determine that the weighted-average dumping margins for the respective PORs are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd	9/5/96–8/31/98	55.28
Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho	9/1/97–8/31/98	0.00

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). If requested, a hearing will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday 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 30 days and 37 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 issue the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any 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 these reviews. The final results of these reviews shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the final results of these reviews and for future deposits of estimated duties. We will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by these reviews if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of these reviews 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 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 these review periods. 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 these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those established in the final results of these reviews, 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 these reviews, 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 manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 58.69 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.

These administrative reviews and notice are published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 30, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–26592 Filed 10–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–839, A–583–833]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the Republic of Korea and Taiwan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Kane (Republic of Korea) or Alysia Wilson (Taiwan), AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–2815 or 482–0108, respectively.

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

On April 29, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its notice of initiation of antidumping investigations of certain polyester staple fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan. *See Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan,* 64 FR 23053. The initiation notice stated that we would issue our preliminary determinations by September 9, 1999. On August 25, 1999, at the request of E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc.; Arteva Specialities S.a.r.l., d/b/a KoSa; Wellman, Inc.; and Intercontinental Polymers, Inc. (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''the petitioners'') [1], the Department extended the preliminary determination until no later than September 29, 1999. *See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan,* 64 FR 47766 (September 1, 1999).

On September 29, 1999, pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the petitioners requested that the Department postpone the preliminary determinations in these investigations. Since the Department finds no compelling reason to deny the request, we are postponing the deadline for issuing these determinations until no later than October 4, 1999.

This extension and notice are in accordance with section 733(c) of the Act.

[1] E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Taiwan case.