

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-570-828]

Silicomanganese From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 11, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy Finn at (202) 482-0065 or James Terpstra at (202) 482-3965, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Information*Statutory Time Limits*

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the Date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On January 25, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on silicomanganese from the People's Republic of China, covering the period December 1, 1997 through November 8, 1999, we published the preliminary results of review (64 FR 60784). In our notice of preliminary results, we stated our intention to issue the final results of this review no later than March 7, 2000.

Extension of Final Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore we are extending the time

limits for completion of the final results until no later than May 6, 2000. See Decision Memorandum from Holly A. Kuga to Robert S. LaRussa, dated December 17, 1999, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Commerce Building.

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

Dated: January 5, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-632 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-533-808]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results and partial rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by Viraj Group, Ltd. ("Viraj"), respondent, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod ("SSWR") from India. The period of review ("POR") is December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998.

We have preliminarily determined that respondent Viraj has made sales below normal value ("NV"). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this segment of the proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 11, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen Bailey or Rick Johnson, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0413 (Bailey) or (202) 482-3818 (Johnson).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**The Applicable Statute**

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

Background

On October 20, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rod from India (58 FR 54110). On December 8, 1998, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order (63 FR 67646).

On December 29, 1998, Mukand, Ltd. ("Mukand"), Panchmahal Steel, Ltd. ("Panchmahal") and Viraj requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from India. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b), we published a notice of initiation of the review of Panchmahal and Viraj on January 25, 1999 (64 FR 3682), and published a notice of initiation of the review of Mukand on February 22, 1999 (64 FR 8542). The review of Mukand was initiated at a later date due to an inadvertent omission in the January 25, 1999 **Federal Register** notice. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), on February 23, 1999, Mukand and Panchmahal timely withdrew their requests for review.

Respondent Viraj submitted its Section A questionnaire response on March 24, 1999, and its Sections B & C questionnaire responses on April 19, 1999.

On May 11, 1999, petitioners submitted a sales-below-cost allegation. This allegation was supplemented on July 2, 1999. Based on the request by petitioners, on July 23, 1999, the Department initiated a sales-below-cost investigation of stainless steel wire rod by Viraj. On August 30, 1999, respondent Viraj submitted its response to the Section D questionnaire. The Department, however, considered this response to be insufficient and requested Viraj to re-submit its Section D questionnaire response, which it did on October 14, 1999.

On August 31, 1999, due to the reasons set forth in the *Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from*

India, the Department extended the due date for the preliminary results. In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department extended the due date for the notice of preliminary results the maximum 120 days allowable, from the original due date of September 2, 1999, to January 3, 2000.

On November 4, 1999, Viraj asked to withdraw its request for this review. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), if a respondent withdraws its request for an administrative review within 90 days of the date of publication of the initiation of the review, the Department will rescind the review. The Department may extend the time limit if it decides that it is reasonable to do so. In this case, Viraj's request for rescission has not been granted because the request was filed after the 90 day deadline had passed (the administrative review was initiated on January 25, 1999), and we do not find that it is otherwise reasonable to do so (see Partial Rescission of Review, below, for details).

From December 6–11, 1999, the Department conducted a sales and cost verification of Viraj at its production facilities in Tarapur, India. The results of this verification are contained in the sales and cost verification reports for Viraj, public versions of which are on file in the Department's Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of SSWR from India. SSWR are products which are hot-rolled or hot-rolled annealed and/or pickled rounds, squares, octagons, hexagons or other shapes, in coils. SSWR are made of alloy steels containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. These products are only manufactured by hot-rolling and are normally sold in coiled form, and are of solid cross-section. The majority of SSWR sold in the United States are round in cross-section shape, annealed and pickled. The most common size is 5.5 millimeters in diameter.

The SSWR subject to this review are currently classifiable under subheadings 7221.00.0005, 7221.00.0015, 7221.00.0020, 7221.00.0030, 7221.00.0040, 7221.00.045, 7221.00.0060, 7221.00.0075, and 7221.00.0080 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written

description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

Partial Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, a party that requests an administrative review may withdraw such request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. As noted above in the "Background" section, because Mukand and Punchmahal have timely withdrawn their requests for review, the Department is rescinding the review with respect to these two companies. This rescission of administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). By contrast, Viraj did not withdraw its request for an administrative review in a timely manner. Although under section 351.213(d)(1) the Department may extend the deadline for withdrawing a request for review, in this case Viraj did not ask for rescission of the review until after the Department had expended substantial resources in conducting the review. In adopting section 351.213(d)(1) the Department explained that we would take into consideration how much time and effort had been devoted to a review in deciding whether to permit an untimely withdrawal of request for review. *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27317 (1997). In this particular case, the Department has solicited and received multiple questionnaire responses and supplemental responses from respondent, and, as discussed above, has initiated a sales-below-cost investigation. Therefore, we have continued with this review with respect to Viraj.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by the respondent, covered by the description in the "Scope of the Review" section, above, and sold in the comparison market during the POR, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Because there were no contemporaneous sales of identical or similar foreign like product in the comparison market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to constructed value ("CV").

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 purchase order date better reflects the date on which Viraj

established the material terms of sale. In this case, Viraj stated in its April 19, 1999 questionnaire response that the material terms of sale are set at order date. This claim was confirmed at verification. See *Memorandum to the File: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India—Antidumping Administrative Review 12/01/97 through 11/30/98—Verification of Viraj Impoexpo's ("VIL") and Viraj Alloys ("VAL") Sales ("Sales Verification Report")*, at page 5 (January 3, 2000). Although by using the order date as date of sale the U.S. sales fall outside of the POR, the Department has the discretion to consider U.S. sales which fall outside of the POR in its analysis. In accordance with the Department's practice, we reviewed sales of merchandise shipped to the United States during the POR.

Affiliation

Viraj is composed of three different companies, two of which are involved in the production and sale of subject merchandise. Viraj Forgings Ltd., which produces steel forgings, is not involved in the production or sale of SSWR. Viraj Alloys, Ltd. ("VAL") produces steel billets which are transferred to Tata SSL, Ltd. ("Tata"), an unaffiliated Indian steel company, which is subcontracted to roll the billets as a tolling operation. VAL then sells the rolled billets to Viraj Impoexpo, Ltd. ("VIL"), which anneals and pickles a certain percentage of the rolled billets into SSWR and subsequently exports the subject merchandise.

Normal Value Comparisons

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

Export Price

For calculation of the price to the United States, we used EP, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was first sold by Viraj to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and CEP treatment was not otherwise indicated. The Department calculated EP for Viraj based on packed, delivered prices to customers in the United States. We made deductions from the starting price for movement expenses (foreign inland freight, ocean freight, insurance, and brokerage and handling) in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act. Additionally, we added to the U.S. price an amount for duty drawback pursuant to section

772(c)(1)(B) of the Act. For a further discussion of duty drawback, *see Sales Verification Report*, at pages 11–12, January 3, 2000. As discussed above in the “Date of Sale” section, we used order date as the date of sale.

Normal Value

After testing (1) home market viability and (2) whether comparison market sales were at below-cost prices, we calculated NV as noted in the “Price-to-CV Comparisons” section of this notice.

1. Comparison Market Viability

Viraj had no sales of the subject merchandise in the home market during the POR. Moreover, the only market outside the United States to which Viraj sold the foreign like product during the POR was Turkey. In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in Turkey to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Viraj’s volume of third country sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act. Because Viraj’s aggregate volume of third country sales to Turkey was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we based our NV analysis on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in Turkey.

2. Cost of Production Analysis

On May 11, 1999, petitioners filed an allegation that Viraj made third country sales at prices that were below the cost of production (“COP”), and supplemented this allegation on July 2, 1999. Our analysis of the allegation indicated that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Viraj had sold SSWR in the third country market at prices less than the COP. Accordingly, on July 23, 1999, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, we initiated a COP investigation to determine whether sales were made at prices less than the COP.

We conducted the COP analysis described below.

A. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of Viraj’s cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, including the cost of the tolling operation performed by Tata, plus an amount for third country selling, general and administrative expenses (“SG&A”), including interest expenses, and packing costs, with the following exceptions.

1. Billet-Major Input

In its original section D questionnaire response, dated August 30, 1999, VIL reported that it purchases the billets used in the production of SSWR from VAL (after Tata further processes the billets). Because the billets are produced by VAL, an affiliate of VIL, and because the billets are a major input in the production of SSWR sold by VIL, the major input rule should be applied to value the billets that VIL obtained from VAL (*see Notice of Final Results and Partial Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Pasta From Italy*, 64 FR 6615, 6621 (February 10, 1999)). The major input rule of section 773(f)(3) of the Act provides that the Department may value inputs obtained from affiliated parties at the highest of the transfer price, market price, or the affiliated supplier’s costs. *See*, 19 CFR Section 351.407(b). In this instance, the Department found at verification that the transfer price is identical to the market price and above VAL’s cost of production. *See Memorandum to the File: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India—Antidumping Administrative Review 12/01/97 through 11/30/98—Verification of Viraj Impeexpo’s (“VIL”) and Viraj Alloys (“VAL”) Cost of Production (“Cost Verification Report”)* at page 8 (January 3, 2000). Therefore, we are valuing input billets at the transfer price, as reported in verification exhibit 15 of the *Cost Verification Report*.

2. Fixed Overhead Costs

At verification, the Department determined that Viraj did not include the account items “Material Handling Charges” (*i.e.*, freight expenses) and “Repairs to Plant & Machinery” in its calculation of fixed overhead costs. *See Cost Verification Report* at page 11. Because these expenses relate to the production of subject merchandise, we have determined that they should be included as fixed overhead costs. Accordingly, we have recalculated the ratio of fixed overhead costs to the cost of goods sold and adjusted the total cost of manufacture. *See Memorandum to the File: Analysis Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Review for Viraj (“Analysis Memorandum”)* at page 5.

3. Variable Overhead Costs

At verification, the Department found a minor error by Viraj in its calculation of the variable overhead costs for light diesel oil. Based on this finding, we have revised Viraj’s reported variable overhead cost. *See Analysis Memorandum* at page 5.

4. General and Administrative (“G&A”) Expenses

At verification, the Department found that Viraj improperly included selling expenses in its calculation of G&A expenses. Therefore, for purposes of these preliminary results, we have recalculated the G&A factor. *See Analysis Memorandum* at page 4.

5. Interest Expenses

At verification, the Department found that in addition to reporting bank charges as a direct selling expense in its Section B & C response, Viraj reported banking charges in its calculation of net interest expense. Therefore, for purposes of these preliminary results, we have excluded banking charges from the calculation of net interest expense. Additionally, at verification we found that Viraj deducted from net interest expense an amount for interest usance charges. Because these charges were not reported by Viraj in its U.S. or home market sales file as a direct selling expense, we preliminarily find that these interest usance charges should be included in Viraj’s net interest expense. *See Analysis Memorandum* at page 5.

6. Packing

At verification, the Department found that Viraj calculated its POR packing cost based on the sample cost of packing materials during the POR, and requested that Viraj recalculate packing expenses based on the weighted-average POR cost of packing materials. For purposes of these preliminary results, we have used the recalculated packing expense as explained in the *Sales Verification Report* at page 10.

B. Test of Third Country Market Sales Prices

We compared the weighted-average COP figures to third country 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 COP. In determining whether to disregard third country market sales made at prices less than 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. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to the third country market prices, less any applicable movement charges.

C. Results of the COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C), where more than 20 percent of respondent’s sales of a given product

were at prices less than the COP, we disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were made in "substantial quantities." As a result of our COP test, we preliminarily determine to disregard certain below-cost sales during the POR. However, as mentioned above, because there were no contemporaneous comparison market matches, we have not used Viraj's third country sales as the basis for normal value.

Calculation of Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used CV as the basis for NV because there were no contemporaneous sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act based on the sum of respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A, including interest expenses, and profit. We calculated the COP included in the calculation of CV as noted above, in the "Calculation of COP" section of the notice. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.405(b)(1), 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.

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 level of trade ("LOT") as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on constructed value ("CV"), that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative ("SG&A") expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. As discussed above, all of Viraj's sales to the U.S. were EP sales.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP, 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.

In the present review, Viraj did not request a level of trade (LOT) adjustment. To ensure that no such adjustment was necessary, in accordance with the principles discussed above, we examined information regarding the distribution systems in both the U.S. and third country market, including the selling functions, classes of customers, and selling expenses.

In both the third country comparison market and the United States, Viraj reported one LOT and one distribution system with one class of customer (distributors). Viraj stated that it manufactures the merchandise after receipt of a final confirmed order and sells directly to its customers in the comparison market and in the United States on a CIF basis. Viraj reported that it uses a forwarding agent for sales to the United States but that in all other aspects it performs identical selling functions in both the third country comparison market and the United States. These selling functions include soliciting inquiries from customers, negotiating with customers, and procurement of export orders. Further, Viraj reported that it did not provide other sales-related services on any of its sales, such as inventory maintenance, technical advice, warranty services, or advertising. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude that Viraj performs identical selling functions in the comparison market and the United States and that a LOT adjustment is not warranted.

Price-to-CV Comparisons

For price-to-CV comparisons, we made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment by deducting third country market direct selling expenses (i.e., imputed credit and banking charges) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (i.e., imputed credit and banking charges). For computing credit expenses, it is the Department's normal practice to use an interest rate applicable to loans in the same currency as that in which the sales are denominated (see, e.g., *Analysis for the preliminary determination in the investigation of stainless steel plate in coils from Korea—Pohang Iron & Steel Company*, 63 FR 59535 (November 4, 1998)). We note that while all sales to the United States are denominated in U.S. dollars, the short-term interest rate used by Viraj was derived from loans denominated in rupees. Therefore, we have not accepted Viraj's reported credit expense for its U.S. sales and have instead calculated an imputed credit expense for these sales using the U.S. weighted-average effective rate on

commercial and industrial loans over one month and under one year made by all commercial banks. The Federal Reserve calculates this rate quarterly. Loan rates were collected from the four quarters corresponding to the POR and then weight-averaged by the amount of loans made in each quarter. All calculations are shown at Appendix I of the *Analysis Memorandum*.

Additionally, at verification, we found that for its U.S. sales, Viraj did not include banking charges in the field "Other Direct Selling Expenses" as stated in its supplemental response, dated June 25, 1999, at page 3. See *Sales Verification Report* at page 10. Therefore, for purposes of these preliminary results, we have used the information obtained at verification to determine banking charges for the sales in issue. See *Analysis Memorandum*, at page 5.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for Viraj for the period December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
Viraj	2.76

The Department will disclose calculations performed in connection with this preliminary determination 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 two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the case briefs. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**; rebuttal briefs may be submitted not later than five days thereafter. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in any written comments or at a hearing, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of this review, the Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on the merchandise subject to

review. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), if applicable, we will calculate an importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR.

Furthermore, the following 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) For Viraj, a deposit equal to the above margin will be required; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original 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 (3) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 48.80 percent, the "All Others" rate made effective by the original investigation.

These deposit requirements, 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)(2) 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 determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 3, 2000.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-634 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-054, A-588-604]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof From Japan; Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Time Limits

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limits.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits for the final results of the 1997-1998 administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order (A-588-604) and finding (A-588-054) on tapered roller bearings from Japan. These reviews cover three manufacturers/exporters and one reseller/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 11, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Scott at (202) 482-2657 or Robert James at (202) 482-0649, AD/CVD Enforcement Office Eight, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete these reviews within the normal statutory time limit, the Department is extending the time limits for completion of the final results until Monday, February 28, 2000 in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. See Memorandum dated January 4, 2000 from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, on file in Room B-099 of the main Commerce building.

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

Dated: January 4, 2000.

Edward Yang,

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

[FR Doc. 00-639 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Exporters' Textile Advisory Committee; Notice of Open Meeting

A meeting of the Exporters' Textile Advisory Committee will be held on February 29, 2000. The meeting will be from noon to 4 p.m. in the Main Conference Room on the sixth floor at the office of Milliken & Company, 1045 6th Avenue, New York, New York. The Committee provides advice and guidance to Department officials on the identification and surmounting of barriers to the expansion of textile exports, and on methods of encouraging textile firms to participate in export expansion.

The Committee functions solely as an advisory body in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The meeting will be open to the public with a limited number of seats available. For further information or copies of the minutes, contact William Dawson at (202) 482-5155.

Dated: January 6, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 00-605 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 010300B]

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

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

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and its Comprehensive Management Committee, Demersal Committee, Monkfish Committee, Law Enforcement Committee, Committee Chairmen, and Executive Committee will hold a public meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 25, 2000 to Thursday, January 27, 2000. See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION for specific dates and times.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn Select, 480 King Street, Old Town Alexandria, VA; telephone: 703-549-6080.