

Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain compact ductile iron waterworks fittings and glands ("CDIW") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). Because no domestic party responded to the sunset review notice of initiation by the applicable deadline, the Department is revoking this order.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5050 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 7, 1993, the Department issued the antidumping duty order on CDIW from the PRC (58 FR 47117). Pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the Department initiated a sunset review of this order by publishing notice of the initiation in the **Federal Register**, November 2, 1999 (64 FR 59160). In addition, as a courtesy to interested parties, the Department sent letters, via certified and registered mail, to each party listed on the Department's most current service list for this proceeding to inform them of the automatic initiation of the sunset review on this order.

No domestic interested party in the sunset review on this order responded to the notice of initiation by the November 17, 1999 deadline (*see* § 351.218(d)(1)(i) of *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13520 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*").

Determination To Revoke

Pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(A) of the Act and § 351.218(d)(1)(iii)(B)(3) of the *Sunset Regulations*, if no domestic interested party responds to the notice of initiation, the Department shall issue a final determination, within 90 days after the initiation of the review, revoking the finding or order. Because no domestic interested party responded to the notice of initiation by the applicable deadline, November 17, 1999, we are revoking this antidumping duty order.

Effective Date of Revocation and Termination

Pursuant to section 751(c)(6)(A)(iv) of the Act, the Department will instruct the

United States Customs Service to terminate the suspension of liquidation of the merchandise subject to this order entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, on or after January 1, 2000. Entries of subject merchandise prior to the effective date of revocation will continue to be subject to suspension of liquidation and antidumping duty deposit requirements. The Department will complete any pending administrative reviews of this order and will conduct administrative reviews of subject merchandise entered prior to the effective date of revocation in response to appropriately filed requests for review.

Dated: January 14, 2000.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-1658 Filed 1-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-423-602]

Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Belgium

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Belgium.

SUMMARY: On September 23, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Belgium (64 FR 51511) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from the domestic interested parties. The Department did not receive a request for a public hearing, and, therefore, no hearing was held. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Darla D. Brown 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) 482-3207 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*") and 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

Scope

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order is industrial phosphoric acid ("IPA") from Belgium. IPA is currently classifiable under item number 2809.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

Background

On September 23, 1999, the Department issued its *Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Belgium* (64 FR 51511) ("*Preliminary Results*"). In our *Preliminary Results*, we found that revocation of the order would likely result in continuation or recurrence of dumping. In addition, we preliminarily determined that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail were the order revoked was 14.67 percent for Societe Chimique Prayon-Rupel, S.A. ("Prayon") as well as for "all other" producers and/or exporters.

On November 8, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i), we received comments on behalf of Albright and Wilson Americas, Inc., FMC Corporation, and Solutia Inc. (collectively, the "domestic interested parties"). We have addressed the comments received below.

Comments

Comment 1: The domestic interested parties maintain that the Department

correctly found that dumping would likely continue or recur if the antidumping duty order were revoked. The domestic interested parties base their conclusion on the fact that dumping has continued over the life of the order as well as the fact that import volumes have declined significantly over the life of the order. In addition, the domestic interested parties argue that the Department correctly rejected Prayon's argument that future exchange rates would eliminate Prayon's dumping margin.

Department: The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties. For reasons provided in greater detail in our *Preliminary Results*, we find that dumping has continued over the life of the order and is likely to continue if the order were revoked.

Comment 2: The domestic interested parties argue that the Department correctly chose the margin of dumping found in the original less than fair value ("LTFV") determination as the margin to report to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission"). The domestic interested parties maintain that the Department was correct in selecting the margins from the original investigation to forward to the Commission because these margins are the only calculated rates which reflect the behavior of producers/exporters without the discipline of the order in place.

Department: The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties. Again, for reasons provided in detail in our *Preliminary Results*, we find that the margins likely to prevail were the order revoked would be 14.67 percent for Prayon and 14.67 percent for "all others".

Final Results of Review

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

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Prayon	14.67
All Others	14.67

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: January 18, 2000.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-1659 Filed 1-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty new shipper review of stainless steel bar from India.

SUMMARY: On August 25, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes for the final results.

This review covers three producers/exporters of stainless steel bar to the United States during the period February 1, 1998, through July 31, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Breeden or Melani Miller, Import Administration, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office 1, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-1174 or 482-0116, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 25, 1999, the Department published the preliminary results of the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India (64 FR 46350) ("*Preliminary Results*"). The manufacturers/exporters in this new shipper review are Jyoti Steel Industries ("Jyoti"), Parekh Bright Bars Pvt. Ltd. ("Parekh"), and Shah Alloys Ltd. ("Shah"). We verified information provided by Jyoti as discussed in the *Verification* section, below. We received a case brief from the petitioners¹ on December 22, 1999. We received rebuttal briefs from Jyoti and Shah on January 7, 2000.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of stainless steel bar ("SSB"). SSB means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), wire (*i.e.*, cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The SSB subject to this review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.10.0005, 7222.10.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for

¹ Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division, Crucible Materials Corp., Electroalloy Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Slater Steels Corp., Talley Metals Technology, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC).