

demonstrating increased dumping coupled with increased market share.

Our review of import statistics, provided by the domestic interested parties, covering pipes from Korea and Taiwan demonstrated that the margins calculated in the original investigations are probative of the behavior of Korean and Taiwanese manufacturers/exporters if the orders were revoked as they are the only margins which reflect their actions absent the discipline of the order. However, with respect to Ta Chen, the Department disagrees with the domestic interested parties. Absent evidence that Ta Chen chose to increase dumping in order to maintain or increase market share, the margin calculated in the original investigation is the margin the Department will provide to the Commission.<sup>16</sup>

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 Reviews section of this notice.

**Final Results of Reviews**

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

**KOREA**

| Manufacturer/exporter   | Margin (percent) |
|---|------------------|
| Pusan Steel Pipe Co., Ltd (now SeAH Steel Corp.) <sup>1</sup> ..... | 2.67             |
| All manufacturers/producers/exporters .....                         | 7.00             |

<sup>1</sup> SeAH is the corporate successor to Pusan, and Pusan had acquired certain of Sammi's production assets. See Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea; Final Results of Changed-Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63 FR 16979 (April 7, 1998).

<sup>16</sup> The Department recently made a preliminary determination to revoke the order, with respect to Ta Chen, based on *de minimis* margins in the last three reviews. See Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Taiwan Certain Welded: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 64 FR 71728 (December 22, 1999). However, given that Ta Chen waived participation in this sunset proceeding and did not provide any information indicating that a more recently calculated margin would be more appropriate, the Department determined that, consistent with the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the margin calculated in the original investigation is most likely to prevail if the order were revoked.

**TAIWAN**

| Manufacturer/exporter  | Margin (percent) |
|--|------------------|
| Chang Tieh Industry Co., Ltd (now Chang Mien) <sup>1</sup> . | excluded.        |
| Jaung Yuann Enterprise Co., Ltd..                            | 31.91.           |
| Ta Chen Stainless Pipe Co., Ltd.                             | 3.27.            |
| Yeun Chyang Industrial Co., Ltd.                             | 31.90.           |
| All Others .....   | 19.84.           |

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of antidumping duty law the Department concluded that Chang Mein is the successor firm to Chang Tieh, and, as such is excluded from the order. See Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Taiwan; Final Results of Changed-Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63 FR 34147 (June 23, 1998).

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 28, 2000.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-2585 Filed 2-3-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**[C-533-063]**

**Certain Iron-metal Castings From India: Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review Pursuant to Settlement**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment to final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On January 18, 1991, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** its final results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India for the period 1986 (56 FR 1976). Pursuant to

a settlement agreement, the Department has recalculated the countervailing duty rates. The final countervailing duty rates for this review period are listed below in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 4, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert Copyak, Office 6, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On

January 18, 1991, the Department published the final results of its administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India for the period January 1, 1986 through December 31, 1986. See *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings from India*, 56 FR 1976. Subsequently, respondents challenged the final results before the Court of International Trade (CIT). The primary issue involved the calculation of the program rates for the subsidies provided under India's International Price Reimbursement Scheme (IPRS). The IPRS is a program through which the Government of India (GOI) provided rebates to castings exporters that purchased domestically-produced pig iron at prices set by the GOI. According to the GOI, these rebates were calculated to equal the differences between the higher domestic prices actually paid and the lower alternative prices available from sources outside of India.

As the IPRS was also the subject of litigation for the review period 1985 in *Creswell v. United States*, Consolidated Court No. 91-01-00012 (*Creswell*), litigation for the review period 1986 was stayed pending finalization of *Creswell*. After the CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination for the 1985 administrative review (see *Creswell*, slip op. 98-139 (CIT Sept. 29, 1998)), the Department published a notice of amended final results in accordance with that opinion. See *Certain Iron-metal Castings from India: Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review In Accordance With Decision Upon Remand*, 63 FR 67858 (December 9, 1998). In lieu of pursuing further litigation with respect to the administrative review of the review period 1986, the parties have entered into a settlement agreement. The parties agreed to countervailing duty rates that were calculated based on the methodology approved by the CIT in *Creswell*. On December 10, 1999, the

CIT approved the settlement agreement and dismissed the lawsuit. *See Southern Star, Inc., v. United States*, Slip Op. 99-130, Consol. Ct. No. 91-01-00060 (CIT December 10, 1999).

#### Final Results of Review

Pursuant to the settlement agreement, we recalculated the company-specific and all-other subsidy rates for the period January 1, 1986, through December 31, 1986. The amended final countervailing duty rates are:

| Manufacturer/exporter                  | Revised rates (percent) |
|--|-------------------------|
| Crescent Foundry Co. Pvt. Ltd. ...     | 9.07                    |
| Kejriwal Iron & Steel Works .....      | 23.75                   |
| Govind Steel .....                     | 128.60                  |
| Uma Iron & Steel Co./Commex Corp. .... | 30.24                   |
| All Others .....                       | 16.66                   |

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue liquidation instructions directly to Customs. The above rates will not affect the cash deposit requirements currently in effect.

This amendment to the final results of countervailing duty administrative review notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 351.213, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: January 24, 2000.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-2578 Filed 2-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-533-063]

#### Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India: Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review Pursuant to Settlement

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

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment to final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On August 22, 1991, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** its final results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain

iron-metal castings from India for the period 1987 (56 FR 41658). Pursuant to a settlement agreement, the Department has recalculated the countervailing duty rates. The final countervailing duty rates for this review period are listed below in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 4, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Copyak, Office 6, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On August 22, 1991, the Department published the final results of its administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain iron-metal castings from India for the period January 1, 1987 through December 31, 1987. *See Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Certain Iron-Metal Castings from India*, 56 FR 41658. Subsequently, respondents challenged the final results before the Court of International Trade (CIT). The primary issue involved the calculation of the program rates for the subsidies provided under India's International Price Reimbursement Scheme (IPRS). The IPRS is a program through which the Government of India (GOI) provided rebates to castings exporters that purchased domestically-produced pig iron at prices set by the GOI. According to the GOI, these rebates were calculated to equal the differences between the higher domestic prices actually paid and the lower alternative prices available from sources outside of India.

As the IPRS was also the subject of litigation for the review period 1985 in *Creswell v. United States*, Consolidated Court No. 91-01-00012 (*Creswell*), litigation for the review period 1987 was stayed pending finalization of *Creswell*. After the CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination for the 1985 administrative review (*see Creswell*, slip op. 98-139 (CIT Sept. 29, 1998)), the Department published a notice of amended final results in accordance with that opinion. *See Certain Iron-metal Castings from India: Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review In Accordance With Decision Upon Remand*, 63 FR 67858 (December 9, 1998). In lieu of pursuing further litigation with respect to the administrative review of the review period 1987, the parties have entered into a settlement agreement. The parties agreed to countervailing duty rates that were calculated based on the methodology approved by the CIT in

*Creswell*. On December 10, 1999, the CIT approved the settlement agreement and dismissed the lawsuit. *See Super Castings, v. United States*, Slip Op. 99-131, Consol. Ct. No. 91-09-00659 (CIT December 10, 1999).

#### Final Results of Review

Pursuant to the settlement agreement, we recalculated the company-specific and all-other subsidy rates for the period January 1, 1987, through December 31, 1987. The amended final countervailing duty rates are:

| Manufacturer/exporter              | Revised rates (%) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Crescent Foundry Co. Pvt. Ltd. ... | 8.25              |
| Kejriwal Iron & Steel Works .....  | 7.18              |
| RSI India Pvt. Ltd. ....           | 9.42              |
| Uma Iron & Steel Co. ....          | 7.56              |
| Super Castings (India) .....       | 37.96             |
| Select Steel .....                 | 37.17             |
| Commex .....                       | 24.39             |
| All Others .....                   | 18.62             |

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue liquidation instructions directly to Customs. The above rates will not affect the cash deposit requirements currently in effect.

This amendment to the final results of countervailing duty administrative review notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 351.213, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: January 24, 2000.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-2579 Filed 2-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Export Trade Certificate of Review

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance of an amended export trade certificate of review, application No. 90-7A007.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce has issued an amended Export Trade Certificate of Review to The United States Surimi Commission ("USSC") on January 28, 2000. Notice of issuance of the original Certificate was published in the **Federal Register** on August 30, 1990 (55 FR 35445).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs,