recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of the Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5050.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews 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 (1999) 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*'').

Background

On August 2, 1999, the Department initiated the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia (64 FR 41915). We invited parties to comment. On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in this case no response) from respondent interested parties, we determined to conduct an expedited sunset review. The Department has conducted this sunset review in accordance with sections 751 and 752 of the Act.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.,* an order in effect on January 1, 1995). This review concerns a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, on December 3, 1999 the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia is extraordinarily complicated and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than February 28, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.[1]

Scope of Review

The product covered by this review is extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. Extruded rubber thread is defined as vulcanized rubber thread obtained by extrusion of stable or concentrated natural rubber latex of any cross sectional shape, measuring from 0.18 mm, which is 0.007 inch or 140 gauge, to 1.42 mm, which is 0.056 inch or 18 gauge, in diameter. Extruded rubber thread is currently classifiable under subheading 4007.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

The antidumping duty order of the subject merchandise remains in effect for all producers and exporters of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the ''Issues and Decision Memorandum'' (''Decision Memo'') from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Robert S. LaRussa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated February 28, 2000, which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference into this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in B–099.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at www.ita.doc.gov/import__admin/records/frn/, under the heading ''Malaysia''. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Heveafil/Filmax Schn. Bhd	108.62
Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd	20.36
Filati Lastex Elastofibre (Malaysia)	105.78
Rubfil Sdn. Bhd	108.62
All Others	15.16

In addition, in the 1995–1996 administrative review, the Department found that the four companies identified above absorbed duties on the following percentage of their U.S. sales: Heaveafil—100 percent, Rubberflex—57.35 percent, Filati—100 percent, and Rubfil—100 percent.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections section 751(c), 752, and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: February 28, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–5507 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] *See Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews,* 64 FR 67847 (December 3, 1999).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip From the Republic of Korea, Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received information sufficient to warrant initiation of a changed circumstances administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip from Korea (56 FR 25669 (June 5, 1991)). On July 5, 1996, the order was

revoked, in part, with respect to Cheil Synthetics, Inc. (Cheil) based on three consecutive years of no dumping. (See Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Notice of Revocation in Part, 61 FR 35177 (July 5, 1996).) On January 26, 1998, the Department determined that Saehan Industries, Inc. (Saehan) was the successor-in-interest to Cheil, and that the Department's partial revocation with respect to Cheil applied to Saehan (63 FR 3703). On January 5, 2000, Toray Saehan Inc. (TSI) requested that the Department determine that TSI is the successor to Saehan, based upon TSI assuming Saehan's PET film business. Based on the information provided in TSI's January 5, 2000, letter and supplemental documentation provided on February 14, 2000, we preliminarily determine that TSI is the successor firm to Saehan. If these preliminary results are confirmed in the final results of review, the Department's application of the July 5, 1996, partial revocation of the order with respect to Saehan, as the successor-in-interest to Cheil, will apply to TSI.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney at (202) 482–4475 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.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1999).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 4, 2000, TSI requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act to determine whether TSI should properly be considered the successor firm to Saehan and if, as such, the revocation that is applicable to Saehan should apply to TSI. TSI also requested the Department to publish the preliminary results concurrently with this notice of initiation, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). In its request, TSI notified the Department that it was established on October 15, 1999, and commenced operations on December 1, 1999. TSI is a joint venture between Saehan and Toray Industries, Inc. of Japan. TSI indicated that the management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customers base of TSI are virtually identical to those of Saehan, the company which the Department has determined to be the successor to Cheil. On February 4, 2000, the Department requested that TSI provide documentary evidence supporting its successor-in-interest claim. On February 14, 2000, TSI submitted documentary evidence demonstrating that TSI maintained essentially the same management, production facilities, suppliers, and customer relationships as TSI. (See TSI February 14, 2000, Response to the Department's Request for Additional Information.) Citing the Department's determinations in *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 58 FR 59010 (Nov. 5, 1993), *Certain Hot Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom,* 64 FR 53994, 53955 (Oct. 5, 1999) and *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada,* 57 FR 5128, 5129 (February 12, 1992), TSI claimed that the Department should determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Saehan, and that the revocation applicable to Saehan should apply to TSI. On January 20, 2000, we received a letter from E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Company and Mitsubishi Polyester Films, L.L.C., the petitioners in this case. Petitioners took no position concerning TSI's contention that it is the successor company to Saehan. Petitioners contend, however, that if the Department determines that TSI is the successor to Saehan, it should require TSI to fully comply with the conditions of the partial revocation applicable to Saehan.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextrued. The films excluded from this antidumping duty order are metallized films, and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

This changed circumstances administrative review covers TSI.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circmstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Act, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether TSI is the successor company to Saehan. In making such a determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in (1) management, (2) production facilities, (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customers base. See e.g., Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 57 FR 20460 (May 13, 1992). While no one or several of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if its resulting operation is similar to that of the predecessor. See e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel, Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same entity as the former company, the Department will treat the successor company the same as the predecessor for purposes of antidumping liability, *e.g.,* assign the same cash deposit rate, revocation, etc. (*See id.*)

We examined the information provided by TSI in its January 5, and February 14, 2000, letters and have determined that TSI has established a *prima facie* case that it is the successor-in-interest to Saehan, which the Department has determined to be the successor-in-interest to Cheil. A majority of the senior managers involved in the day-to-day production and sales operation of TSI are the same as those that managed Saehan. Therefore, the management and organizational structure of Saehan has remained intact under TSI. In addition, there have been no changes in the production facilities, inputs and

supplier relationships, or customer base. Because we find that TSI has maintained the same management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer bases as Saehan, we preliminarily determine that TSI operates as essentially the same business entity as Saehan with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise. Based upon the foregoing, we preliminary determine that the July 5, 1996, partial revocation issued with respect to Cheil, and applied to Saehan, Cheil's successor company, applies to TSI as Saehan's successor-in-interest.

Because TSI has presented evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of its successorship status, we find it appropriate to issue the preliminary results in combination with the notice of initiation in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). We agree with petitioners that TSI must fully comply with the terms of the revocation applicable to Saehan; therefore, we have requested and received written confirmation from TSI that it will adhere to the terms of the revocation applicable to Cheil, and applied to Saehan, Cheil's successor-in-interest. (See TSI February 14, 2000, Response to the Department's Request for Additional Information, at Appendix F).

Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 5 days after the deadline for case briefs. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, which will include the results of its analysis to issues raised in any such written comments, no later than four months following the date of publication of this notice. This initiation of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(b) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)), and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: March 1, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–5515 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–807]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film From Korea

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

ACTION: Notice of Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from Korea.

SUMMARY: On February 4, 2000, the Department of Commerce (''the Department''), pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate (''PET'') film from Korea is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping (65 FR 5592). On February 24, 2000, the International Trade Commission (''the Commission''), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (65 FR 9298). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department is publishing notice of the continuation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 7, 2000.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 1, 1999, the Department initiated, and the Commission instituted, a sunset review (64 FR 35588 and 64 FR 35685, respectively) of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of its review, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order to be revoked (*see Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film From Korea*, February 4, 2000 (65 FR 5592).

On February 24, 2000, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (*see Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from Korea*, 65 FR 9298 (February 24, 2000) and USITC Pub. 3278, Investigation No. 731–TA–459 (Review) (February 2000)).

Scope

The merchandise covered by this antidumping duty order includes all gauges of raw pre-treated, or primed polythylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or co-extruded. The films excluded from this antidumping duty order are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order. PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (''HTS'') item number 3920.62.00.00. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Korea. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping duty deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of continuation of this order will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this Notice of Continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) and 751(c)(6) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of this order not later than February 2005.