

circumstances of sale ("COS") in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We made COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred on home market sales (credit expenses) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit expenses).

#### Revocation

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2), NHCI requested revocation of the antidumping duty order, in part. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(e), the request was accompanied by certifications that NHCI had not sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value during the current period of review and would not do so in the future. NHCI further certified that it sold the subject merchandise to the United States in commercial quantities for a period of at least three consecutive years. NHCI also agreed to immediate reinstatement of the antidumping duty order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that NHCI, subsequent to the revocation, sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value.

We must determine, as a threshold matter, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222, whether the company requesting revocation sold the subject merchandise in commercial quantities in each of the three years forming the basis of the request. *See* Pure Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part, 64 FR 12977, 12978 (March 16, 1999) ("Fifth Review") and Pure Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part, 64 FR 50489, 50490 (September 17, 1999) ("Sixth Review"). In the Fifth Review, we determined that NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in any of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation (the administrative review years 1994–1995, 1995–1996, and 1996–1997). In the Sixth Review, we determined that NHCI did not sell the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in two of the three years cited by NHCI to support its request for revocation (the administrative review years 1995–1996 and 1996–1997). Consistent with our findings in the Fifth Review and Sixth Review, we preliminarily find that NHCI does not qualify for revocation of the order on pure magnesium because it does not have three consecutive years of sales in

commercial quantities at not less than normal value, as provided for in 19 CFR 351.222(b) and (e)(1)(ii). In particular, NHCI's sales in 1996–1997 were not in commercial quantities. (See the Memorandum from Team to Susan Kuhbach, "Commercial Quantities," dated April 20, 2000, for a discussion of NHCI's selling activity).

#### Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that NHCI's margin for the period August 1, 1998, through July 31, 1999, is zero.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 42 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 case and rebuttal briefs. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. 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 of this notice.

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 with an electronic version included. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review subsequently, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of pure magnesium from Canada entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review (except no cash deposit will be required for the company if its weighted-average margin is de minimis, i.e., less than 0.5 percent); (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less than fair value investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received

an individual rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, the previous 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 (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 21 percent, the "all others" rate established in Pure Magnesium from Canada; Amendment of Final Determination of Sales At Less Than Fair Value and Order in Accordance With Decision on Remand (58 FR 62643, November 29, 1993).

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility 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.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 2, 2000.

**Troy H. Cribb,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00–11600 Filed 5–9–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–580–810]

#### Certain Welded ASTM A–312 Stainless Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On December 28, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded ASTM A–312 stainless steel pipe (WSSP) from Korea (64 FR 72645). The merchandise covered by this order is austenitic stainless steel pipe that meets the standards and specifications set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) for the

welded form of chromium-nickel pipe designated ASTM A-312. The review covers one manufacturer. The period of review is December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 10, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Gilgunn or Mark Hoadley, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0648 and (202) 482-0666, 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

### Background

On December 28, 1999, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on WSSP from Korea (64 FR 72645). We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

### Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this order consists of austenitic stainless steel pipe that meets the standards and specifications set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) for the welded form of chromium-nickel pipe designated ASTM A-312. WSSP is produced by forming stainless steel flat-rolled products into a tubular configuration and welding along the seam. WSSP is a commodity product generally used as a conduit to transmit liquids or gases. Major applications for WSSP include, but are not limited to, digester lines, blow lines, pharmaceutical lines, petrochemical stock lines, brewery process and transport lines, general food processing lines, automotive paint lines and paper process machines. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following United States

Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings: 7306.40.5005, 7306.40.5015, 7306.40.5045, 7306.40.5060 and 7306.40.5075. Although these subheadings include both pipes and tubes, the scope of this order is limited to welded austenitic stainless steel pipes. Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memo) from Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, to Troy H. Cribb, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated April 26, 2000, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memo, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. 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 the Central Records Unit, located in room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce Building. 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/](http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/frn/). The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

### Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. We have also corrected certain programming and clerical errors in our preliminary results. These changes and corrections are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo, accessible in B-099 and on the Web at [www.ita.doc.gov/import\\_admin/records/frn/](http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/frn/).

### Final Results of Review

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margin exists for the period December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
SeAH Steel Corporation Ltd. ....	1.02

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In

accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we have calculated exporter/importer-specific assessment rates. We divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting percentage margins against the entered Customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.

### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of WSSP from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate shown above; (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 this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (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 7.00 percent. This rate is the "All Others" rate from the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final 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 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 doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a 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. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials 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 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 26, 2000.

**Troy H. Cribb,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

## Appendix

### List of Issues

1. Cost of Production.
2. Model Matching.
3. Programming and Clerical Errors.

[FR Doc. 00-11737 Filed 5-9-00; 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. 88-3A012.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce has issued an amendment to the Export Trade Certificate of Review granted to National Tooling & Machining Association ("NTMA") on October 18, 1988. Notice of issuance of the Certificate was published in the **Federal Register** on October 25, 1988 (53 FR 43140).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482-5131 (this is not a toll-free number) or at E-mail at oetca@ita.doc.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. Sections 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. The regulations implementing Title III are found at 15 CFR Part 325 (1999).

The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs ("OETCA") is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Department of Commerce to publish a summary of the certification in the **Federal Register**. Under Section 305(a) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

#### Description of Amended Certificate

Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 88-00012, was issued to NTMA on October 18, 1988 (53 FR 43140, October 25, 1988) and previously amended on December 4, 1989 (54 FR 51914, December 19, 1989), and September 2, 1993 (58 FR 47868, September 13, 1993).

NTMA's Export Trade Certificate of Review has been amended to include the attached list of companies as "Members" of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(1) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(1)).

A copy of the amended certificate will be kept in the International Trade Administration's Freedom of Information Records Inspection Facility, Room 4102, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Dated: May 3, 2000.

**Morton Schnabel,**

*Director, Office of Export Trading, Company Affairs.*

#### Attachment

b & b Tool Company, Inc., Rockford, IL  
 A & A Industries, Inc., Peabody, MA  
 A & A Machine Company, Inc., Southampton, PA  
 A & A Machine Shop, Inc., La Marque, TX  
 A & B Machine, Van Nuys, CA  
 A & B Machine Shop, Rockford, IL  
 A & B Tool & Manufacturing Corp., Toledo, OH  
 A & D Precision, Fremont, CA  
 A & E Custom Manufacturing, Kansas City, KS  
 A & E Machine Shop, Inc., Lone Star, TX  
 A & G Machine, Inc., Auburn, WA  
 A & S Tool & Die Company, Inc., Kernersville, NC  
 A A Precisioneering, Inc., Meadville, PA  
 A B A Division, Manchester, CT  
 A B C O Tool & Engineering, Phoenix, AZ  
 A B Heller, Inc., Milford, MI  
 A B N Industrial Co., Inc., Buena Park, CA  
 A B R Enterprises Inc., South Pasadena, CA  
 A C Machine, Inc., Akron, OH  
 A C Mfg. Co. Inc., Malden, MA  
 A E Cole Die & Engraving, Columbus, OH  
 A E Machine Works, Inc., Houston, TX  
 A F C Tool Company, Inc., Dayton, OH  
 A I M Tool & Die, Grand Haven, MI  
 A M C Precision, Inc., N. Tonawanda, NY  
 A M Design, E. Canton, OH  
 A M Machine Company, Inc., Baltimore, MD  
 A Mfg., Grand Terrace, CA

A S C Corporation, Owings Mills, MD  
 A T G, Inc., Houston, TX  
 A. C. Cut-Off, Inc., Azusa, CA  
 A+ Engineering, Ipswich, MA  
 A-G Tool & Die, Miamitown, OH  
 A-Line Tool & Die, Inc., Louisville, KY  
 A-RanD, Inc., Phoenix, AZ  
 A-W Engineering Company, Inc., Santa Fe Springs, CA  
 Abbott Machine & Tool, Inc., Toledo, OH  
 Abbott Tool, Inc., Toledo, OH  
 Ability Tool Company, Rockford, IL  
 Able Wire EDM, Inc., Brea, CA  
 Abrams Airborne Manufacturing, Tucson, AZ  
 Abrasive Machining Inc., Rockford, IL  
 Absolute Manufacturing, N. Chelmsford, MA  
 Absolute Turning & Machine, Tucson, AZ  
 Acadiana Hydraulic Works, Inc., New Iberia, LA  
 Accu Die & Mold Inc., Stevensville, MI  
 Accu-Right Laser Corporation, Villa Ridge, MO  
 Accu-Roll, Inc., Rochester, NY  
 Accudynamics, Inc., Middleboro, MA  
 Accudyne Aerospace & Defense, Palm Bay, FL  
 Accura Industries, Inc., Rochester, NY  
 Accurate Grinding & Mfg. Corp., Los Angeles, CA  
 Accurate Grinding Corp., Warwick, RI  
 Accurate Machine Co. Inc., Indianapolis, IN  
 Accurate MachineWorks, Inc., Newport Beach, CA  
 Accurate Machining, Mukilteo, WA  
 Accurate Manufacturing Company, Glendale, CA  
 Accurate Manufacturing Company, Alsip, IL  
 Accurate Products Co., Tucson, AZ  
 Accurite Machine & Mfg. Inc., Louisville, KY  
 Accutronics, Inc., Littleton, CO  
 AccuCraft, New Haven, MO  
 AccuRounds, Avon, MA  
 Ace Manufacturing Company, Cincinnati, OH  
 Ace Specialty Company, Inc., Tonawanda, NY  
 Ackley Machine Corporation, Moorestown, NJ  
 Acklin Stamping, Toledo, OH  
 Acme Brass & Machine Works, Inc., Kansas City, MO  
 Acra Aerospace, Inc., Anaheim, CA  
 Acraloc Corporation, Oak Ridge, TN  
 Acro Industries, Inc., Rochester, NY  
 Acro Tool & Die Company, Inc., Akron, OH  
 Actco Tool & Mfg. Co., Meadville, PA  
 Action Die & Tool Inc., Wyoming, MI  
 Action Mold & Machining, Inc., Grand Rapids, MI  
 Action Mold & Tool Co., Anaheim, CA  
 Action Precision Grinding Inc., North Tonawanda, NY