

("PRC"), which has an April anniversary month.

As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i) and (iii)(A), each of the three companies identified above has certified that it did not export brake rotors to the United States during the period of investigation ("POI"), and that it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer which did export brake rotors during the POI. Each company has further certified that its export activities are not controlled by the central government of the PRC, satisfying the requirements of 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B). Pursuant to the Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv)(A), Concord, Huanri, and Meita each submitted documentation establishing the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise to the United States, the

volume of that shipment, and the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.214(b), and based on information on the record, we are initiating the new shipper reviews for Concord, Huanri, and Meita.

It is the Department's practice in cases involving non-market economies to require that a company seeking to establish eligibility for an antidumping duty rate separate from the country-wide rate provide de jure and de facto evidence of an absence of government control over the company's export activities. Accordingly, we will issue a questionnaire to Concord, Huanri, and Meita (including a separate rates section), allowing approximately 37 days for response. If the response from

each respondent provides sufficient indication that it is not subject to either de jure or de facto government control with respect to its exports of brake rotors, each review will proceed. If, on the other hand, a respondent does not demonstrate its eligibility for a separate rate, then it will be deemed to be affiliated with other companies that exported during the POI, and the review of that respondent will be rescinded.

Initiation of Review

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we are initiating new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from the PRC. We intend to issue the preliminary results of these reviews not later than 180 days after the date on which the reviews are initiated.

Antidumping Duty Proceeding	Period to be reviewed
PRC: Brake Rotors, A-570-846: Beijing Concord Auto Technology Inc. Qingdao Meita Automotive Industry Co., Ltd. Shandong Laizhou Huanri Group General Co.	04/01/00-09/30/00

We will instruct the Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting, until the completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise exported by the above-listed companies. This action is in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(e).

Interested parties that need access to proprietary information in these new shipper reviews should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.214(d).

Dated: November 20, 2000.

Louis Apple,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-30142 Filed 11-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-570-825]

Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of antidumping duty administrative review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On September 6, 2000, in response to a request made by Guangdong Chemicals Import and Export Corporation, Sinochem Tianjin Import and Export Corporation, and ICC Chemical Corporation, the Department of Commerce published the notice of initiation of an antidumping duty administrative review on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China for the period July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000. Because these parties have withdrawn their request for review, the Department is rescinding this review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 27, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Priddy or James Nunno, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1130 or (202) 482-0783, 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, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

On July 31, 2000, Guangdong Chemicals Import and Export Corporation (Guangdong), Sinochem Tianjin Import and Export Corporation (Tianjin), and ICC Chemical Corporation requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China for the review period July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000. On September 6, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of administrative review with respect to Guangdong and Tianjin. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 65 FR 53980 (Sept. 6, 2000). On October 19, 2000, Guangdong, Tianjin, and ICC

Chemical Corporation withdrew their request for an administrative review in the above-referenced case.

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. Because Guangdong and Tianjin's withdrawal was submitted within the 90-day time limit, and no other party requested a review, we are rescinding the review. We will issue appropriate appraisal instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

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.

This determination is issued in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) and (d)(4).

Dated: November 20, 2000.

Louis Apple,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-30143 Filed 11-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-823-809, A-841-804]

Preliminary Determinations of Critical Circumstances: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Ukraine and Moldova

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 27, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Magd Zalok or Mark Manning at (202) 482-4162 and (202) 482-3936, respectively; AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Preliminary Determinations of Critical Circumstances

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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

Background

On July 18, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated investigations to determine whether imports of steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Ukraine and Moldova, among others, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less-than-fair-value (LTFV) (65 FR 45754, July 25, 2000). On August 14, 2000, the International Trade Commission (ITC) determined that there is a reasonable indication of material injury to the domestic industry from imports of rebar from Ukraine and Moldova, among other countries. On August 22, 2000, the petitioner alleged that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of rebar from the above-referenced two countries.¹

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.206(c)(2)(i), because the petitioner submitted critical circumstances allegations more than 20 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determinations, the Department must issue preliminary critical circumstances determinations not later than the date of the preliminary determinations. In a policy bulletin issued on October 8, 1998, the Department stated that it may issue preliminary critical circumstances determinations prior to the date of the preliminary determinations of dumping, assuming sufficient evidence of critical circumstances is available (*see Change in Policy Regarding Timing of Issuance of Critical Circumstances Determinations*, 63 FR 55364). In accordance with this policy, at this time we are issuing the preliminary critical circumstances decision in the investigations of imports of rebar from Ukraine and Moldova for the reasons discussed below and in the concurrent Memorandum from Holly Kuga to Troy H. Cribb: Antidumping Duty

¹ The petitioner also alleged that there is a reason to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of rebar from Belarus. However, we are not making a determination with respect to this country at this time.

Investigations of Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar from Ukraine and Moldova—Preliminary Affirmative Determinations of Critical Circumstances (Critical Circumstances Preliminary Determinations Memorandum).

Critical Circumstances

Section 733(e)(1) of the Act provides that the Department will preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist if there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that: (A)(i) there is a history of dumping and material injury by reason of dumped imports in the United States or elsewhere of the subject merchandise, or (ii) the person by whom, or for whose account, the merchandise was imported knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the subject merchandise at less than its fair value and that there was likely to be material injury by reason of such sales, and (B) there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period. Section 351.206(h)(1) of the Department's regulations provides that, in determining whether imports of the subject merchandise have been "massive," the Department normally will examine: (i) the volume and value of the imports; (ii) seasonal trends; and (iii) the share of domestic consumption accounted for by the imports. In addition, section 351.206(h)(2) of the Department's regulations provides that an increase in imports of 15 percent during the "relatively short period" of time may be considered "massive."

Section 351.206(i) of the Department's regulations defines "relatively short period" as normally being the period beginning on the date the proceeding begins (*i.e.*, the date the petition is filed) and ending at least three months later. The regulations also provide, however, that if the Department finds that importers, exporters, or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely, the Department may consider a period of not less than three months from that earlier time.

In determining whether the above criteria have been satisfied, we examined: (1) The evidence presented in the petition; (2) recent import statistics released by the Census Bureau after the initiation of the LTFV investigation; and (3) the ITC preliminary injury determination.

History of Dumping and Importer Knowledge

We are not aware of any existing antidumping order in any country on rebar from Ukraine and Moldova. For