

time limit for the preliminary results) from the date of the publication of the preliminary results. *See also* 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Background

On August 22, 2003, the Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy, covering the period July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003 (68 FR 50750). On March 17, 2004, the Department fully extended the preliminary results of the review by 120 days (69 FR 12641). On August 6, 2004, the Department published the preliminary results of its review (69 FR 47880). The final results of this review are currently due no later than December 6, 2004.

Extension of Final Results of Reviews

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit because the Department needs additional time to fully consider parties' arguments regarding the application of facts available with respect to Barilla Alimentare, S.p.A., and certain respondents' proposed modifications to the wheat codes. Therefore, we are extending the deadline for the final results of the above-referenced review until February 2, 2005.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: October 29, 2004.

Jeffrey A. May,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E4-3011 Filed 11-3-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-046]

Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Finding

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of the expedited sunset review of the antidumping duty finding: polychloroprene rubber from Japan.

SUMMARY: On July 1, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty finding on certain polychloroprene rubber from

Japan.¹ On the basis of the notice of intent to participate and substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in this case waiver of participation) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited sunset review of the antidumping duty finding pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act") and section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2) of the Department's regulations.² As a result of this sunset review, the Department determined that revocation of the antidumping duty finding would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review".

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 4, 2004.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 1, 2004, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty finding on polychloroprene rubber from Japan in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act. *See Notice of Initiation*, 69 FR 39905 (July 1, 2004).

The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate within the applicable deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations on behalf of DuPont Dow Elastomers L.L.C. ("DDE").³ DDE claimed interested party status as a domestic producer of polychloroprene rubber from Japan.

The Department received complete substantive responses from the domestic interested party within the 30-day deadline specified in the Department's regulations under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). However, the Department did not receive adequate responses from respondent interested parties to this proceeding. As a result,

¹ *See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 69 FR 39905 (July 1, 2004) ("Notice of Initiation").

² The Department received a statement of waiver of participation of the five-year sunset review from Showa Denko L.L.C. ("SDK"). *See* letter to James J. Jochum, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, July 30, 2004.

³ DDE stated that it succeeds E.I. DuPont De Nemours & Company ("DuPont"), Petitioner in this antidumping proceeding. DuPont was the original Petitioner in the original investigation of polychloroprene rubber from Japan.

pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited sunset review of this antidumping duty finding.

Scope of the Antidumping Duty Finding

Imports covered by this sunset review are shipments of polychloroprene rubber, an oil resistant synthetic rubber also known as polymerized chlorobutadiene or neoprene, currently classifiable under items 4002.42.00, 4002.49.00, 4003.00.00, 4462.15.21 and 4462.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS"). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum ("Decision Memo")" from Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to James J. Jochum, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated October 29, 2004, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail if the antidumping duty finding were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Commerce Building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>, under the heading "November 2004". The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

The Department determines that revocation of the antidumping duty finding on polychloroprene rubber from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average margins:

Manufacturers/producers/exporter's	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Denki Kagaku Kogyo K.K.	0.00
Denki Kagaku Kogyo, K.K./Hoei Sangyo Co., Ltd.	55.00
Suzugo Corporation.	55.00
All Others.	55.00

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. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is 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 the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 29, 2004.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E4-3014 Filed 11-3-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-423-809]

Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Stainless steel plate in coils from Belgium.

SUMMARY: On April 1, 2004, the Department initiated a sunset review of the countervailing duty (“CVD”) order on stainless steel plate in coils (“SSPC”) from Belgium pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 69 FR 17129 (April 1, 2004). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the CVD order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of subsidies at the levels indicated in the “Final Results of Review” section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 4, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hilary Sadler, Esq., 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) 482-4340.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Department’s Regulations

The Department’s procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in 19 CFR 351.218. 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).

Background

On April 1, 2004, the Department initiated a sunset review of the CVD order on SSPC from Belgium pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 69 FR 17129 (April 1, 2004). On April 16, 2004, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from Allegheny Ludlum Corp. (“Allegheny Ludlum”), North America Stainless (“NAS”), and the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC (“USWA”), (collectively, “domestic interested parties”) within the applicable deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. See *Response of the Domestic Interested Parties* at 2, May 3, 2004 (“Domestic Response”). All domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status, under sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act, as a U.S. producer of the domestic like product or a certified union whose workers are engaged in the production of the subject merchandise in the United States. See *Domestic Response*. The USWA was a petitioner in the investigation and has been involved in this proceeding since its inception. *Id.* at 6. Armo, Inc., J&L Specialty Steels, Inc., and Lukens Inc. were also petitioners in the original investigation but are either no longer producers of subject merchandise or are scheduled to cease production of SSPC this year. *Id.* According to the domestic interested parties in this review, two unions, Butler Armco Independent Union and Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, that were original petitioners are not participating in this sunset review because very few workers at these unions are engaged in the production of SSPC in the United States. *Id.* at 7. The domestic interested parties have participated as a group at various segments of this order. *Id.*

The Department received a waiver of participation from U & A Belgium, a respondent interested party. See *Response of U & A Belgium*, “SSPC from Belgium—Sunset Participation Waiver” (April 30, 2004). We did receive substantive responses from the Government of Flanders and the Government of Belgium (collectively, “GOB”) and the Delegation of the European Commission (“EU”). See *Substantive Response of the GOB*, (“GOB Response”) (May 3, 2004) and the *Substantive Response of the EU* (“EU Response”) (April 30, 2004). In addition, the GOB and the domestic industry submitted rebuttals on May 10, 2004. See *Rebuttal of the Domestic Interested Parties (“Domestic Rebuttal”)* (May 10, 2004) and *GOB Rebuttal* (May 10, 2004).

As a result of the lack of respondent company participation in this sunset review, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of this order. See *Memorandum to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Office of Policy Director, from Kelly Parkhill, Director of Industry and Support, Sunset Review of Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Belgium: Adequacy of Respondent Interested Party Responses to the Notice of Initiations* (May 19, 2004).

Scope of Review

The product covered by this order is certain stainless steel plate in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject plate products are flat-rolled products, 254 mm or over in width and 4.75 mm or more in thickness, in coils, and annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject plate may also be further processed (*e.g.*, cold-rolled, polished, etc. provided that it maintains the specified dimensions of plate following such processing. Excluded from the scope of these orders are the following: (1) Plate not in coils, (2) plate that is not annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled, (3) sheet and strip, and (4) flat bars. In addition, certain cold-rolled stainless steel plate in coils is also excluded from the scope of this order. The excluded cold-rolled stainless steel plate in coils is defined as that merchandise which meets the physical characteristics described above that has undergone a cold-reduction process that reduced the thickness of the steel by 25 percent or more, and has