

The following commodities have been proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:  
 Starter Rope, Engine 2990-00-961-3692  
 2990-00-972-7950

**Beverly L. Milkman,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-6810 Filed 3-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

## COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

### Procurement List; Additions

**AGENCY:** Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

**ACTION:** Additions to the Procurement List.

**SUMMARY:** This action adds to the Procurement List commodities and services to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 21, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Gateway 3, Suite 310, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-4302.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Beverly Milkman (703) 603-7740.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 30, 1998, January 22 and 29, and February 5, 1999, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notices (63 FR 65746 and 64 FR 3483, 4638 and 5764) of proposed additions to the Procurement List.

After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified nonprofit agencies to provide the commodities and services and impact of the additions on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the commodities and services listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46-48c and 41 CFR 51-2.4.

I certify that the following action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

1. The action will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements for small entities other than the small organizations that will furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

2. The action will not have a severe economic impact on current contractors for the commodities and services.

3. The action will result in authorizing small entities to furnish the commodities and services to the Government.

4. There are no known regulatory alternatives which would accomplish the objectives of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48c) in connection with the commodities and services proposed for addition to the Procurement List.

Accordingly, the following commodities and services are hereby added to the Procurement List:

#### *Commodities*

Cap, Combat Camouflage

8415-01-134-3175

8415-01-134-3176

8415-01-134-3177

8415-01-134-3178

8415-01-134-3179

8415-01-134-3180

8415-01-084-1683

8415-01-084-1684

8415-01-084-1685

8415-01-084-1686

8415-01-084-1687

8415-01-084-1688

(Remaining Government Requirements)

Insignia, Embroidered

8455-01-388-8485

#### *Services*

Commissary Shelf Stocking, Custodial and Warehousing

Fallon Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada

Grounds Maintenance

BRECC, 3900 Loch Raven Boulevard,  
 Baltimore, Maryland

#### *Janitorial/Custodial*

Department of Veterans Affairs Lompoc Clinic, 1111 East Ocean Avenue, Lompoc, California

#### *Janitorial/Custodial*

Veterans Affairs Primary Care Clinic, 145 Falmouth Road, Hyannis, Massachusetts

#### *Janitorial/Grounds Maintenance*

VA Northern California Health Care System, Mare Island Outpatient Clinic, Vallejo, California

This action does not affect current contracts awarded prior to the effective date of this addition or options that may be exercised under those contracts.

**Beverly L. Milkman,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-6811 Filed 3-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-848, A-580-838]

### Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Aperture Masks From Japan and South Korea

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 22, 1999.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mark Ross, at (202) 482-4794, or Thomas Schauer, at (202) 482-4852; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

### Initiation of Investigations

#### *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, as amended ("the Act") by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to Department of Commerce ("Department") regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

#### *The Petitions*

On February 24, 1999, the Department received petitions filed in proper form by BMC Industries, Inc. ("BMC," referred to hereafter as "the petitioner"). The petitioner filed supplemental information to the petitions on March 8, 12, and 16, 1999.

The petitioner alleges that imports of certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.

The Department finds that the petitioner has standing to file the petitions because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping investigations it is requesting the Department to initiate. See "Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions" below.

#### *Scope of Investigations*

For purposes of these investigations, the products covered consist of all aperture masks (also known as "shadow

masks") made from aluminum-killed, open-coil annealed steel (decarburized) (known generally as "AK steel") for color picture tubes ("CPTs") used in television sets. AK steel includes the following types of steel: low carbon, AF (annealing-free) steel, AK type A steel (commonly referred to as AKM steel), AK type B steel, and general AK steel. The aperture masks covered by the scope generally have a vertical pitch (distance between the centers of two apertures) of greater than .28mm. Specifically excluded from the scope are the following products: (1) aperture masks made from FeNi 36 alloy (whether sold under the brand names Invar, Inovar or LLTE); (2) aperture masks that have a vertical pitch of less than .28 mm that are generally used for color display tubes ("CDTs") used in computer monitors; and (3) grille masks (a grille mask replaces the slots in an aperture mask with an array of finely tensioned vertical wires).

The merchandise subject to these investigations is classifiable under 8540.91.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

During our review of the petitions, we discussed the scope with the petitioner to ensure that the scope accurately reflects the merchandise for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. Moreover, as we discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (62 FR at 27323), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments by April 5, 1999. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit at Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

#### *Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions*

Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act requires that the Department determine, prior to the initiation of an investigation, that a minimum percentage of the domestic industry supports an antidumping petition. A petition meets this minimum requirement if the domestic producers

or workers who support the petition account for: (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Under section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act, if the petitioner(s) account for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department is not required to poll the industry to determine the extent of industry support.

To determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who account for production of the domestic like product. The ITC, which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. However, while both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition of domestic like product, they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.<sup>1</sup>

Section 771(10) of the Act defines domestic like product as "a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the like-product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," i.e., the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

The domestic like product referred to in the petitions, and as clarified by the March 8 and 12, 1999, supplements to the petitions, is the single product defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section, above. No party has commented on the petitions' definition of domestic like product, and there is nothing on the record to indicate that this definition is inaccurate. The Department, therefore, has adopted this definition of the domestic like product.

<sup>1</sup> See *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988); *High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

With respect to the above-cited industry-support requirements, the Department has determined that the petitions and supplemental information contained adequate evidence of sufficient industry support. See Initiation Checklist, dated March 16, 1999 (public document on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce, Room B-099). Additionally, no person who would qualify as an interested party pursuant to sections 771(A), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of the Act has expressed on the record opposition to the petitions. Information currently on the record indicates that the producer who supports the petitions accounts for 100 percent of the production of the domestic like product. Accordingly, the Department determines that these petitions are filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

#### *Export Price and Normal Value*

The petitioner identified three Japanese producers and one South Korean producer in its less-than-fair-value allegations. The Japanese producers are Dai Nippon Printing Co., Ltd. ("DNP"), Dainippon Screen Manufacturing Company, Ltd. ("DNS"), and Toppan Printing Co., Ltd. ("Toppan"). The South Korean producer is LG Micron Ltd. ("LGM"). The petitioner determined export prices for each of these producers based on price quotes obtained by the petitioner's sales personnel in the ordinary course of business. These price quotes are for various sizes of the aperture masks covered by the scope of the petitions. The petitioner provided trip reports and an affidavit from a BMC sales representative to support the validity of the price quotes. All U.S. price quotes were denominated in U.S. dollars and, where appropriate, the petitioner made adjustments for movement expenses. Our review of the petitioner's calculation of export prices did not indicate the need to make changes to those prices.

With respect to normal value for Japan, the petitioner could not find data regarding Japanese home market prices. Moreover, the petitioner alleges that the volume of Japanese domestic sales of in-scope merchandise is insufficient to form a basis for normal value. In support of its claims that pricing information is unavailable and that the Japanese domestic market is not viable, the petitioner provided an affidavit from a responsible BMC sales representative. The affidavit documents the employee's efforts to uncover pricing information and indicates that most of the aperture

masks sold in Japan are types specifically excluded from the scope of the petitions (e.g., aperture masks made from Invar). Lacking pricing information for sales of the foreign like product in the Japanese market, the petitioner turned to third-country sales as the basis for normal value in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. However, as described in more detail below, the petitioner provided information in the petitions demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of certain aperture masks from Japan to third-country markets were made at prices below the cost of production (i.e., the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication (i.e., COM), selling, general and administrative ("SG&A") expenses, and packing), within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. The petitioner therefore concluded that sales from Japan to third countries cannot serve as the basis for normal value. Furthermore, the petitioner requested that the Department conduct a countrywide investigation of sales below cost for third-country market sales from Japan.

With respect to normal value for South Korea, the petitioner stated that it believes that the volume of South Korean home market sales is sufficient to form a basis for normal value. The petitioner also provided information in the petitions demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of certain aperture masks in South Korea were made at prices below the cost of production, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. The petitioner therefore concluded that sales in the South Korean home market cannot serve as the basis for normal value. Furthermore, the petitioner requested that the Department conduct a countrywide investigation of sales below cost for home market sales in South Korea.

To support its allegations that prices from Japan to third-country markets and prices in the South Korean home market are below the cost of production, the petitioner compared price quotes for each of the identified producers to each company's cost of production. The petitioner calculated the COM and packing components of the cost of production based on its own production experience with adjustments for known differences in costs incurred in the United States and costs incurred in Japan and South Korea. It derived company-specific SG&A expenses for the Japanese producers using each company's financial statements. For LGM, the South Korean producer of certain aperture masks, the petitioner said it was not able to obtain a financial statement for the calculation of SG&A

expenses. However, since the petitioner could obtain the financial statements of LGM's parent company, LG Electronics, it calculated SG&A based on the financial statements of LG Electronics. We reviewed the cost-of-production calculations and accepted the underlying cost data contained in the petitions, as revised and/or supplemented by the March 8, 12, and 16, 1999, submissions.

We compared the cost-of-production data supplied in the petitions to the corresponding Japanese producers' third-country prices and the South Korean producer's home market prices. We found that the prices in every instance were below the cost of production. Thus, for both Japan and South Korea, these findings constitute "reasonable grounds to believe or suspect" that sales of the foreign like product were made below their respective cost of production within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. See "Initiation of Cost Investigation," below.

Since the petitioner found that the third-country prices of the Japanese producers and the home market prices of the South Korean producer were below the cost of production, the petitioner based normal value on constructed value. The petitioner calculated constructed value by adding profit to the figures that it used to compute the cost of production. It based profit on the same financial statements it used for the calculation of SG&A expenses. We reviewed the calculation of constructed value and accepted the underlying cost data contained in the petitions, as revised and/or supplemented by the March 8, 12, and 16, 1999, submissions.

#### *Fair Value Comparison*

Based on the data provided by the petitioner, we find that there is reason to believe that imports of certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

The margin calculations in the petitions, as revised in the March 16, 1999, supplement to the petitions, indicate dumping margins ranging from 3.77 to 85.34 percent for certain aperture masks from Japan and a dumping margin of 10.61 percent for certain aperture masks from South Korea.

If it becomes necessary at a later date to consider the petitions as a source of facts available under section 776 of the Act, we may review and, if necessary, revise the margin calculations.

#### *Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation*

The petitions allege that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, and is threatened with material injury, by reason of imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than normal value. The petitioner explained that the industry's injured condition is evident in declining trends in capacity utilization, income growth, and profits. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including lost sales and pricing information. The Department assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and determined that these allegations are sufficiently supported by accurate and adequate evidence and they meet the statutory requirements for initiation. See Initiation Checklist, dated March 16, 1999.

#### *Initiation of Antidumping Investigations*

We have examined the petitions on certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea and have found that they meet the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value.

Our preliminary determinations will be issued by August 3, 1999, unless the deadline for the determinations is extended.

#### *Initiation of Cost Investigation*

As explained above, the Department has found that there are "reasonable grounds to believe or suspect" that sales of certain aperture masks in the comparison markets for Japan and South Korea were made below their respective cost of production within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating countrywide sales-below-cost investigations with respect to certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea.

#### *Distribution of Copies of the Petitions*

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, copies of public versions of the petitions have been provided to the representatives of the Governments of Japan and South Korea.

#### *International Trade Commission Notification*

We have notified the ITC of our initiation of these investigations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

*Preliminary Determination by the ITC*

The ITC will determine by April 12, 1999, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of certain aperture masks from Japan and South Korea are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in termination of the investigations; otherwise, the investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 16, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-6934 Filed 3-19-99; 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: Postponement of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is extending by 120 days the time limit of the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998, since it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 22, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sunkyu Kim, at (202) 482-2613; or John Maloney, at (202) 482-1503, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

*Postponement of Preliminary Results of Review:* Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to make a preliminary determination in an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which

the preliminary determination is published. However, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act provides that, when it is not practicable to complete the review within the specified time period, the Department may extend the time period for completing the preliminary results by 120 days. We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time frame. See Decision Memorandum from Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, to Robert S. LaRussa, Assistant Secretary. Accordingly, the deadline for issuing the preliminary results of this review is now due no later than July 31, 1999. In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we plan to issue the final results of this administrative review within 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

Dated: March 12, 1999.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-6832 Filed 3-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

#### **Stainless Steel Bar from India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of 1997-1998 antidumping duty administrative review and new shipper review of stainless steel bar from India.

**SUMMARY:** On November 12, 1998, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes for the final results.

These reviews cover five producers/exporters of stainless steel bar to the United States during the period February 1, 1997, through January 31, 1998.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 22, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Zak Smith, James Breeden, or Stephanie

Hoffman, Import Administration, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office 1, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0189, 482-1174, or 482-4198, 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, all references to the Department of Commerce's ("the Department's") regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On November 12, 1998, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review and new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India (63 FR 63288) ("preliminary results"). The manufacturers/exporters in this administrative review are Bhansali Bright Bars Pvt. Ltd. ("Bhansali") and Venus Wire Industries Limited ("Venus"). The manufacturers/exporters in this new shipper review are Sindia Steels Limited ("Sindia"), Chandan Steel Limited ("Chandan"), and Madhya Pradesh Iron & Steel Company ("Madhya"). We received a case brief from Madhya on December 18, 1998. We received case and rebuttal briefs from the petitioners<sup>1</sup> and the other respondents in February.

#### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by these reviews are shipments of stainless steel bar ("SSB"). SSB means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or

<sup>1</sup> Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division, Crucible Materials Corp., Electroalloy Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Slater Steels Corp., Talley Metals Technology, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC).