

responses from domestic interested parties and respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting full sunset reviews to determine whether revocation of the orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy. As a result of this extension, the Department intends to issue its preliminary results not later than September 17, 1999.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 25, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Scott E. Smith, Martha V. Douthit or Melissa G. Skinner, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6397, (202) 482-3207 or (202) 482-1560 respectively.

**Extension of Final Results**

The Department has determined that the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Belgium and the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid from Israel are extraordinarily complicated. In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("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). See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act. The Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of these reviews until not later than September 17, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act. The final results of these reviews will, therefore, be due not later than January 25, 2000.

Dated: June 21, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-16248 Filed 6-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-201-805]

**Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube From Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; and Partial Revocation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and partial revocation.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request by one respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting two administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico (A-201-805). These reviews cover one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during two periods of review (POR): April 28, 1992, through October 31, 1993, (the 92/93 POR) and November 1, 1993, through October 31, 1994 (the 93/94 POR).

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the foreign market value (FMV) for the first period of review (POR). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative reviews, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties based upon the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

**EFFECTIVE DATES:** June 25, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Drury, Nancy Decker or Linda Ludwig, Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 7866, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0195 (Drury), (202) 482-0196 (Decker), or (202) 482-3833 (Ludwig).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Applicable Statute and Regulations**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

**Background**

The Department published an antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico on November 2, 1992 (57 FR 49453). The Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order for the 92/93 POR on November 3, 1993 (58 FR 58682). On November 19, 1993, respondent Hylsa S.A. de C.V. ("Hylsa") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the

antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico. On November 30, 1993, respondent Tuberia Nacional S.A. de C.V. ("TUNA") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of this order. We initiated this review on January 18, 1994. See 59 FR 2593 (January 18, 1994).

The Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order for the 93/94 POR on November 10, 1994 (59 FR 56034). On November 29, 1994, respondent Hylsa S.A. de C.V. ("Hylsa") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico. On November 30, 1994, respondent Western American Manufacturing, Inc. ("Western American") requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of this order. We initiated this review on December 15, 1994. See 59 FR 64650 (December 15, 1994).

The Department is conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act").

**Partial Termination of Review**

On November 30, 1995, TUNA withdrew its request for administrative review for the 92/93 POR, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). Ordinarily, parties have 90 days from the date of publication of notice of initiation within which to withdraw a request for review. In this case, the record indicates that petitioners have no objection to the withdrawal and in fact had previously requested that the Department terminate the review of TUNA (See Letter to Secretary of Commerce from R. Alan Luberd, dated May 11, 1994). In addition, the review of TUNA has not progressed substantially and there would be no undue burden on the parties or the Department as a result of said withdrawal. Therefore, the Department has determined that it would be reasonable to grant the withdrawal at this time. In accordance with section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department has terminated the 92/93 administrative review insofar as it regards TUNA.

On March 14, 1995, Western American withdrew its request for administrative review for the 93/94 POR, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). Ordinarily, parties have 90 days from the date of publication of notice of initiation within which to withdraw a request for review. In this case, the

record indicates that petitioners have no objection to the withdrawal. In addition, the review of Western American has not progressed substantially and there would be no undue burden on the parties or the Department as a result of said withdrawal. Therefore, the Department has determined that it would be reasonable to grant the withdrawal at this time. In accordance with section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department has terminated the 93/94 administrative review insofar as it regards to Western American.

#### Scope of the Review

The review of "circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube" covers products of circular cross-section, not more than 406.4 millimeters (16 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (black, galvanized, or painted), or end finish (plain end, beveled end, threaded, or threaded and coupled). Those pipes and tubes are generally known as standard pipe, though they may also be called structural or mechanical tubing in certain applications. Standard pipes and tubes are intended for the low pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air and other liquids and gases in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other related uses. Standard pipe may also be used for light load-bearing and mechanical applications, such as for fence tubing, and for protection of electrical wiring, such as conduit shells.

The scope is not limited to standard pipe and fence tubing, or those types of mechanical and structural pipe that are used in standard pipe applications. All carbon steel pipes and tubes within the physical description outlined above are included within the scope of this review, except line pipe, oil country tubular goods, boiler tubing, cold-drawn or cold-rolled mechanical tubing, pipe and tube hollows for redraws, finished scaffolding, and finished rigid conduit. In accordance with the Final Negative Determination of Scope Inquiry (56 FR 11608, March 21, 1996), pipe certified to the API 5L line pipe specification, or pipe certified to both the API 5L line pipe specifications and the less-stringent ASTM A-53 standard pipe specifications, which fall within the physical parameters as outlined above, and entered as line pipe of a kind used for oil and gas pipelines, are outside of the scope of the antidumping duty order.

Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule

(HTS) subheadings: 7306.3010.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

The 92/93 POR is April 28, 1992 through October 31, 1993, and the 93/94 POR is November 1, 1993 through October 31, 1994. Subsequent to the partial terminations above, these reviews cover sales of circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube by Hylsa.

#### Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(3) of the Act, we verified information provided by the respondent using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports.

#### Use of Best Information Available (92/93 POR)

Section 776(b) of the Tariff Act provides that, in making a final determination in an administrative review, if the Department "is unable to verify the accuracy of the information submitted, it shall use the best information available to it as the basis for its action. \* \* \*" In addition, section 776(c) of the Act requires the Department to use BIA "whenever a party or any other person refuses or is unable to produce information requested in a timely manner or in the form required, or otherwise significantly impedes an investigation. \* \* \*"

In deciding what to use as BIA, section 353.37(b) of our regulations provides that we may take into account whether a party refuses to provide information. For purposes of these reviews, and in accordance with our practice, we have used the more adverse BIA—generally the highest rate for any company for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country from this or any prior segment of the proceeding, including the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation—whenever a company refused to cooperate with the Department or otherwise significantly impeded the proceeding. When a company substantially cooperated with our requests for information, but we were unable to verify information it provided or it failed to provide all information requested in a timely manner or in the form requested, we used as BIA the higher of (1) the highest

rate (including the "all others" rate) ever applicable to the firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country from either the LTFV investigation or a prior administrative review; or (2) the highest calculated rate in this review for any firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country.

We preliminarily determine that the use of best information available (BIA), in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, is appropriate for Hylsa for the 92/93 POR. We have assigned a cooperative (second-tier) BIA rate to the company for these preliminary results, which is the rate assigned to Hylsa during the original investigation. When a company substantially cooperates with our requests for information but we are unable to verify the information it provided or the company fails to provide complete or accurate information, we assign that company second-tier BIA. (See *Allied Signal v. United States*, 996 F.2d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (concluding that the Department's two-tiered BIA methodology, under which cooperating companies are assigned the lower, "second tier" BIA rate, is reasonable).)

Hylsa cooperated with our requests for information and agreed to verification. However, the multiple and pervasive nature of errors and omissions in the information provided by Hylsa prevented the Department from relying on Hylsa's response for these preliminary results. For example, despite our attempts, we were unable to verify either Hylsa's total quantity and value of home-market sales or its value of U.S. sales of subject merchandise. In addition, we found a significant discrepancy between reported and actual third-country sales of subject merchandise. (See verification report.)

Establishing the completeness of the response with respect to the quantity and value of sales in both the home and U.S. markets is a very significant element of verification. However, as a result of verification, Hylsa subsequently acknowledged that it had failed to report approximately 10% of its sales of subject merchandise in the home market for the period of review. Moreover, Hylsa did not retain the complete database used to develop its response to the Department. As a result, we were unable to reconcile the quantity and value figures for the home market reported to the Department with the company's audited financial statements. In addition, Hylsa failed to prepare a detailed analysis of home market sales in a pre-selected month of the POR as requested in our verification outline. Finally, Hylsa was unable to

explain the discrepancy in U.S. sales value. (See verification report.)

The completeness of both the home market and U.S. sales databases is essential because both are used to calculate the dumping duties. As the Department stated in *Silicon Metal From Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke in Part*, 62 FR 1954 (January 14, 1996), it is the obligation of respondents to provide an accurate and complete response prior to verification so that the Department may have the opportunity to analyze fully the information and other parties are able to review and comment on it. Verification is intended to establish the accuracy and completeness of a response rather than to supplement and reconstruct the information to fit the requirements of the Department. "Establishing the completeness of the response with respect to the sales of the subject merchandise in the United States is a very significant element of the verification." *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 66742 (December 17, 1996). "The completeness of the U.S. sales database is essential because it is used to calculate the dumping duties." *Id.* It is our practice at verification to examine a selected portion of both databases, rather than the entire database, to test the accuracy and completeness of information that the company provided. The CIT has upheld this practice. See *Bomont Industries v. United States*, 733 F. Supp. 1507, 1508 (CIT 1990) ("verification is like an audit, the purpose of which is to test information provided by a party for accuracy and completeness. Normally an audit entails selective examination rather than testing of an entire universe."); See also *Monsanto Co. v. United States*, 698 F.Supp. 275, 281 (CIT 1988) ("verification is a spot check and is not intended to be an exhaustive examination of the respondent's business"). Where the Department finds discrepancies in the portion which it examines, it must judge the effect on the unexamined portion of the response. In the instant case, the loss of a database used to prepare the original response to the Department prevented Hylsa from reconciling aggregate total figures reported to the Department with the company's financial statements. While the company was generally able to tie

monthly financial statements to a monthly sales statistics database, it had no explanation as to the remaining discrepancies between this database and the information submitted to the Department.

In addition, the company's admission that it had failed to report approximately 10 percent of home market sales of subject merchandise further throws the reported quantity and value figures into doubt. Since the Department was unable to reconcile aggregate totals, we requested (as we did in the verification outline) that Hylsa prepare a worksheet tying the pre-selected month to the response submitted to the Department. The pre-selected month corresponded to the month when most of the U.S. sales occurred and most likely would have been used in the calculation of the dumping duties. The company stated that it could not prepare the requested worksheet without the missing database for that month. Department officials then requested a listing of sales from a different month in an attempt to tie it to the sales statistics database. When a Department official selected a particular sale and requested supporting documentation, the company was unable to produce it at that time. Late on the last day, Hylsa indicated that it could provide the supporting documentation. By that time, however, there was insufficient time for Department officials to verify and establish the accuracy of the documents. (See verification report.)

We believe that the use of total BIA is warranted. The inability of Hylsa to reconcile aggregate quantities and values to its financial statements throws into doubt the accuracy of Hylsa's reported transaction-specific sales. Since such sales are used to calculate FMV on a monthly basis, the addition or omission of home-market sales can have a large impact on the final margin. If there are a small number of sales to the U.S. in relation to the home-market, or sales are bunched in particular months, or certain products are only sold in a limited number of months, or other conditions exist, the potential for distortion or manipulation by omitting or creating home-market sales is particularly great. We must be certain that all sales are reported accurately and completely to address this concern, and reconciling quantity and value is one of the most fundamental ways of ensuring accuracy and completeness. Without that certainty, we do not believe that it is possible to calculate an accurate margin for this POR.

As explained above, the multiple and pervasive nature of errors and omissions

in the information provided by Hylsa prevented the Department's reliance on its submissions for these preliminary results. See, e.g. *Yamaha Motor Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 910 F.Supp. 679 (CIT 1995) (upholding the Department's use of second-tier BIA where the Department found that respondent's errors and omissions were multiple and pervasive); *National Steel Corp. v. United States*, 870 F.Supp. 1130 (CIT 1994) (approving the Department's use of BIA where respondent omitted significant information from submissions); *Tatung Co. v. United States*, 18 C.I.T. 1137 (1994) (upholding the Department's use of BIA due to omissions and errors in respondent's submission). Therefore, in accordance with section 776(b) of the Tariff Act, the inability to verify aggregate quantity and value figures was the determining factor in our decision to apply BIA to the company's response for the 92/93 POR. See decision memorandum, February 28, 1997.

### Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, for the 93/94 POR, we considered each circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube product produced by Hylsa, covered by the descriptions in the "Scope of the Review" section of this notice, *supra*, and sold in the home market during the POR, to be such or similar merchandise for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales of circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube. For each of the products produced by Hylsa within the scope of the A-201-805 order, we examined the categories of merchandise listed in Section 771 (16) of the Act for purposes of model matching. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in Appendix VI of the Department's April 24, 1996 antidumping questionnaire. In making the product comparisons, we matched each foreign like product based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondent and verified by the Department. Where sales were made in the home market on a different weight basis from the U.S. market (e.g. theoretical versus actual weight), we converted all quantities to the same weight basis, using the conversion factors supplied by Hylsa, before making our fair-value comparisons. We compared individual U.S. transactions to monthly weighted average FMVs.

### Date of Sale

For the 93/94 POR, depending on the channel of trade and on the date after which the key terms of sale could not be changed, we treated one of the following dates as the date of the sale: The date of the invoice or the date of shipment.

### United States Price

All of Hylsa's U.S. sales in the 93/94 POR were based on the price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States. The Department determined that purchase price, as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act, was the appropriate basis for calculating USP. We made adjustments to purchase price, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, international freight, insurance, U.S. inland freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, and U.S. Customs duties.

### Foreign Market Value

Based on a comparison of the volume of home market and third country sales, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(A) of the Act, we based FMV on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers in the home market. Based on our verification of home-market sales responses, we are disallowing an adjustment for a steel supplier rebate. We have previously outlined our reasons for rejecting this adjustment. *See Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube From Mexico: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 57 FR 42953 (September 17, 1992) ("this rebate program does not qualify for a circumstance of sale adjustment because it reflects a difference in production costs, rather than a difference in selling expenses. Adjustments for circumstance of sale are, by definition, limited to consideration of a seller's marketing practices and expenses, and are unaffected by conditions affecting production"); *See also Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube From Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 68708 (December 30, 1996).

We made adjustments to FMV for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(4)(C) of the Act.

### Cost-of-Production Analysis

Petitioners alleged, on July 23, 1996 with respect to the 93/94 POR, that Hylsa sold circular welded non-alloy steel pipes and tubes in the home market at prices below COP. Based on

this allegation, in accordance with Section 773(b) of the Act, the Department determined, on September 30, 1996, that it had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Hylsa had sold the subject merchandise in the home market at prices below its COP. *See Letter to Shearman and Sterling and Decision Memorandum* (September 30, 1996). We therefore initiated a cost investigation with regard to Hylsa for the 93/94 POR in order to determine whether the respondent made home-market sales during the 93/94 POR at prices below its COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.51(c), we calculated COP for Hylsa as the sum of reported materials, labor, factory overhead, and general expenses. We compared COP to home market prices, net of price adjustments, discounts, and movement expenses.

In accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made in substantial quantities over an extended period of time, and whether such sales were made at prices which permitted recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade.

In accordance with our normal practice, for each model for which less than 10 percent, by quantity, of the home market sales during the POR were made at prices below COP, we included all sales of that model in the computation of FMV. For each model for which 10 percent or more, but less than 90 percent, of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP, we excluded those sales priced below COP, provided that they were made over an extended period of time. For each model for which 90 percent or more of the home market sales during the POR were priced below COP and were made over an extended period of time, we disregarded all sales of that model in our calculation and, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, we used the constructed value (CV) of those models, as described below. *See, e.g., Mechanical Transfer Presses From Japan, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 59 FR 9958 (March 2, 1994).

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, to determine whether sales below cost had been made over an extended period of time, we compared the number of months in which sales below cost occurred for a particular model to the number of months in which that model was sold. If the model was sold in fewer than three months, we

did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were below-cost sales of that model in each month. If a model was sold in three or more months, we did not disregard below-cost sales unless there were sales below cost in at least three of the months. *See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 58 FR 64720, 64729 (December 8, 1993).

Because Hylsa provided no indication that its below-cost sales of models within the "greater than 90 percent" and the "between 10 and 90 percent" categories were at prices that would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time and in the normal course of trade, we disregarded those sales of models within the "10 to 90 percent" category which were made below cost over an extended period of time. In addition, as a result of our COP test for home market sales of models within the "greater than 90 percent" category, we based FMV on CV for all U.S. sales for which more than 90 percent of sales of the comparison home market model occurred below COP. Finally, where we found, for certain of Hylsa's models, home market sales for which less than 10 percent were made below COP, we used all home market sales of these models in our comparisons.

We also used CV as FMV for those U.S. sales for which there was no sale of such or similar merchandise in the home market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials, labor, and factory overhead in our calculations. Where the general expenses were less than the statutory minimum of 10 percent of the cost of manufacture (COM), we calculated general expenses as 10 percent of the COM. Where the actual profits were less than the statutory minimum of 8 percent of the COM plus general expenses, we calculated profit as 8 percent of the sum of COM plus general expenses. Based on our verification of Hylsa's cost response, we adjusted Hylsa's reported COP and CV as described below.

Contrary to specific written instructions from the Department, we found that Hylsa failed to report weighted-average costs by product for the entire POR. Instead, Hylsa reported six months of costs by product which were not weight-averaged. As best information available, we made the following changes. Since respondent did not provide twelve months of

weighted-average cost data, we used as best information available the highest monthly cost by product as the actual cost for the POR. We segregated home-market sales by finish into galvanized and non-galvanized products. As best information available, we took the highest product cost in each of these two groups and applied it to all products within the specific groups.

In accordance with section 773 of the Act, for those U.S. models for which we were able to find a home market such or similar match that had sufficient above-cost sales, we calculated FMV based on the packed, F.O.B., ex-factory, or delivered prices to unrelated purchasers in the home market. We made adjustments, where applicable, for post-sale inland freight and for home market direct expenses. We also adjusted FMV for differences in circumstances of sale based on direct selling expenses.

#### Reimbursement

Petitioners requested that the Department examine the issue of reimbursement where the producer/exporter is the importer of record. Section 353.26 of the Department's regulations states that "[i]n calculating the United States price, the Secretary will deduct the amount of any antidumping duty which the producer or reseller: (i) [P]aid directly on behalf of the importer; or (ii) [r]eimbursed to the importer." 19 CFR 353.26(a)(1). The Department's interpretation of the regulation is that it anticipates that separate corporate entities must exist as producer/reseller and importer in order to invoke the regulation. In the present case, the U.S. importer of record, Hylsa, is also the same corporate entity that produces and exports the subject merchandise. In such a case, there is no separate company or separate U.S. subsidiary, wholly owned or otherwise, that acts as the importer of record. Rather, the importer and exporter are one and the same corporate entity. In this case, there can be no payment made to, or on behalf of, the importer within the meaning of the regulation. Accordingly, the Department interprets its reimbursement regulation as inapplicable in this case.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists:

#### CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL PIPES AND TUBES

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted—average margin (percent)
Hylsa 92/93 .....	32.62
Hylsa 93/94 .....	27.66

Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for 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 the 93/94 review; (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, or the original 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) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will be 32.62 percent. This is the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Mexico*, 57 FR 42953 (September 17, 1992).

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-16244 Filed 6-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-357-811, A-351-830, A-570-854, A-560-807, A-588-849, A-821-810, A-859-801, A-791-807, A-583-834, A-549-814, A-489-808, A-307-815]

**Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Cold-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From Argentina, Brazil, the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, Japan, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, and Venezuela**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 25, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rick Johnson (Russian Federation, South Africa) at (202) 482-3818; Jim Doyle (People's Republic of China) at (202) 482-0159; John Kugelman (Turkey) at (202) 482-0649; Linda Ludwig (Brazil, Venezuela), at (202) 482-3833; and Steven Presing or Kris Campbell (Argentina, Indonesia, Japan, Thailand, Taiwan, Slovakia) at (202) 482-0194 and (202) 482-3813, respectively; 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,