

Section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act directs the Department to exclude all zero and *de minimis* weighted-average dumping margins, as well as dumping margins determined entirely under facts available under section 776 of the Act, from the calculation of the "all others" rate. Accordingly, we have excluded the *de minimis* dumping margin for Pound Maker from the calculation of the "all others" rate.

#### ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our preliminary determination. If our final antidumping determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry. The deadline for that ITC determination would be the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after the date of our final determination.

#### Public Comment

For this investigation, case briefs must be submitted no later than August 6, 1999. Rebuttal briefs must be filed no later than August 13, 1999. A list of authorities used, a table of contents, and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Executive summaries should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes.

Section 774 of the Act provides that the Department will hold a hearing to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs, provided that such a hearing is requested by any interested party. If a hearing is requested, it will be held on August 18, 1999, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should specify the number of participants and provide a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs.

If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination no later than September 13, 1999 (*i.e.*, 75 days after the date of issuance of this notice).

This determination is published pursuant to sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 30, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-17392 Filed 7-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-601]

#### **Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of 1997-1998 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of 1997-1998 administrative review and partial rescission of review.

**SUMMARY:** We preliminarily determine that sales of tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China, were made below normal value during the period June 1, 1997, through May 31, 1998. We are also rescinding the review, in part, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 8, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Zak Smith or James Breeden, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0189 and (202) 482-1174, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **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 ("URAA"). In addition, all references to the Department of Commerce's ("the Department's") regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

##### **Background**

On May 27, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (52 FR 19748) the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts

thereof, finished and unfinished ("TRBs"), from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31717). On June 30, 1998, the petitioner, The Timken Company, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review. Thus, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1), we published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on July 28, 1998 (63 FR 40258).

On September 21, 1998, we sent a questionnaire to the Secretary General of the Basic Machinery Division of the Chamber of Commerce for Import & Export of Machinery and Electronics Products and requested that the questionnaire be forwarded to all PRC companies identified in our initiation notice and to any subsidiary companies of the named companies that produce and/or export the subject merchandise. In this letter, we also requested information relevant to the issue of whether the companies named in the initiation notice are independent from government control. *See the Separate Rates Determination* section, below. Courtesy copies of the questionnaire were also sent to companies with legal representation and to companies listed in the initiation notice for which we were able to obtain addresses.

We received responses to the questionnaire from the following six companies: Luoyang Bearing Corp. (Group) ("Luoyang"), Wafangdian Bearing Factory ("Wafangdian"), Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Company ("Zhejiang"), China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation ("CMC"), Wanxiang Group Corporation ("Wanxiang"), and Premier Bearing & Equipment ("Premier").

On October 28 and December 4, 1998, the petitioner made requests to rescind the review with respect to Wafangdian, Zhejiang, Wanxiang, and CMC. While the petitioner's rescission requests were made more than 90 days after initiation, 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations provides that we may extend that deadline, and it is our practice to do so where it poses no undue burden on the parties or the Department. Therefore, in accordance with 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations, we have rescinded the review regarding these companies (for a complete discussion of this decision see the Memorandum from Team to Richard Moreland, "Partial Rescission of Review," dated February 19, 1999). CMC objected to the rescission on the grounds that it requested a review when requesting revocation. However, CMC's request for revocation was submitted

after the anniversary month and, therefore, cannot constitute a timely request for review. Thus, CMC's request was not considered.

In addition, during April, May, and October, 1998, Triumph Express Service Int'l Limited, Shanghai United Bearing, Transunion International Company, Ltd., China Resources Transportation & Godown Co., Ltd., Scanwell Consolidators, Ltd., and Chin Jun Industrial, Ltd. reported no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review ("POR"), June 1, 1997, through May 31, 1998. We independently confirmed with the Customs Service that there were no shipments from these companies. Therefore, in accordance with 351.213(d)(3) of our regulations, we preliminarily conclude that there were no shipments from these companies to the United States and are rescinding the review with respect to these companies.

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

#### Scope of Review

Merchandise covered by this review includes TRBs and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the PRC; flange, take up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. This merchandise is classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") item numbers 8482.20.00, 8482.91.00.50, 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.80, 8708.99.80.15, and 8708.99.80.80. Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order and this review is dispositive.

#### Separate Rates Determination

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) ("*Sparklers*"), as amplified by the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) ("*Silicon Carbide*"). Under this policy, exporters in nonmarket economies ("NMEs") are entitled to separate,

company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to export activities. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of de jure absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with the individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. De facto absence of government control over exports is based on four factors: (1) Whether each exporter sets its own export prices independently of the government and without the approval of a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits or financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements; and (4) whether each exporter has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management (see *Silicon Carbide*, 59 FR at 22587, and *Sparklers*, 56 FR at 20589).

In previous administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC, we determined that Luoyang should receive a separate rate (see, e.g., *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of 1996-1997 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review and Determination Not to Revoke Order in Part*, 63 FR 63842 (November 17, 1998) ("*TRBs X*"). We preliminarily determine that the evidence on the record of this review also demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to Luoyang's exports according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*. Therefore, we have continued to assign Luoyang a separate rate.

Premier is a privately owned Hong Kong trading company. Because we have determined that this firm, rather than its PRC-based suppliers, is the proper respondent with respect to its sales of TRBs to the United States, no separate-rates analysis of Premier's suppliers is necessary. See the *United States Sales* section, below.

#### Separate-Rate Determinations for Non-Responsive Companies

We have preliminarily determined that those companies for which we

initiated a review and which did not respond to the questionnaire should not receive separate rates. See the *Use of Facts Otherwise Available* section, below.

#### Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We preliminarily determine that, in accordance with sections 776(a) and (b) of the Act, the use of adverse facts available is appropriate for all companies which did not respond to our requests for information. Furthermore, we preliminarily determine that Premier did not demonstrate that it cooperated to the best of its ability in providing certain information, and we have applied adverse facts available to calculate a portion of Premier's margin.

1. *Companies that did not respond to the questionnaire:* Where the Department must base its determination on facts available because a respondent failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use inferences adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing facts available. Section 776(b) of the Act also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. Information from prior segments of the proceeding constitutes secondary information and section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action ("SAA") provides that "corroborate" means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value (see H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 870 (1994)).

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department

will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin inappropriate. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (see, e.g., *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812, 6814 (Feb. 22, 1996) (where the Department disregarded the highest margin as adverse facts available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin)).

We have preliminarily assigned a margin of 33.18 percent to those companies for which we initiated a review and which did not respond to the questionnaire. This margin, calculated for sales by Xiangfan Machinery Import & Export (Group) Corp. during the 1996-97 review, represents the highest overall margin calculated for any firm during any segment of this proceeding. As discussed above, it is not necessary to question the reliability of a calculated margin from a prior segment of the proceeding. Further, there are no circumstances indicating that this margin is inappropriate as adverse facts available. Therefore, we preliminarily find that the 33.18 percent rate is corroborated. As noted in the *Separate Rates Determination* section above, we have also preliminarily determined that the non-responsive companies should not receive separate rates. Therefore, the facts available for these companies form the basis for the PRC rate, which is 33.18 percent for this review.

2. *Premier*: Premier, a Hong Kong-based reseller of TRBs, claims that it attempted to obtain factors-of-production data for the models it sold in the United States from its suppliers. Premier provided factors data from two suppliers for some models which it sold to the United States. However, only one supplier's set of factors data was usable as Premier was unable to answer supplemental questions relating to the second supplier's set of factors data. For other models sold in the United States, Premier stated that it was unable to provide factors data from any of its PRC suppliers. Instead, Premier provided factors data from another PRC producer of the same models. For the remaining models sold in the United States by Premier, no factors data were reported.

As in prior reviews, we have preliminarily determined that there is little variation in factor utilization rates among the TRB producers from which

we have received factors-of-production data (see, e.g., *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of 1996-1997 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review*, 63 FR 37339, 37342 (July 10, 1998) ("Preliminary TRBs X")). Therefore, for the models for which we have such information, we are using, as facts available, the factors data provided by Premier, including information from manufacturers which did not supply Premier during the POR, in order to calculate normal value.

For the models for which no factors data was reported, we have preliminarily determined that Premier has not demonstrated that it cooperated to the best of its ability in responding to our antidumping duty questionnaire. While Premier has stated that it attempted to obtain factors data from its PRC-based suppliers, it has not provided sufficient evidence on the record to support this claim. For example, Premier did not provide copies of the letters it sent to all of its suppliers requesting information, nor has it provided copies of letters from all of its suppliers responding to Premier's request. In addition, Premier submitted contradictory information about its suppliers. Given that this is the eleventh review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC and that Premier has participated in several reviews, Premier has been on notice of the Department's requirements on this matter. Because the missing factors of production amount to a substantial portion of Premier's response, we are using adverse facts available for such missing data.

Thus, with respect to Premier's U.S. sales for which no corresponding factors data were reported, we are applying, as adverse facts available, a margin of 25.56 percent, the highest overall margin ever applicable to Premier. This approach is consistent with our final results in the prior review (see *TRBs X* 63 FR 63857). As discussed above, it is not necessary to question the reliability of a calculated margin from a prior segment of the proceeding. Further, there are no circumstances indicating that this margin is inappropriate as adverse facts available. Therefore, we preliminarily find that the 25.56 percent rate is corroborated.

#### United States Sales

Premier reported that it maintains inventories of TRBs in Hong Kong and sells TRBs worldwide. Therefore, its PRC-based suppliers have no knowledge when they sell to this firm that the

shipments are destined for the United States. Since Premier is the first party to sell the merchandise to the United States, we have calculated United States price of this merchandise based on Premier's sales.

For sales made by Premier and Luoyang, we based the U.S. sales on export price ("EP"), in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and because the constructed export price methodology was not indicated by other circumstances.

We calculated EP based on the FOB, CIF, or C&F port price to unaffiliated purchasers, as appropriate. From this price we deducted amounts, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, and marine insurance. We valued the deduction for foreign inland freight using surrogate data (Indian freight costs). (We selected India as the surrogate country for the reasons explained in the *Normal Value* section of this notice.) When marine insurance and ocean freight were provided by PRC-owned companies, we valued the deductions using the surrogate data (amounts charged by international providers). When marine insurance and ocean freight were provided by market economy companies, we deducted the values reported by the respondents for these services.

#### Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine normal value ("NV") using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) the merchandise is exported from an NME, and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV under section 773(a) of the Act. The Department has treated the PRC as an NME in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Moreover, parties to this proceeding have not argued that the PRC tapered roller bearing industry is a market-oriented industry. Consequently, we have no basis to determine that the information would permit the calculation of NV using PRC prices or costs. Therefore, except as noted below, we calculated NV based on factors of production in accordance with sections 773(c)(3) and (4) of the Act and § 351.408(c) of our regulations.

Although Premier is a Hong Kong company, we also calculated NV for it based on factors-of-production data. We did not use Premier's third-country sales in calculating NV because its PRC-based suppliers knew at the time of sale that the subject merchandise was destined for exportation. Section 773(a)(3)(A) of the Act provides that under such conditions NV may be determined in the country of origin of the subject merchandise. Accordingly, we calculated NV for Premier on the basis of PRC production inputs and surrogate country factor prices.

Under the factors-of-production methodology, we are required to value the NME producer's inputs in a comparable market economy country that is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. We chose India as the most comparable surrogate on the basis of the criteria set out in § 351.408(b) of our regulations. See Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach from Jeff May: "Tapered Roller Bearings ("TRBs") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"): Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection," dated January 8, 1999, for a further discussion of our surrogate selection. We selected Indonesia as a second-choice surrogate based on the same criteria. We note that, in past reviews of this and other orders, we have found that both India and Indonesia are significant producers of TRBs (see *Preliminary TRBs X*, 63 FR 37342, and *Tapered Roller Bearing and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Romania: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 63 FR 11217-01 (March 6, 1998)).

We used publicly available information from India to value the various factors of production with the exception of the following: hot-rolled alloy steel bars for the production of cups and cones, cold-rolled steel rods used in the production of rollers, and steel scrap from the production of cups, cones, and rollers. To value hot-rolled alloy steel bars for the production of cups and cones we used publicly available Japanese export prices to Indonesia. To value cold-rolled steel rods used in the production of rollers we used publicly available Indonesian import data. We used these data because we found the Indian data for those inputs to be unreliable. (See Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach: "Selection of a Surrogate Country and Steel Value Sources," dated June 30, 1999 ("Steel Values Memorandum").)

We valued the factors of production as follows (for a complete description of the factor values used, see the Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach:

"Factors of Production Values Used for the Preliminary Results," dated June 30, 1999):

1. *Steel Inputs.* For hot-rolled alloy steel bars used in the production of cups and cones, consistent with *TRBs X* (63 FR 63845), we used a weighted average of Japanese export values to Indonesia from the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") category 7228.30.900 obtained from Official Japan Ministry of Finance statistics. For cold-rolled steel rods used in the production of rollers, we used Indonesian import data under Indonesian tariff subheading 7228.50000 obtained from *Badan Pusat Statistik, Republik Indonesia*. For cold-rolled steel sheet for the production of cages, we used Indian import data under Indian tariff subheading 7209.4200 obtained from the *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Vol. II—Imports*. (For further discussion of selection of steel value sources, see Steel Values Memorandum.)

As in previous administrative reviews, we eliminated from our calculation steel imports from NME countries and imports from market economy countries that were made in small quantities. For steel used in the production of cups, cones, and rollers, we also excluded imports from countries that do not produce bearing-quality steel (see, e.g., *TRBs X*). We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest PRC port to the TRBs factory or the domestic supplier to the TRBs factory (see *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Collated Roofing Nails From the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 51410 (October 1, 1997), and *Sigma Corporation v. United States*, 117 F. 3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

One producer in this review purchased steel sheet from a market economy supplier and paid for the steel with market economy currency. Thus, in accordance with section 351.408(c)(1) of our regulations, we valued the steel input using the actual price reported for directly imported inputs from a market economy. Two producers purchased imported steel bar from a trading company in the PRC. We have not used the trading company prices and instead used a surrogate to value that steel.

We valued scrap recovered from the production of cups, cones, and rollers using Indonesian import statistics from HTS category 7204.29000. Scrap recovered from the production of cages was valued using import data from the Indian tariff subheading 7204.4100.

2. *Labor.* Section 351.408(c)(3) of our regulations requires the use of a

regression-based wage rate. We have used the regression-based wage rate on Import Administration's internet website at [www.ita.doc.gov/import\\_admin/records/wages](http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/wages).

3. *Overhead, SG&A Expenses, and Profit.* For factory overhead, we used information obtained from the fiscal year 1997-98 annual reports of six Indian bearing producers. We calculated factory overhead and selling, general and administrative ("SG&A") expenses (exclusive of labor and electricity) as percentages of direct inputs (also exclusive of labor) and applied these ratios to each producer's direct input costs. For profit, we totaled the reported profit before taxes for the six Indian bearing producers and divided it by the total calculated cost of production ("COP") of goods sold. This percentage was applied to each respondent's total COP to derive a company-specific profit value.

4. *Packing.* We calculated the packing costs as a percentage of COP for each respondent based on the information submitted in the 1996-97 review. This ratio was applied to the respondents' COP for the current review to derive a company-specific packing expense. See Memorandum from Susan Kuhbach to the File: "Valuation of Packing," dated February 12, 1999.

5. *Electricity.* We used a simple average of 1995 regional electricity prices in India for large industries as reported in *India's Energy Sector*, published by the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy Pvt. Ltd. (September 1996). We adjusted the value to reflect inflation using the WPI.

6. *Inland Freight.* We valued truck freight using a rate derived from the April 20, 1994 issue of *The Times of India*. We adjusted the rate to reflect inflation using the WPI. We valued rail freight using rates published by the Indian Railway Conference Association in 1995. We calculated an average rate per kilometer and adjusted the rate to reflect inflation using the WPI.

7. *Ocean Freight.* We calculated a value for ocean freight based on 1996 rate quotes from Maersk Inc. Because the information obtained was from a period contemporaneous with the POR, no adjustments were necessary.

8. *Marine Insurance.* We calculated a value for marine insurance based on the CIF value of the TRBs shipped. We obtained the rate used through queries we made directly to an international marine insurance provider.

9. *Brokerage and Handling.* We used the public version of a U.S. sales listing reported in the questionnaire response submitted by Viraj Impoexpo in the antidumping investigation of *Stainless*

*Steel Wire Rod from India* (63 FR 48184, September 9, 1998). Because this information is contemporaneous with the current POR, no adjustments were necessary.

#### Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period June 1, 1997, through May 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Luoyang .....	0.98
Premier .....	23.61
PRC Rate .....	33.18

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 42 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Issues raised in hearings will be limited to those raised in the respective 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.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. With respect to EP sales for these preliminary results, we divided the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of that importer's/customer's entries under the order during the review period.

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for

consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) For the PRC companies named above, the cash deposit rates will be the rates for these firms established in the final results of this review, except that, for exporters with de minimis rates, i.e., less than 0.50 percent, no deposit will be required; (2) for previously-reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters with separate rates, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) for all other PRC exporters, the rate will be the PRC country-wide rate, which is 33.12 percent; and (4) for all other non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under § 351.402(f) of our regulations 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: June 30, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-17393 Filed 7-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 062999B]

##### Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Meetings

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting(s).

**SUMMARY:** The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Summer Flounder Monitoring Committee, Scup Monitoring Committee, Black Sea Bass Monitoring Committee, and Bluefish

Monitoring Committee will hold public meetings.

**DATES:** On July 20, 1999, the Black Sea Bass Monitoring Committee will begin meeting at 10:00 a.m. The Scup Monitoring Committee will meet from 2:00-5:00 p.m. On July 21, 1999, the Summer Flounder Monitoring Committee will meet from 8:00 a.m. until noon. The Bluefish Monitoring Committee will meet from 1:00-4:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** These meetings will be held at the Sheraton International Hotel, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, 7032 Elm Road, BWI Airport, Baltimore, MD 21240, telephone: 410-859-3300.

**Council address:** Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19904, telephone: 302-674-2331.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, telephone: 302-674-2331, ext. 19.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The purpose of these meetings is to recommend the 2000 commercial management measures, commercial quotas, and recreational harvest limits for summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass. The Bluefish Monitoring Committee will meet to recommend commercial management measures, recreational management measures, and a commercial quota for bluefish for 2000.

Although other issues not contained in this agenda may come before these committees for discussion, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in this notice.

#### Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Joanna Davis at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: July 1, 1999.

**Bruce C. Morehead,**  
*Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*  
[FR Doc. 99-17370 Filed 7-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-F