A copy of the application and the accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230

U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, 11135 "O" Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68137

Dated: June 30, 1999.

Dennis Puccinelli.

Acting Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 99–17640 Filed 7–9–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 35-99]

Foreign-Trade Zone 38—Charleston, SC; Application for Foreign-Trade Subzone Status, Fuji Photo Film, Inc. (Imaging and Information Products) Greenwood, SC

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of FTZ 38, requesting special-purpose subzone status for the manufacturing and distribution facilities (imaging and information products) of Fuji Photo Film, Inc. (Fuji), located in Greenwood, South Carolina. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on June 28, 1999.

Fuji's Greenwood, South Carolina complex (488 acres, 2.0 million sq. ft.) is comprised of seven facilities: Facility 1 (350,000 sq. ft.)—Distribution Center, located at 921 Highway 246 South; Facility 2 (120,000 sq. ft.)—Graphic Arts Film Finishing Facility, located at 201 Pucketts Ferry Road; Facility 3 (210,000 sq. ft.)—Pre-sensitized Offset Printing Plate Manufacturing Facility, located at 211 Pucketts Ferry Road; Facility 4 (300,000 sq. ft.)—Videotape and Computer Back-up Tape Manufacturing Facility, located at 311 Pucketts Ferry Road; Facility 5 (200,000 sq. ft.)—Onetime-use Camera Manufacturing Facility, located at 401 Pucketts Ferry Road; Facility 6 (500,000 sq. ft.)—Color Photographic Paper and Color Negative Film Manufacturing Facility, located at 401 Pucketts Ferry Road; and Facility 7 (250,000 sq. ft.)—35mm Film Finishing

Factory, located at 123 Spray Shed Road.

The facilities (1,250 employees) are used for the manufacture and distribution of imaging and information products (graphic arts film; presensitized offset printing plates; blank videotapes and computer back-up tape; one-time-use cameras; and color negative photographic paper and film). Some of the components used in the manufacturing process are purchased from abroad (ranging from 8 to 75 percent of finished product value, depending on the product), with average U.S. value added for the Greenwood facilities estimated at 60 to 70 percent of the finished products' value. The foreign components which Fuji proposes to import under subzone procedures include chemicals (e.g., titanium oxide; methanol; alkylphenonl; glycol ether; di-n-butyl phthalate; tricarboxylated benzene; hydroxyalkyl benzoate; phenylphosphonic acid; axon dye; basic blue dye; oil/water emulsion) and other components (e.g., bulk photographic film; packaging materials; one-time-use camera components) used in the production of Fuji's imaging and information products (current duty rates on these items range from duty-free to 13.2 percent).

Zone procedures would exempt Fuji from Customs duty payments on foreign components used in export production. On its domestic sales, Fuji would be able to choose the lower duty rate that applies to the finished products (dutyfree to 6.5 percent) for the foreign inputs noted above. Fuji would be able to avoid duty on foreign inputs which become scrap/waste (savings on scrap/waste are estimated to comprise less than 15 percent of overall anticipated subzone savings). FTZ status may also make a site eligible for benefits provided under state/local programs. The application indicates that the savings from zone procedures would help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and three copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is September 10, 1999. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to September 27, 1999.

A copy of the application and the accompanying exhibits will be available

for public inspection at each of the following locations:

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230

U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, Park Central Office Park, Building 1, Suite 109, 555 N. Pleasantburg Drive, Greenville, SC 29607

Dated: June 30, 1999.

Dennis Puccinelli,

Acting Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 99–17641 Filed 7–9–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-570-007]

Barium Chloride From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of barium chloride from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On November 30, 1998, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on barium chloride from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998.

For all companies named in this review, we are basing our preliminary results on "facts available" (FA). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess antidumping duties on entries during the period.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nova J. Daly or Thomas Futtner, AD/ CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office Four, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0989, and 482–3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions as of January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998.

Scope of the Review

The imports covered by this review are shipments of barium chloride, a chemical compound having the formulas BaCl2 or BaCl2–2H2O, currently classifiable under item number 2827.38.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

Background

On October 17, 1984, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register (49 FR 40635) the antidumping duty order on barium chloride from the PRC. On October 9, 1998, the Department published in the Federal Register (63 FR 54440) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order. In response to our notice of opportunity to request administrative review for this POR, the petitioner, Chemical Products Corporation ("CPC"), requested, by letter dated October 22, 1998, that the Department conduct an administrative review of the following Chinese manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise: Hebei Xinji Chemical Plant (Hebei); Hengnan Chemical Factory (Hengnan); Kunghan Chemical Factory (Kunghan); Linshu Chemical Factory (Linshu); Qingdao Red Star Chemical Group Co. (Red Star); Sichuan Emeishan Salt Chemical Industry Group Company, Ltd. (Sichuan); Sinochem (U.S.A.)(Sinochem); Tangshan Chemical Factory (Tangshan); Tianjin Chemical Industry Corporation (Tianjin); Tianjin Bohai Chemical United Import/Export Company (Tianjin Bohai); and Zhangjiaba Salt Chemical Plant (Zhangjiaba). (See Letter from CPC to

the Department, October 22, 1998). One of these companies, Sinochem, was previously determined by the Department to be entitled to a separate rate.

On November 30, 1998, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review on the producers/exporters named by the petitioner in its review request (63 FR 65748).

The Department sent questionnaires to all of the companies for which we had addresses on January 28, 1999. Also on January 28, 1999, we sent a letter to Mr. Zhang Yuqing of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC), enclosing copies of the questionnaire.

Separate Rates

Although Sinochem had been granted separate rate status in a prior administrative review, in this review. like the other named companies, Sinochem failed to respond or show that it remained entitled to a separate rate. Consequently, we have considered Sinochem to be part of the PRC-wide entity for purposes of this administrative review. In addition, the other companies named in the request for review also did not request a separate rate. Exporters which have not established they are entitled to a separate rate are presumed to be under common government control and, therefore, should receive a single PRCwide rate. Because none of the companies for which an administrative review has been requested for this POR has demonstrated that it is entitled to a separate rate, all are deemed to be included in the PRC-wide entity, and will receive a common margin in this review.

Facts Available

Section 776(a)(1) of the Act mandates that the Department use FA if necessary information is not available on the record of an antidumping proceeding. In addition, section 776(a)(2) of the Act mandates that the Department use FA where an interested party or any other person: (A) Withholds information requested by the Department; (B) fails to provide requested information by the requested date or in the form and manner requested; (C) significantly impedes an antidumping proceeding; or (D) provides information that cannot be verified. In this case, none of the named respondents responded to the Department's questionnaire. Where the Department must base the entire dumping margin for a respondent in an administrative review on FA because that respondent failed to cooperate by

not acting to the best of its ability, section 776(b)(2) authorizes the Department to use an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing FA. Section 776(b)(2) also authorizes the Department to use as adverse FA information derived from the petition, the final determination in the investigation, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record.

In this administrative review, none of the companies responded to our questionnaire. Therefore, we lack information with which to calculate a margin and, consequently, have determined we must base the margin for the PRC-wide entity on FA.

As noted above, none of the companies named in the notice of initiation in this review responded. Therefore, we find that the PRC-wide entity failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with the Department's requests for information. Consequently, we have preliminarily decided to use adverse FA with respect to the PRC-wide entity in accordance with section 776(b) of the Act.

For the preliminary results of this review, we determine that it is appropriate to use, as adverse FA for the PRC-wide rate, the highest rate from this or previous segments of the proceeding. In this case, we have used Sinochem's rate of 60.84 percent from *Barium Chloride From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 29467 (July 2, 1992) (1990–91 Final Results).

Information from prior segments of a proceeding constitutes secondary information. Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. 103–316, Vol. 1 (1994)(SAA), provides that "corroborate" means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. See SAA at 870.

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. The only source for calculated margins is an administrative determination. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as adverse FA 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 not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse FA, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. See, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 60 FR 49567, 49568 (September 26, 1995) (the Department disregarded the highest margin as best information available because that margin was based on an extraordinarily high business expense resulting from uncharacteristic investment activities, which resulted in the high margin).

In the absence of information on the administrative record that application of this 60.84 percent rate would be inappropriate, that the margin is not relevant, or that leads us to re-examine this rate as adverse FA in the instant review, we find the margin reliable and relevant. Therefore, we have satisfied the corroboration requirements under section 776(c) of the Act and have applied, as FA, the 60.84 percent margin from the 1990–91 Final Results.

Accordingly, we are applying a single dumping rate—the highest rate established in any segment of this proceeding—to all exporters in the PRC. The weighted-average dumping margin is as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted- average margin percentage
PRC-wide rate	60.84

The Department will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. See section 351.224(b) of the Department's regulations. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication date of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. 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. See sections 351.309 and

351.310 of the Department's regulations. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results.

Duty Assessment Rates

Upon completion of the final results in this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We intend to issue assessment instructions to Customs based on the dumping rate stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of barium chloride from the PRC 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) The cash deposit rate for all Chinese exporters will be the rate established in the final results of this review; and (2) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to their PRC suppliers. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 351.402(f) of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this POR. 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.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. section 1675(a)(1)), section 777(i) of the Act (19 U.S.C. section 1677f(i)), and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: July 2, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration. [FR Doc. 99–17645 Filed 7–9–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-791-802]

Furfuryl Alcohol From the Republic of South Africa; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review and revocation of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On March 8, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on furfuryl alcohol from the Republic of South Africa and intent to revoke in part. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period June 1, 1997–May 31, 1998. We have analyzed comments submitted regarding the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 12, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle or Kris Campbell, AD/ CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0650 or 482–3813, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On March 8, 1999, we published the preliminary results of this review and intent to revoke in part. See Furfuryl Alcohol from the Republic of South Africa; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke Order in Part, 64 FR 10983. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. On April 7, 1999, respondent Illovo Sugar Limited