

with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 9, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-31421 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-502]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From India

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited Sunset Review: Certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from India.

SUMMARY: On May 3, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from India (64 FR 23596) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping

duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1698 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 3, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("*Sunset Regulations*"), and 19 C.F.R. Part 351 (1999) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*; Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("*Sunset Policy Bulletin*").

Scope

The products covered by this order include circular welded non-alloy steel pipes and tubes, of circular cross-section, with an outside diameter of 0.372 inches or more, but not more than 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). These 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-conditioner 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 protections of electrical wiring, such as conduit shells.

The scope is not limited to standard pipe and fence tubing or those types or mechanical and structural pipe that are used in standard pipe applications. All carbon-steel pipes and tubes within the physical description outline above are included in the scope of this order, except for 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. The subject merchandise was classifiable under items 610.3231, 610.3234, 610.3241, 610.3242, 610.3243, 610.3252, 610.3254, 610.3256, 610.3258, and 610.4925 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated ("TSUSA"); currently, it is classifiable under item numbers 7306.30.1000, 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.30.5040, 7306.30.5055, 7306.30.5805, and 7306.30.5090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the TSUSA and HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

History of the Order

In the final determination of the original investigation, covering the period February 1, 1985, through July 31, 1985 (51 FR 9089, March 17, 1986), the Department determined a margin of 7.08 percent for Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. ("TISCO"), and "all others."¹

There have been six administrative reviews for the subject antidumping duty order. A summary of these reviews follows:

Period of Review ("POR")	Citation
1 May 1987—30 April 1988	56 FR 64753 (December 12, 1991)
1 May 1988—30 April 1989	56 FR 64753 (December 12, 1991)
1 May 1990—30 April 1991	57 FR 54360 (November 18, 1992)
1 May 1995—30 April 1996	62 FR 47632 (September 10, 1997)
	62 FR 63070 (November 26, 1997) Amended
1 May 1996—30 April 1997	63 FR 32825 (June 16, 1998)
	63 FR 39269 (July 22, 1998) Amended
	63 FR 66120 (December 1, 1998) Amended
1 May 1997—30 April 1998	64 FR 23821 (May 4, 1999)

¹ Two of the three companies investigated, Zenith Steel Pipes and Industries Ltd. and Gujarat Steel

Tubes Ltd., were excluded from the final affirmative

determination, since the Department found no sales at less than fair value.

In addition to the companies subject to the original investigation, the Department has investigated and/or reviewed imports from producers/exporters Jindal Pipes Ltd. ("Jindal"), Rajinder Pipes Ltd. ("Rajinder") and Rajinder Steel Ltd. (collectively "RSL"), and Lloyd's Metals & Engineers ("Lloyds").

To date, the Department has not issued a duty-absorption determination in this case.

Background

On May 3, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from India (64 FR 23596), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of Allied Tube and Conduit Corp., Sawhill Tubular Division—Amoco, Century Tube, IPSCO Tubular Inc., LTV Steel Tubular Products, Maverick Tube Corporation, Sharon Tube Company, Western Tube and Conduit, and Wheatland Tube Company (collectively "domestic interested parties") on May 18, 1999, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. The domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as U.S. producers of certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes. We received a complete substantive response from the domestic interested parties on June 2, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). We did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to this proceeding. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day review of this order.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of 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). On September 7, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from India is extraordinarily complicated and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than November 29, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.²

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping duty order, and it shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. Additionally, the domestic interested parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action ("the SAA"), H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103-826, pt.1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (*see* section II.A.2). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3).

In addition to considering the guidance on likelihood cited above, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that

revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In the instant review, the Department did not receive a response from any respondent interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations*, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

In their substantive response, the domestic interested parties argue that revocation of the subject order would result in the resumption of sales at less than fair value by margins equivalent to those found in the original investigation (*see* June 2, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 3). With respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, the domestic interested parties assert that margins have increased since the original investigation. For example, domestic interested parties note the dumping margins for two investigated companies, Tisco and Rajinder, increased to 87.39 percent. *Id.*

With respect to import volumes, the domestic interested parties assert that import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly, noting that 1998 imports amounted to 12,000 tons, or nearly a 50-percent drop from the 22,000 tons imported in 1985 (the year prior to the subject order). *Id.* In their substantive response, the domestic interested parties argue that both the overall decrease in imports from India into the United States and continuing presence of even higher dumping margins than those found in the original investigation indicate a strong likelihood of continuation of dumping should the order be terminated.

As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63-64, if companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the discipline were removed. Dumping margins above *de minimis* have existed throughout the life of the order, and continue to exist, for shipments of subject merchandise from all Indian producers/exporters investigated other than those excluded from this order.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, we considered the volume of imports before and after the issuance of the order in 1986. The statistics on imports of the subject merchandise cited by the domestic interested parties and those we examined show that Indian producers/exporters continued to export after the order was issued, although not

² See *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 48579 (September 7, 1999).

at pre-order levels. According to U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports, in 1985, the year prior to the order, approximately 20 million kilograms of subject merchandise were imported into the United States. Although imports peaked in 1988, average imports declined to approximately 7.5 million kilograms over the next ten years, which is almost 50 percent of pre-order levels.

Based on this analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Given that dumping has continued at levels above de minimis after the issuance of the order, average imports of subject merchandise declined after the issuance of the order, respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in this review before the Department, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the order were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation (*see* section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*). Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty-absorption determinations (*see* sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

In their substantive response, the domestic interested parties, based on their argument that dumping is likely to continue should the order be terminated, urge the Department to find that the magnitudes of the margins likely to prevail are identical to the margins found for Indian producers/exporters in the original investigation (*see* June 2, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 3).

We agreed with the domestic interested parties' assertion that we should report to the Commission the margins from the original investigation. These margins reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the order in place. Absent argument, or evidence to the contrary, we see no reason to change our usual practice. Therefore, the Department, consistent

with the SAA at 890 and the House Report at 64, will report to the Commission the margins from the original investigation as contained in this Final Results of Review section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margin listed below:

Producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Tata Iron and Steel Company, Ltd.	7.08
All others	7.08

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 29, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-31423 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Closed Meeting of the U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee (APAC)

AGENCY: Interagency Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The APAC will have a closed meeting on December 16, 1999 at a location to be announced to discuss U.S.-made automotive parts sales in Japanese and other Asian markets.

DATES: December 16, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert Reck, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4036, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: 202-482-1418.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee

(the "Committee") advises U.S. Government officials on matters relating to the implementation of the Fair Trade in Automotive Parts Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-261). The Committee: (1) reports to the Secretary of Commerce on barriers to sales of U.S.-made automotive parts and accessories in Japanese and other Asian markets; (2) reviews and considers data collected on sales of U.S.-made auto parts and accessories in Japanese and Asian markets; (3) advises the Secretary of Commerce during consultations with other Governments on issues concerning sales of U.S.-made automotive parts in Japanese and other Asian markets; and (4) assists in establishing priorities for the initiative to increase sales of U.S.-made auto parts and accessories to Japanese markets, and otherwise provide assistance and direction to the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out the intent of that section; and (5) assists the Secretary of Commerce in reporting to Congress by submitting an annual written report to the Secretary on the sale of U.S.-made automotive parts in Japanese and other Asian markets, as well as any other issues with respect to which the Committee provides advice pursuant to its authorizing legislation. At the meeting, committee members will discuss specific trade and sales expansion programs related to automotive parts trade policy between the United States and Japan and other Asian markets.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel formally determined on November 29, 1999, pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, that the December 16 meeting of the Committee and of any subcommittee thereof, dealing with privileged or confidential commercial information may be exempt from the provisions of the Act relating to open meeting and public participation therein because these items are concerned with matters that are within the purview of 5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(4) and (9)(B). A copy of the Notice of Determination is available for public inspection and copying in the Department of Commerce Records Inspection and copying in the Department of Commerce Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, Main Commerce.

Dated: December 1, 1999.

Henry P. Misisco,

Director, Office of Automotive Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99-31493 Filed 12-2-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-M