

from 0.003 millimeters (0.00012 inches) through 0.005 millimeters (0.000196 inches) in thickness and that is comprised of either two evenly applied layers, the first layer consisting of 99 percent zinc, 0.5 percent cobalt, and 0.5 percent molybdenum followed by a layer consisting of chromate, and finally, a layer consisting of silicate.

There have been three changed circumstances administrative reviews. On December 22, 1997, the Department published the final results of a changed circumstances review requested by Sudo Corporation.⁶ In this review, the Department revoked the antidumping duty order with regard to certain electrolytic zinc-coated steel coiled rolls from Japan.

In the second changed circumstances review, requested by Uchiyama, the Department revoked the antidumping duty order with regard to certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products used in the manufacture of rubber seals and metal inserts for ball bearings.⁷

The Department completed a third changed circumstances review, requested by Taiho Corporation of America, in which it determined to revoke the order with respect to (1) certain products meeting the requirements of SAE standard 792 for Bearing and Bushing Alloys, and (2) certain products meeting the requirements of SAE standard 783 for Bearing and Bushing Alloys.⁸

There has been one circumvention inquiry initiated regarding this proceeding. On October 30, 1998, the Department initiated an anticircumvention inquiry regarding boron-added corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan.⁹ The inquiry was subsequently enjoined by the Court of International Trade in *Nippon Steel v. United States*, Ct. No. 98-10-03102 (Ct. Int'l Trade). The case is now pending before the Court of

Appeals for the Federal Circuit, No. 99-1379, 1386 (Fed. Cir.).

The Department has conducted one scope ruling at the request of Drive Automotive Industries of America, Inc. ("Drive Automotive"). On February 24, 1998, the Department found that steel coils imported by Drive Automotive and having a thickness of 0.8 mm and a width of 2000 mm, electrolytically coated with zinc, were within the scope of the order (63 FR 29700, June 1, 1998).

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memo") from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Robert S. La Russa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated March 20, 2000, which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference into this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at www.ita.doc.gov/import-admin/records/frn. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporters	Margin (percent)
Nippon Steel Corporation	36.41
Kawasaki Steel Corporation	36.41
All Others	36.41

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on May 17, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than May 8, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed

not later than May 15, 2000. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, no later than July 27, 2000.

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

Dated: March 20, 2000.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-7386 Filed 3-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-485-803]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Romania; Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania (64 FR 47767) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct a full review. As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Preliminary Results of Review section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 27, 2000.

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, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1930 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

⁶ See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Results of Change Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 62 FR 66848 (December 22, 1997).

⁷ See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Results of Change Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 64 FR 14861 (March 29, 1999).

⁸ See *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Results of Change Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order*, 64 FR 57032 (October 22, 1999).

⁹ See *Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan; Initiation of Anticircumvention Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Order*, 63 FR 58364 (October 30, 1998).

Statute and Regulations

This review is being conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("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 in 19 CFR 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").

Background

On September 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania (64 FR 47767), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation and U.S. Steel Corporation, a unit of USX Corporation ("domestic interested parties"), within the applicable deadline (September 15, 1999) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. On October 4, 1999, Sidex, S.A. ("Sidex") notified the Department that it intended to participate in this review as a respondent interested party. Domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. producers of a domestic like product; Sidex is an interested party pursuant to section 771(9)(A) of the Act, as a foreign producer and exporter of subject merchandise.

On September 24, 1999, we received a request for an extension to file rebuttal comments from domestic interested parties.¹ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.302(b)(1999), the Department extended the deadline for all participants eligible to file rebuttal comments until October 15, 1999.² On

October 1, 1999, we received a complete substantive response from domestic interested parties, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i), and a complete substantive response from Sidex. On October 15, 1999, we received rebuttal comments from domestic interested parties. On October 21, 1999, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A), the Department determined to conduct a full (240-day) sunset review of this order.³

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). This review concerns a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Accordingly, on December 22, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of cut-to-length carbon steel flat plate is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this review until not later than March 20, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.⁴

Scope of Review

These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") under item numbers: 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000,

7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.1000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.50.0000, and 7212.50.5000. Included in this order are flat-rolled products of non-rectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this order is grade X-70 plate. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memo") from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Robert S. La Russa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated March 20, 2000, which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference into this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at www.ita.doc.gov/import-admin/records/frn. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporters	Margin (percent)
Metalexportimport, S.A.	75.04
All Others	75.04

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested,

¹ See September 24, 1999, Request for an Extension to File Rebuttal Comments in the Sunset Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders: A-602-803; A-351-817; C-351-818, A-122-822, A-122-823, A-405-802, A-588-826, A-421-804, A-455-802, A-485-803, C-401-401, C-401-804, C-401-805, from Valerie S. Schindler, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, to Jeffrey A. May, Office of Policy.

² See September 30, 1999, Letter from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy to Valerie S.

Schindler, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

³ See October 21, 1999, Memoranda for Jeffrey A. May, Re: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania; Adequacy of Respondent Interested Party Response to the Notice of Initiation.

⁴ See *Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Full Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 71726 (December 22, 1999).

will be held on May 17, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than May 8, 2000, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than May 15, 2000. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, no later than July 27, 2000.

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

Dated: March 20, 2000.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-7385 Filed 3-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-859, A-557-810, A-533-819, A-549-816]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Steel Wire Rope From India, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China, and Thailand

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 27, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Abdelali Elouaradia or Gabriel Adler at (202) 482-0498 and (202) 482-1442, respectively; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigations

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1999).

The Petitions

On March 1, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received petitions filed in proper form by the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Speciality Cable Manufacturers (the

petitioner). The Department received information supplementing the petitions throughout the initiation period.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Act, the petitioner alleges that imports of steel wire rope from India, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China (China), and Thailand are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioner filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act and has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations that it is requesting the Department to initiate (*see Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions* below).

Scope of Investigations

For purposes of these investigations, the product covered is steel wire rope. Steel wire rope encompasses ropes, cables, and cordage of iron or carbon or stainless steel, other than stranded wire, not fitted with fittings or made up into articles, and not made up of brass-plated wire. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under subheadings: 7312.10.6030, 7312.10.6060, 7312.10.9030, 7312.10.9060, and 7312.10.9090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs Service purposes, the written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petitions, we discussed the scope with the petitioner to ensure that it accurately reflects the product for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (62 FR 27323), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments by April 7, 2000. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit at Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether the petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.¹

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

The domestic like product referred to in the petitions is the single domestic like product defined in the "Scope of Investigations" section, above. No party has commented on the petitioner's definition of domestic like product, and there is nothing on the record to

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