

investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 66.92 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly-Phenylene Terephthalamide From The Netherlands*, 59 FR 32678 (June 24, 1994).

These cash 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 19 CFR 351.402 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.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 29, 2000.

**Troy H. Cribb,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-17106 Filed 7-5-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-583-816]

#### **Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Not Revoke in Part**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and intent not to revoke in part.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from respondent Ta Chen Stainless Pipe Co., Ltd. ("Ta Chen"), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain

stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. This review covers one manufacturer and exporter of the subject merchandise. The period of review ("POR") is June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999. We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value ("NV"). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on entries of Ta Chen's merchandise during the period of review, in accordance with the Department's regulations (19 CFR 351.106 and 351.212(b)). The preliminary results are listed in the section titled "Preliminary Results of Review," *infra*.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 6, 2000.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Doreen Chen, Sally Gannon, or Robert Bolling, Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0408, (202) 482-0162 and (202) 482-3434, respectively.

#### **Applicable Statute**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are 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's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

#### **Background**

On June 16, 1993, the Department published in the Federal Register (58 FR 33250) the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan. On June 9, 1999, we published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 30962) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Taiwan covering the period June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999. On June 30, 1999, petitioners, Markovitz Enterprises, Inc. (Flowline Division), Alloy Piping Products Inc., Gerlin, Inc., and Taylor Forge, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of Ta Chen for the period of June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999. On June 30, 1999, Ta Chen also requested that we conduct an administrative review for the aforementioned period and requested revocation of the Department's antidumping duty order

on pipe fittings from Taiwan. On July 29, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review for the period of June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999 (64 FR 41075).

On July 29, 2000, the Department issued to Ta Chen its antidumping questionnaire. On September 21, 1999, Ta Chen reported that it made sales of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review ("POR") in its response to Section A of the Department's questionnaire. On October 13, 1999, Ta Chen submitted its response to Sections B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire. On January 31, 2000, the Department issued to Ta Chen the supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, C and D of the Department's questionnaire. On March 10, 2000 and April 4, 2000, Ta Chen submitted its supplemental responses to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire. On April 24, 2000, the Department issued to Ta Chen its second supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, C and D. On May 16 and 18, 2000, Ta Chen submitted its second supplemental responses to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire. On June 2, 2000, the Department issued to Ta Chen its third supplemental questionnaire to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire. On June 7, 2000, Ta Chen submitted its third supplemental response to Sections A, B, C, and D of the Department's questionnaire.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 245 days. On March 6, 2000, the Department extended the time limits for these preliminary results to June 28, 2000 in accordance with the Act. *See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan*, 65 FR 11766 (March 6, 2000).

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

#### **Scope of the Review**

The products subject to this investigation are certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings, whether finished or unfinished, under 14 inches inside diameter. Certain welded stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("pipe fittings") are used to connect pipe sections in piping systems where conditions

require welded connections. The subject merchandise is used where one or more of the following conditions is a factor in designing the piping system: (1) Corrosion of the piping system will occur if material other than stainless steel is used; (2) contamination of the material in the system by the system itself must be prevented; (3) high temperatures are present; (4) extreme low temperatures are present; and (5) high pressures are contained within the system.

Pipe fittings come in a variety of shapes, with the following five shapes the most basic: "elbows", "tees", "reducers", "stub ends", and "caps." The edges of finished pipe fittings are beveled. Threaded, grooved, and bolted fittings are excluded from this review. The pipe fittings subject to this review are classifiable under subheading 7307.23.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS").

Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive. Pipe fittings manufactured to American Society of Testing and Materials specification A774 are included in the scope of this order.

#### Period of Review

The POR for this administrative review is June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999.

#### Verification

Due to administrative constraints, verification prior to the issuance of this notice of preliminary results was not conducted. The Department's regulations state, at section 351.307(b)(iii), that the Department will verify factual information upon which it relies in the final results of a revocation under section 751(d) of the Act, prior to issuing final results in an administrative review. Accordingly, the Department will verify the information to be used in the final results, after these preliminary results.

#### Product Comparison

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all pipe fittings produced by Ta Chen, covered by the description in the "Scope of Review" section of this notice, supra, and sold in the home market during the POR to be foreign like products for the purpose of determining appropriate product comparisons to pipe fittings sold in the United States. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by Ta Chen as

follows (listed in order of preference): specification, seam, grade, size and schedule.

Although section 771(16) of the Act states that foreign like products are merchandise produced in the same country by the same person, for purposes of these Preliminary Results, we have also considered merchandise purchased from other Taiwanese manufacturers and re-sold by Ta Chen that matched the aforementioned physical characteristics to be foreign like products because we did not have sufficient information to match subject merchandise to foreign like products on a producer-specific basis. However, we intend to seek further information on this issue at verification and will reconsider the issue for the Final Results based on any additional information obtained at verification. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in the Department's March 1, 2000 instructions, or to constructed value ("CV"), as appropriate.

#### Date of Sale

The Department's regulations state that the Department will normally use the date of invoice, as recorded in the exporter's or producer's records kept in the ordinary course of business, as the date of sale. See 19 CFR 351.401(i). If Commerce can establish "a different date [that] better reflects the date on which the exporter or producer establishes the material terms of sale," Commerce may choose a different date. *Id.*

In the present review, Ta Chen claimed that invoice date should be used as the date of sale in both the home market and U.S. market. Ta Chen stated that "for both U.S. and Taiwan sales, there was only one type of sales agreement—i.e., through order confirmation." See Ta Chen's Supplemental Response at 4 (March 10, 2000). Ta Chen reported that there is no lag time between invoice and shipment. See Ta Chen's Second Supplemental Questionnaire Response, at 4 (May 16, 2000). Moreover, Ta Chen did not indicate any industry practice which would warrant the use of a date other than invoice date in determining date of sale.

Accordingly, because we have no information demonstrating that another date is more appropriate, we preliminarily based date of sale on invoice date recorded in the ordinary course of business by the involved

sellers and resellers of the subject merchandise in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(i). However, we intend to fully verify information concerning Ta Chen's claims that invoice date is the appropriate date of sale. Based on the outcome of our verification, we will determine whether it is appropriate to continue to use the date of invoice as the date of sale.

#### Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise by Ta Chen to the United States were made at below NV, we compared, where appropriate, the CEP to the NV, as described below. Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the CEPs of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weighted-average NV of the foreign like product where there were sales at prices above the cost of production ("COP"), as discussed in the Cost of Production Analysis section, below.

#### Export Price/ Constructed Export Price

Ta Chen reported both EP and CEP sales of subject merchandise for the POR. We analyzed the record evidence on Ta Chen's sales made to the United States and preliminarily determined that all sales to the United States should be classified as CEP.

Section 772(a) of the Act defines export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for the purchaser for exportation to the United States."

\* \* \* Section 772(b) of the Act defines constructed export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter." \* \* \* Thus, a CEP sale is distinct from an EP sale in that it is a sale or agreement to sell to an unaffiliated customer that takes place in the United States and is executed by or for the producer/exporter or by a seller affiliated with the producer/exporter, whereas a sale is classified as an EP sale where a producer or exporter sells directly to unaffiliated purchasers outside the United States.

In the instant case, all of the sales at issue were "back-to-back" sales; that is, Ta Chen sold pipe fittings to Ta Chen's U.S. affiliate, TCI, and then TCI sold the

pipe fittings to the unaffiliated U.S. customers at a marked-up price to account for TCI's commission and selling expenses. In addition, the record evidence demonstrates that for sales reported by Ta Chen as EP sales, the sale to the first unaffiliated customer was made between TCI and the unaffiliated customer in the United States. TCI takes title to subject merchandise, invoices the U.S. customer, and receives payment from the U.S. customer. In addition, TCI incurs seller's risk, makes agreements with commission agents, relays orders and price requests from the U.S. customer to Ta Chen, and pays for containerization expenses, U.S. customs broker charges, U.S. antidumping duties and international freight. See Second Supplemental Questionnaire Response (May 16, 2000) at 5. Ta Chen also stated that on occasion the U.S. customer will initiate the sale with TCI or TCI will initiate the sale with the customer. *Id.*

Based on these facts, we have determined that these sales originally reported as EP by Ta Chen meet the standard for CEP since the first sale to an unaffiliated customer occurred in the United States and was between TCI and the U.S. purchaser. Therefore, we reclassified the EP sales originally reported by Ta Chen as CEP sales.

Having determined such sales are CEP, we calculated the price of Ta Chen's United States sales based on CEP in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act. We calculated CEP based on FOB or delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. Where appropriate, we deducted discounts. Also where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(d)(1), the Department deducted commissions, direct selling expenses and indirect selling expenses, including inventory carrying costs, which related to commercial activity in the United States. We also made deductions for movement expenses, which include foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, ocean freight, containerization expense, harbor construction tax, marine insurance, U.S. inland freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, and U.S. Customs duties. Finally, pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we made an adjustment for CEP profit. In accordance with Department practice, we recalculated credit expenses for CEP sales by basing credit on Ta Chen's U.S. dollar-denominated short-term borrowing rate, rather than on Ta Chen's home market currency-denominated short-term borrowing rate. See Import Administration Policy Bulletin, Imputed Credit Expenses and Interest rates (February 23, 1998). See Analysis Memo at page 9.

## Normal Value

After testing home market viability, as discussed below, we calculated normal value ("NV") as noted in the "Price-to-CV Comparisons" and "Price-to-Price Comparisons" sections of this notice.

### 1. Home Market Viability

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is greater than or equal to five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared Ta Chen's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Because Ta Chen's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable. We therefore based NV on home market sales.

### 2. Cost of Production Analysis

Because we disregarded sales below the cost of production in our last administrative review, the most-recently completed segment of this proceeding,<sup>1</sup> we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales by Ta Chen in its home market were made at prices below the COP, pursuant to sections 773(b)(1) and 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we conducted a COP analysis of home market sales by Ta Chen.

#### A. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated a weighted-average COP based on the sum of Ta Chen's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for general and administrative expenses ("G&A"), interest expenses, and packing costs. We relied on the COP data submitted by Ta Chen in its original and supplemental cost questionnaire responses. For these preliminary results, we did not make any adjustments to Ta Chen's submitted costs.

#### B. Test of Home Market Prices

We compared the weighted-average COP for Ta Chen to home market sales

of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made (1) within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and (2) at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade, in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to home market prices, less any movement charges, discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

#### C. Results of the COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of Ta Chen's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of Ta Chen's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined that such sales have been made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act. In such cases, because we use POR average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, we disregarded the below-cost sales. Where all sales of a specific product were at prices below the COP, we disregarded all sales of that product.

#### D. Calculation of Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Ta Chen's cost of materials, fabrication, G&A (including interest expenses), U.S. packing costs, direct and indirect selling expenses, and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by Ta Chen in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the actual weighted-average home market direct and indirect selling expenses.

#### Price-to-Price Comparisons

For those product comparisons for which there were sales at prices above the cost of production ("COP"), we

<sup>1</sup> See Stainless Steel Butt Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63 FR 67855 (December 9, 1998). For further discussion, see Stainless Steel Butt Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63 FR 30710, 30712 (June 5, 1998).

based NV on prices to home market customers. We calculated NV based on prices to unaffiliated home market customers. Where appropriate, we deducted early payment discounts, credit expenses, and inland freight. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for home market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in CEP comparisons. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Additionally, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs. In accordance with the Department's practice, where there were no usable contemporaneous matches to a U.S. sale observation, we based NV on CV.

#### Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade ("LOT") as the CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market, or when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, 62 FR 61731, 61732 (November 19, 1997).

In reviewing the selling functions reported by the respondent, we examined all types of selling functions and activities reported in respondent's questionnaire response on LOT. In analyzing whether separate LOTs

existed in this review, we found that no single selling function was sufficient to warrant a separate LOT in the home market. See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties, Final Rule, 62 FR 27296, 27371 (May 19, 1997).

Ta Chen reported one LOT in the home market based on two channels of distribution: trading companies and end-users. We examined the reported selling functions and found that Ta Chen provides substantially the same selling functions to its home market customers regardless of channel of distribution. These selling functions include research and development and technical assistance, packing, after-sale services, and freight and delivery arrangement. We therefore preliminarily conclude that the selling functions between the reported channels of distribution are sufficiently similar to consider them as one LOT in the comparison market.

Because Ta Chen reported that all of its U.S. sales are made through a single customer category (*i.e.*, TCI acting as a distributor), Ta Chen is claiming that there is only one LOT in the U.S. market. We examined the selling functions for CEP sales, and we preliminarily agree with Ta Chen that its U.S. sales constitute a single LOT.

When we compared the LOT of the CEP to Ta Chen's home market LOT, we found that Ta Chen provided no strategic or economic planning, market research, business system development assistance, personnel-training, engineering, advertising, procurement services, inventory maintenance, or post-sale warehousing at the CEP or home market LOT. Ta Chen reported that it provided moderate-to-low technical assistance at its home market LOT, while providing none at its CEP level. Additionally, Ta Chen reported that it provided low after-sales services at its home market LOT, while providing none at its CEP level. However, our analysis of the selling functions performed by Ta Chen in both markets leads us to conclude that any differences in selling activities are not significant. Accordingly, we preliminarily find that all sales in the home market and the U.S. market were made at the same LOT. Therefore, we have not made a LOT adjustment because all price comparisons are at the same LOT and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act is not appropriate. Additionally, because we found that the LOT in the home market matched the LOT of the CEP transactions, we did not provide a CEP offset by adjusting normal value under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

#### Revocation

Under section 351.222(b) of the Department's regulations, the Department may partially revoke an order with respect to a company if that producer or exporter has sold the merchandise at not less than normal value for a period of at least three consecutive years. On June 30, 1999, Ta Chen, in its capacity as a Taiwanese producer and exporter of subject merchandise, requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from Taiwan with respect to Ta Chen. Ta Chen stated that it sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value for a period of at least three consecutive years, including the current period under administrative review, and that it sold the subject merchandise in commercially significant quantities to the United States during each of these three years. Ta Chen also stated that it would not sell the subject merchandise at less than normal value to the United States in the future and agreed to reinstatement of the order against Ta Chen, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that Ta Chen sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value, subsequent to the revocation.

On May 26, 2000, the Department requested that Ta Chen provide volume and value data on its exports and sales of subject merchandise for the three consecutive years. Ta Chen provided this data in a June 5, 2000 submission, which supported Ta Chen's statement that it sold subject merchandise in commercially significant quantities to the United States during these three years.

The three review periods on which Ta Chen is basing its request for revocation consist of: (1) the period for 6/1/96 through 5/31/97, for which the Department found a *de minimis* margin of 0.34 percent; (2) the period for 6/1/97 through 5/31/98, for which no administrative review was conducted; and (3) the period for 6/1/98 through 5/31/99, for which the Department is currently conducting an administrative review.

The Department is considering Ta Chen's request for revocation, and shall review the relevant information. Because we did not find a *de minimis* margin for these preliminary results, we preliminarily conclude that the criteria for revocation have not been satisfied, and we intend not to revoke the order as to Ta Chen, pending verification after these preliminary results.

### Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as published by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in effect on the date of sale of subject merchandise in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a "fluctuation." In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined, as a general matter, that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. *See, e.g.,* Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 61 FR 8915, 8918 (March 6, 1996) and Policy Bulletin 96-1: Currency Conversions, 61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determined a fluctuation existed, we substituted the benchmark for the daily rate.

### Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period June 1, 1998, through May 31, 1999:

#### CERTAIN STAINLESS STEEL BUTT-WELD PIPE FITTINGS FROM TAIWAN

Producer/manufacturer/ exporter	Weighted- average margin (percent)
Ta Chen .....	8.03

The Department will disclose to any party to the proceeding, within five days of publication of this notice, the calculations performed (19 CFR 351.224(b)). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument (1) A statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument and (3) a table of authorities. Further, we would

appreciate it if parties submitting written comments would provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days after the publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of review, the Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the results and for future deposits of estimated duties. For duty assessment purposes, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by dividing the total dumping margins calculated for the U.S. sales to the importer by the total entered value of these sales. This rate will be used for the assessment of antidumping duties on all entries of the subject merchandise by that importer during the POR.

If found that revocation is warranted for Ta Chen, it will apply to all unliquidated entries of subject merchandise produced by Ta Chen, exported to the United States and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 1, 1999, the first day after the period under review.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion 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 of the final results of this administrative review, as provided in section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Ta Chen, the only reviewed company, will be that established in the final results of this review; (2) For previously reviewed or investigated companies not covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the "all other" rate

established in the LTFV investigation, which was 51.01 percent.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 28, 2000.

**Troy H. Cribb,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-17105 Filed 7-5-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### National Institute of Standards and Technology

#### Advanced Technology Program (ATP) Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Request for nominations of members to serve on the Advance Technology Program Advisory Committee.

**SUMMARY:** NIST invites and requests nominations of individuals for appointment to the Advanced Technology Program Advisory Committee. NIST will consider nominations received in response to this notice for appointment to the Committee, in addition to nominations already received.

**DATES:** Please submit nominations on or before July 21, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Please submit nominations to Dr. Brian C. Belanger, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 1004, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1004. Nominations may also be submitted via FAX to 301-948-1224.

Additional information regarding the Committee, including its charter and current membership list may be found on its electronic home page at: [http://www.atp.nist.gov/atp/adv\\_com/ac\\_menu.htm](http://www.atp.nist.gov/atp/adv_com/ac_menu.htm).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Brian C. Belanger, National Institute of