

482-1560 or (202) 482-6397, respectively, or Vera Libeau, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, at (202) 205-3176.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Initiation of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.218 (see *Procedures for Conducting Five-*

year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998)), we are initiating a sunset review of the following antidumping duty order:

DOC case No.	ITC case No.	Country	Product
A-570-836	A-718	China	Glycine.

Statute and Regulations

Pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act, an antidumping ("AD") or countervailing duty ("CVD") order will be revoked, or the suspended investigation will be terminated, unless revocation or termination would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of (1) dumping or a countervailable subsidy, and (2) material injury to the domestic industry.

The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in the *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations"). 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").

Filing Information

As a courtesy, we are making information related to sunset proceedings, including copies of the *Sunset Regulations* and *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department's schedule of sunset reviews, case history information (e.g., previous margins, duty absorption determinations, scope language, import volumes), and service lists, available to the public on the Department's sunset internet website at the following address: "http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/sunset/".

All submissions in the sunset review must be filed in accordance with the Department's regulations regarding format, translation, service, and certification of documents. These rules can be found at 19 CFR 351.303 (1999). Also, we suggest that parties check the Department's sunset website for any updates to the service list before filing any submissions. The Department will make additions to and/or deletions from the service list provided on the sunset website based on notifications from parties and participation in this review.

Specifically, the Department will delete from the service list all parties that do not submit a substantive response to the notice of initiation.

Because deadlines in a sunset review are, in many instances, very short, we urge interested parties to apply for access to proprietary information under administrative protective order ("APO") immediately following publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation of the sunset review. The Department's regulations on submission of proprietary information and eligibility to receive access to business proprietary information under APO can be found at 19 CFR 351.304-306 (see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Administrative Protective Order Procedures; Procedures for Imposing Sanctions for Violation of a Protective Order*, 63 FR 24391 (May 4, 1998)).

Information Required From Interested Parties

Domestic interested parties (defined in 19 CFR 351.102 (1999)) wishing to participate in the sunset review must respond not later than 15 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation by filing a notice of intent to participate. The required contents of the notice of intent to participate are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(ii). In accordance with the *Sunset Regulations*, if we do not receive a notice of intent to participate from at least one domestic interested party by the 15-day deadline, the Department will automatically revoke the order without further review.

If we receive an order-specific notice of intent to participate from a domestic interested party, the *Sunset Regulations* provide that *all parties* wishing to participate in the sunset review must file substantive responses not later than 30 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the notice of initiation. The required contents of a substantive response, on an order-specific basis, are set forth in the *Sunset Regulations* at 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3). Note that certain information requirements differ for foreign and domestic parties. Also, note that the

Department's information requirements are distinct from the International Trade Commission's information requirements. Please consult the *Sunset Regulations* for information regarding the Department's conduct of sunset reviews.¹ Please consult the Department's regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (1999) for definitions of terms and for other general information concerning antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings at the Department.

This notice of initiation is being published in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c).

Dated: January 28, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-2422 Filed 2-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-427-801, A-428-801, A-475-801, A-588-804, A-485-801, A-559-801, A-401-801, A-412-801]

Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; Notice of Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Rimlinger, AD/CVD

¹ A number of parties commented that these interim-final regulations provided insufficient time for rebuttals to substantive responses to a notice of initiation (*Sunset Regulations*, 19 CFR 351.218(d)(4)). As provided in 19 CFR 351.302(b) (1999), the Department will consider individual requests for extension of that five-day deadline based upon a showing of good cause.

Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4477.

The Applicable Statute

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.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received requests to conduct administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof (AFBs) from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. On June 30, 1999, the Department initiated these administrative reviews covering the period May 1, 1998, through April 30, 1999.

Due to the large number of respondents involved in these reviews and the Department's resource constraints, it is not practicable to complete the AFB reviews within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, the Department is extending the due date for the preliminary results to March 30, 2000. The Department intends to issue the final results of reviews 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results. This extension of the time limit is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: January 27, 2000.

Laurie Parkhill,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-2291 Filed 2-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-008]

Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Taiwan; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On December 13, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of review of the antidumping duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan (64 FR 69488). These amended final results cover the period August 1, 1987 through July 31, 1998, and four manufacturers, Yieh Hsing Enterprise Co. Ltd. (Yieh Hsing) and Kao Hsing Chang Iron & Steel Corporation (KHC), Yun Din Steel Co. Ltd. (Yun Din), and Yieh Loong Co. (Yieh Loong).

On December 15, 1999, pursuant to section 351.224 of the Department's regulations, Yieh Hsing filed an allegation of ministerial errors in the calculation of its final margin. On January 10, 2000, the petitioners filed an allegation of ministerial errors in the calculation of the final margin for KHC. The Department is publishing these amended final results to correct the ministerial errors identified by Yieh Hsing, and one of those alleged by petitioners.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas Killiam or Robert James, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-3019 or 482-0649, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations, codified at 19 C.F.R. Part 351 (1999).

MINISTERIAL ERRORS IN THE FINAL RESULTS OF REVIEW:

In its December 15, 1999 letter, Yieh Hsing alleges that the Department intended to compare U.S. sales to home market sales that occurred in the same month as, in the three months prior to, or in the two months following, the U.S. sale. Yieh Hsing further notes that where comparisons to sales of identical merchandise were not available, the Department intended to make comparisons to sales of the most physically similar home market merchandise.

Yieh Hsing contends that the final results computer program failed to successfully search for sales in months other than the month of the U.S. sale, and failed to search for home market sales of non-identical merchandise. We examined the computer program and agree with Yieh Hsing that these programming failures occurred and that they constitute clerical error within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.244(f). Therefore, for these amended final results, we have corrected the computer program, and have used all contemporaneous sales of identical or similar merchandise in our calculation of normal value.

Petitioners argue that in its calculation of the final margin for KHC, the Department incorrectly performed a foreign exchange conversion on an international freight expense, which had already been reported in U.S. dollars. We reviewed the data and agree that we intended to deduct the expense in question from the price without converting the currency, and for these amended final results, we have removed the incorrect conversion step.

Petitioners also allege that the Department's analysis program failed to effect comparisons of U.S. sales to home market sales with a "CNS" grade designation. We disagree that this model-matching methodology is a ministerial error. The Department intended to exclude CNS grades and to compare the U.S. merchandise to other, more similar home market models. *See* model match program at lines 911-918 (included in petitioners' January 10, 2000 allegation at Exhibit 6). Accordingly, we have not changed the product comparison methodology for these final results.

Non-Responding Companies

As stated in prior notices concerning this review, Yun Din and Yieh Loong did not respond to our requests for information and were assigned, as facts available, the highest rate in any segment of this proceeding; that rate changed as a result of these amended final results.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of the correction of the ministerial errors discussed above, the margins are: