domestic interested parties and inadequate responses from respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting expedited sunset reviews to determine whether revocation of the orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy. As a result of this extension, the Department intends to issue its final results not later than August 30, 1999.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott E. Smith, Martha V. Douthit or Melissa G. Skinner, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397, (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560 respectively.

Extension of Final Results

The Department has determined that the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from the People's Republic of China, porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Taiwan, top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Korea (South), top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Taiwan, standard carnations from Chile, fresh cut flowers from Mexico, fresh cut flowers from Ecuador, brass sheet and strip from Brazil, brass sheet and strip from Korea (South), brass sheet and strip from France, brass sheet and strip from Germany, brass sheet and strip from Italy, brass sheet and strip from Sweden, and brass sheet and strip from Japan, and the countervailing duty orders on top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Korea (South), top-of-the-stove stainless steel cooking ware from Taiwan, standard carnations from Chile, brass sheet and strip from Brazil, brass sheet and strip from France, and pompon chrysanthemums from Peru are extraordinarily complicated. In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''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). See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act. The Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results of these reviews until not later than August 30, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.

Dated: June 1, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–14339 Filed 6–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–583–810]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts from Taiwan; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Extension of time limit for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending by 120 days the time limit for the preliminary results of the seventh antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping order on chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan, since it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)). This review covers 17 producers and exporters of chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan and the period of review is September 1, 1997 through August 31, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 7, 1999.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's regulations are to the current regulations as codified at 19 CFR 351 (1998).

Background

On October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58009), the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan, covering the period September 1, 1997 through August 31, 1998. In our notice of initiation, we stated our intention to issue the final results of these reviews no later than September 30, 1999. Due to the complexity and novelty of certain issues in this case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the statutory time limit mandated by the Act.

Postponement of Preliminary Results of Review

Section 751 (a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and § 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations allows the Department to extend this time period to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively. Due to the 120 day extension, the Department, therefore, is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the aforementioned review from June 2, 1999 to September 30, 1999. The deadline for issuing the final results of this review will be not later than 120 days from the publication of the preliminary results.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: May 25, 1999.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Group II, AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 99–14233 Filed 6–4–99; 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: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Recission of Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the petitioners, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain circular welded steel pipes and tubes

from Taiwan. The review covers four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period May 1, 1997 through April 30, 1998. We preliminarily determine that Yun Din Steel Co. Ltd., Yieh Loong Co., Ltd., Kao Hsing Chang Iron & Steel Corporation , and Yieh Hsing Enterprise Co. Ltd. sold subject merchandise below normal value during the period of review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martin Odenyo or Thomas Killiam, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–5254/3019.

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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 29, 1998, the petitioners, Allied Tube & Conduit Corp., Wheatland Tube Company, Sawhill Tubular Division of Armco Inc., and Laclede Steel Co., filed a request for review of seven Taiwanese companies: Yieh Hsing Enterprise Co., Ltd. (Yieh Hsing), Kao Hsing Chang Iron & Steel Corporation (KHC), Yun Din Steel Co. Ltd. (Yun Din), Yieh Loong Co., Ltd. (Yieh Loong), Far East Machinery Co., Ltd. (FEMCO), Sheng Yu Steel Co., Ltd. (Sheng Yu, formerly An Mau Steel Co., Ltd.), and Tai Feng Industries. We initiated the review on June 29, 1998 (63 FR 35188).

In response to our requests for information, FEMCO and Sheng Yu reported that they had no sales or shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). On inquiry by the Department, Customs did not report any shipments by either company during the POR. Accordingly, we are rescinding the review with respect to FEMCO and Sheng Yu. Tai Feng Industries ceased operations in November 1983. *See* Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Taiwan; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Duty Order (51 FR 234, December 5, 1986). Accordingly, we are rescinding the review with respect to Tai Feng. Yun Din and Yieh Loong did not respond to our requests for information and are discussed below in ''Facts Available.''

On September 23, 1998, the petitioners alleged that Yieh Hsing and KHC made home market sales below the cost of production (COP) during the POR. The Department found that the petitioners' allegation constituted a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that KHC and Yieh Hsing made sales in the home market below COP. Accordingly, in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act, on October 6, 1998, the Department initiated an investigation of sales below cost.

Under 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 365 days. On December 30, 1998, the Department extended the time limit for the preliminary results to May 28, 1999. *See* Extension of Time Limits for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (64 FR 860, January 6, 1999).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes. The Department defines such merchandise as welded carbon steel pipes and tubes of circular cross section, with walls not thinner than 0.065 inch and 0.375 inch or more but not over 4½ inches in outside diameter. These products are commonly referred to in the industry as ''standard pipe'' and are produced to various American Society for Testing Materials specifications, most notably A–53, A–120, or A–135. Standard pipe is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.30.5040, and 7306.30.5055. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

The review covers the period May 1, 1997 through April 30, 1998. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Facts Available

In accordance with section 776(a)(2)(A) of the Act, we determine that the use of facts available is the appropriate basis for dumping margins for Yun Din and Yieh Loong. The Department issued questionnaires to Yun Din and Yieh Loong on June 10, 1998. Our questionnaires established the Section A deadline as July 28, 1998, and the Sections B through E deadline as August 21, 1998. On September 16, 1998, after receiving no response from Yun Din and Yieh Loong, we forwarded an additional letter to both companies, indicating that if we did not receive a complete response to our questionnaire by October 1, 1998, we would proceed with appraisements based upon facts available. To date, we have not received a response from Yieh Loong. On March 2, 1999, we received a letter from Yu Din, in which the company expressed its intent to submit a response to our questionnaire. On March 3, 1999, we responded to the letter by informing Yu Din that the Department's administrative reviews are controlled by statutory deadlines which prevent the Department from accepting a response to our questionnaire at such an extreme date past our established deadlines.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used with respect to a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information. *See* Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 316, 103rd Cong., 2d Sess. 870 (SAA). The failure of Yun Din and Yieh Loong to reply to the Department's questionnaire in a timely manner demonstrates that they failed to act to the best of their ability in this review and, therefore, an adverse inference is warranted.

As adverse facts available for Yun Din and Yieh Loong, we have used the highest rate for any respondent in any segment of this proceeding. This is an appropriate adverse rate because, but for the application of the highest rate in this case, uncooperative respondents would have no incentive to cooperate in future proceedings. Thus, we are applying the rate of 14.08 percent, the highest rate for any respondent in this review.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared export price (EP) to the normal value (NV), as described in the ''Export Price'' and ''Normal Value''

sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Export Price

The Department treated Yieh Hsing's and KHC's sales to the United States as EP sales, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation and the constructed export price methodology was not warranted by the facts of the record. We based EP on the delivered, packed prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage charges, and ocean freight in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes in the home market (HM) to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of home market sales of subject merchandise to the volume of subject merchandise sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Yieh Hsing's and KHC's respective aggregate volumes of HM sales of the foreign like product were greater than five percent of their respective aggregate volumes of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on HM sales. In accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we adjusted NV, where appropriate, by deducting home market packing expenses and adding U.S. packing expenses. We also made deductions from NV for HM inland freight, warranty expenses, early payment discounts, and other discounts. Finally, we made an adjustment to NV for differences in credit expenses, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

Sales Below Cost Investigation

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Because KHC failed to provide any costs for certain models, as facts available we used the highest average cost for the same category of product.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. We found that, for certain models, 20 percent or more of the home market sales were sold at below-cost prices. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made (1) in substantial quantities within an extended period of time and (2) at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act) (*i.e.*, the sales were made at prices below the weighted-average per unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis of determining NV if such sales existed, in accordance with section 773(b)(1).

Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, and general expenses. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by KHC or Yieh Hsing in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the home market. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average HM selling expenses. Pursuant to section 773(e)(3) of the Act, we included U.S. packing. Because KHC failed to provide any constructed value data for certain models, as facts available we used the highest average cost for the same category of product.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) 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 EP or CEP transactions. The NV LOT is that of the starting price sale in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sale from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting price sale, which is usually from the exporter to the importer. 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 EP or CEP sales, 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 transactions, we make a 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 differences in the 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, e.g.*, Certain Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).)

In implementing these principles in this review, we asked the respondents to identify the specific differences and similarities in selling functions and/or support services between all phases of marketing in the home market and the United States.

Yieh Hsing provided information with respect to its selling activities associated with home market sales. Yieh Hsing offers each of its three classes of customers (distributors, retailers, and end-users) the same degree of nominal sales support, such as the opportunity to either purchase merchandise out of inventory or have it made to order. Yieh Hsing did not conduct advertising or inventory maintenance in the home market; however, it provided general technical advice and sale-specific warranty services to all its home market customers. We determine that there is no difference in selling functions between Yieh Hsing's three classes of HM customers. We therefore determine that Yieh Hsing sells to one level of trade in the home market.

Yieh Hsing similarly provided information with respect to the selling functions associated with its U.S. sales. Yieh Hsing's customers in the U.S. market consisted only of distributors, to whom it provided freight and delivery arrangements. Yieh Hsing provided no other services, such as inventory maintenance, technical advice, warranty services, or advertising, to its U.S. customers.

For home market sales, but not U.S. sales, Yieh Hsing provided general technical advice and sale-specific warranty services. Otherwise, the levels of customer assistance and sales support which Yieh Hsing provided its home

market and U.S. customers were not significantly different, and Yieh Hsing did not claim a LOT adjustment. Based upon the foregoing, we determine that Yieh Hsing sold at the same LOT in the U.S. market as it did in the home market, and consequently no LOT adjustment is warranted.

KHC provided information with respect to the selling activities associated with its home market sales. We determine that there is no significant difference in selling functions between KHC's two classes of HM customers (distributor and end-users). KHC generally provided distributors with more services (such as sales allowance discounts, quantity and early payment discounts, technical service and warranty expenses); however the degree to which it provided such services for distributors but not for end-users was not sufficiently documented for us to distinguish different levels of trade.

KHC similarly provided information with respect to selling functions associated with its U.S. sales. KHC had only one customer (a trading company) in the U.S. market during the POR, and its selling functions for that customer did not vary. Therefore, we determine that KHC sold at one level of trade in the U.S. market.

The levels of customer assistance and sales support provided by KHC for its home market and U.S. sales were not significantly different. KHC did not claim a LOT adjustment for U.S. sales, and the LOT information provided by KHC indicates that there was one LOT in the U.S. and home markets.

Sales Comparisons

To determine whether sales of certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes in the United States were made at less than NV, we compared EP to the NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777(A) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the information provided by Yieh Hsing and KHC in response to our antidumping questionnaire.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period May 1, 1997 through April 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Yieh Hsing	5/1/97—4/30/98	6.42
KHC	5/1/97—4/30/98	14.08
Yun Din	5/1/97—4/30/98	14.08
Yieh Loong	5/1/97—4/30/98	14.08

Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 30 days after publication of this notice. Interested parties may also submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue and a brief summary of the argument. All memoranda to which we refer in this notice can be found in the public reading room, located in the Central Records Unit, room B–009 of the main Department of Commerce building. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs.

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including a discussion of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212 (b), we have calculated an importer/customer-specific assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the quantity of those same sales. This Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established in the final results of this administrative review, except that no cash deposit will be required if the rate is *de minimis, i.e.,* less than 0.50 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, 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 for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 9.7%, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.401(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this period of review. 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 issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213.

Dated: May 28, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–14337 Filed 6–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P