SUMMARY: On May 10, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department''), pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act from 1930, as amended (''the Act''), determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from the People's Republic of China (''China'') would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping (64 FR 25011 (May 10, 1999)). On June 3, 1999, the International Trade Commission (''the Commission''), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (64 FR 29885 (June 3, 1999)). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department is publishing notice of the continuation of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from China.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 10, 1999.

Background

On December 2, 1998, the Department initiated, and the Commission instituted, a sunset review (64 FR 364 and 64 FR 374, respectively) of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from China pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of this review, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order to be revoked (*see Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Natural Bristle Paint Brushes from China*, 64 FR 25011 (May 10, 1999)).

On June 3, 1999, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (*see* Natural Bristle Paint Brushes from China, 64 FR 29885 (June 3, 1999) and USITC Pub. 3199, Inv. No. 731–TA–244 (Review) (June 1999)).

Scope

The merchandise covered by this antidumping duty order is shipments of natural bristle paint brushes and brush heads from the China. Excluded from the order are paint brushes with a blend of 40 percent natural bristles and 60 percent synthetic filaments. This merchandise is currently classifiable under item 9603.40.40.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of this antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty order on natural bristle paint brushes from China. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping duty deposits at the rate in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. Pursuant to section 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act, any subsequent five-year review of this order will be initiated not later than the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation of this order.

Normally, the effective date of continuation of a finding, order, or suspension agreement will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Notice of Continuation. As provided in 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department normally will issue its determination to continue a finding, order, or suspended investigation not later than seven days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission's determination concluding the sunset review and immediately thereafter will publish its notice of continuation in the **Federal Register**. In the instant case, however, the Department's publication of the Notice of Continuation was delayed. The Department has explicitly indicated that the effective date of continuation of this order is June 10, 1999, seven days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission's determination. As a result, pursuant to sections 751(c)(2) and 751(c)(6)(A) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of this order not later than May 2004.

Dated: August 2, 1999.

Joseph Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–20335 Filed 8–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–847]

Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China in response to requests by the petitioner, FMC Corporation, and by two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review is December 27, 1996, through June 30, 1998.

With respect to Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import & Export Trade Corporation, this review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal request for administrative review by the petitioner, the interested party that requested review of Guangdong Petroleum.

We have preliminarily found that sales of subject merchandise by Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation and Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the export price and the normal value.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sunkyu Kim or James Nunno, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2613 or (202) 482–0783, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS: 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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (April 1998).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 22, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an amended antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China (PRC). *See* 62 FR 39212. On July 31, 1998, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), the petitioner requested an administrative review of Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation (Ai Jian), Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation (Wuxi), and Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import & Export Trade Corporation (Guangdong Petroleum). We also received requests for a review from Ai Jian and Wuxi on July 31, 1998. We published a notice of initiation of this review on August 27, 1998 (63 FR 45796).

On September 9, 1998, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to Ai Jian and Wuxi. On September 10, 1998, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to Guangdong Petroleum. The Department received responses from the three exporters in November 1998. In addition, the Department received responses from Shanghai Ai Jian Reagent Works (AJ Works) (producer for Ai Jian and Wuxi) and Guangzhou Zhujian Electrochemical Factory (producer for Guangdong Petroleum). On November 23, 1998, the petitioner withdrew its request for an administrative review with respect to Guangdong Petroleum. *See Partial Rescission of Administrative Review* section of the notice below.

We issued supplemental questionnaires to Ai Jian, Wuxi, and AJ Works in December 1998. Responses to these questionnaires were received in February 1999.

In January 1999, the two exporters and the petitioner submitted publicly available information and comments for consideration in valuing the factors of production. In February 1999, the parties submitted rebuttal comments.

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for issuing a preliminary determination in an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary review within the statutory time limit of 245 days. On March 4, 1999, the Department published a notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in this case to August 2, 1999. *See Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Postponement of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 64 FR 10444 (March 4, 1999).

In May 1999, we verified the respondents' questionnaire responses.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The chemical formula for these persulfates are, respectively, (NH sub4) sub2 S sub2 O sub8, K sub2 S sub2 O sub8, and Na sub2 S sub2 O sub8. Ammonium and potassium persulfates are currently classified under subheading 2833.40.60 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Sodium persulfate is classified under HTSUS subheading 2833.40.20. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by the respondents. We used standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the respondents' facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Based on verification, we made certain original documentation containing relevant information. Based on verification, we made certain changes to the data in the sales and factors of production listings submitted by Ai Jian and AJ Works, respectively, and used the revised data to calculate the preliminary margins. *See* the U.S. Price and Factors of Production Adjustments for the Preliminary Results Memorandum from the Team to the File, dated August 2, 1999. Our verification results are outlined in the verification reports placed on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU) in room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building.

Partial Rescission of Administrative Review

On November 23, 1998, the petitioner withdrew its request for an administrative review with respect to Guangdong Petroleum. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department may allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review. The petitioner's request for withdrawal was timely and there were no requests for review from other interested parties. Therefore, the Department is rescinding this review with respect to Guangdong Petroleum.

Separate Rates

It is the Department's policy to assign all exporters of the merchandise subject to review in non-market-economy (NME) countries a single rate, unless an exporter can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports. To establish whether an exporter is sufficiently independent of government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes the exporter in light of the criteria established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991((*Sparklers*), as amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. Evidence relevant to a *de facto* absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four factors, whether the respondent: (1) sets its own export prices independent from the government and other exporters; (2) can retain the proceeds from its export sales; (3) has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts; and (4) has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. *See Silicon Carbide,* 59 FR at 22587; *see also Sparklers,* 56 FR at 20589.

With respect to Ai Jian and Wuxi, for purposes of our final determination for the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation covering the period January through June 1996, the Department determined that there was *de jure* and *de facto* absence of government control of each company's export activities and determined that each company warranted a company-specific dumping margin. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Persulfates from the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 27222 (May 19, 1997) (*Persulfates Final Determination*). For this administrative review, Ai Jian and Wuxi have

responded to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates. We have found that the evidence on the record is identical with the evidence on the record of the LTFV investigation of persulfates from the PRC (*see Persulfates Final Determination,* 62 FR at 27222), and continues to demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to their exports, in accordance with the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide.* In addition, during verification, we examined Ai Jian and Wuxi's business and financial activities, and found that both exporters operate independently with respect to exports. *See Sales Verification Report* for both Ai Jian and Wuxi, dated June 24, 1999.

Export Price

For both AJ and Wuxi, we calculated EP in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and constructed export price (CEP) methodology was not otherwise warranted, based on the facts of record. We calculated EP based on packed, CIF U.S. port, or FOB PRC port, prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States, as appropriate. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for ocean freight services which were provided by market economy suppliers. We also deducted from the starting price, where appropriate, an amount for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, and marine insurance. As these movement services were provided by NME suppliers, we valued them using Indian rates. *See* ''Normal Value'' section for further discussion.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine the normal value (NV) using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) the merchandise is exported from an NME county; and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

The Department has treated the PRC as an NME country in all previous antidumping cases. Furthermore, available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home market prices, third country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Therefore, we treated the PRC as an NME country for purposes of this review and calculated NV by valuing the factors of production in a comparable market economy country which is a significant producer of comparable merchandise.

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.408 direct us to select a surrogate country that is economically comparable to the PRC. On the basis of per capita gross domestic product (GDP), the growth rate in per capita GDP, and the national distribution of labor, we find that India is a comparable economy to the PRC. *See* Memorandum from Director, Office of Policy, to Office Director, AD/CVD Group I, Office 2, dated December 21, 1998.

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act also requires that, to the extent possible, the Department use a surrogate country that is a significant producer of merchandise comparable to persulfates. For purposes of the LTFV investigation, we found that India was a significant producer of comparable merchandise. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Persulfates from the People's Republic of China,* 61 FR 68232, 68233 (December 27, 1996) (*Persulfates Preliminary Determination*). For purposes of this administrative review, we find that India is a producer of persulfates based on information submitted by the respondents in their January 25, 1999, submission. Therefore, we have continued to use India as the surrogate country and have used publicly available information relating to India, unless otherwise noted, to value the various factors of production.

For purposes of calculating NV, we valued PRC factors of production, in accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act. Factors of production include, but are not limited to: (1) Hours of labor required; (2) quantities of raw materials employed; (3) amounts of energy and other utilities consumed; and (4) representative capital cost, including depreciation. In examining surrogate values, we selected, where possible, the publicly available value which was: (1) an average non-export value; (2) representative of a range of prices within the POR or most contemporaneous with the POR; (3) product-specific; and (4) tax-exclusive. For a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in calculating various surrogate values, *see* the Preliminary Results Factors Valuation Memorandum from the Team to the File, dated August 2, 1999 (*Factors Memorandum*). In accordance with this methodology, we valued the factors of production as follows:

To value ammonium sulfate, caustic soda, and sulfuric acid, we used public information from POR issues of the Indian publication *Chemical Weekly,* as provided by the respondents in their January 25, 1999, submission. For caustic soda and sulphuric acid, because price quotes reported in the *Chemical Weekly* are for chemicals with a 100 percent concentration level, we made chemical purity adjustments according to the particular concentration levels of caustic soda and sulphuric acid used by respondents. For potassium sulfate and anhydrous ammonia, we relied on import prices contained in the March and December 1997 issues of Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India (*Monthly Statistics*), as provided by the respondents in their January 25, 1999, submission. Consistent with our methodology used in the LTFV investigation of this proceeding, we used AJ Works' calculated cost of manufacturing based on the information submitted on February 4, 1999, as revised at verification, to value the cost of ammonium persulfates. Where necessary, we adjusted the values reported in the *Chemical Weekly* to exclude sales and excise taxes. For those values not contemporaneous with the POR, we adjusted for inflation using the wholesale price indices (WPI) published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We made further adjustments to account for freight costs between the suppliers and AJ Works' manufacturing facilities.

In accordance with our practice, we added to CIF import values from India a surrogate freight cost using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest PRC port to the factory, or from the domestic supplier to the factory. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From the People's Republic of China,* 62 FR 61977 (November 20, 1997).

We valued labor based on a regression-based wage rate, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3).

For electricity, we relied upon public information from an August 6, 1996, article in *Business World* to obtain an average price for electricity provided to industries in India. To value water we relied on public information reported in the October 1997 publication of the *Second Water Utilities Data Book: Asian and Pacific Region.* We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

As noted in the verification report for AJ Works, company officials indicated that the factory used coal in its production of persulfates. *See Memorandum for the File* for AJ Works, dated June 24, 1999, at page 9. Because the factory had not previously reported factors of production for coal, we used, as facts available, the consumption amounts reported during the LTFV investigation (for the period January through June, 1996). The respondents placed this data on the record of this administrative review on July 13, 1999. To value coal, we relied on public information reported in the antidumping new shipper review for Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the PRC. *See Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From The People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review,* 64 FR 8543, 8545 (February 22, 1999), and *Factors Memorandum* at page 2. We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. Additionally, we adjusted the value for coal to account for freight costs incurred between the suppliers and AJ Works.

For the reported packing materials (*i.e.,* polyethylene and woven bags, polyethylene sheet, wood pallets, fiberboard, and polypropylene sacks), we relied upon Indian import data from the March and December 1997 issues of *Monthly Statistics.* We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. Additionally, we adjusted these values to account for freight costs incurred between the suppliers and AJ Works.

For foreign inland freight, we use the April 1994 truck rate from the *Times of India.* For ocean freight we used the verified per-unit expense reported by Ai Jian in its February 4, 1999, section C supplemental submission because Ai Jian incurred ocean freight expenses that were paid in U.S. dollars to a market economy supplier. For marine insurance and foreign brokerage and handling expenses, we used public information reported in the antidumping duty investigations of sulfur dyes, including sulfur vat dyes, from India and stainless steel bar from India, respectively. *See Final Determination of Sales at Lesser Than Fair Value: Sulphur Dyes, Including Vat Dyes from India,* 58 FR 11385 (March 1, 1993); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Bar from India,* 59 FR 66915 (December 28, 1994); *Factors Memorandum* at page 5. We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

For factory overhead (FOH), selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit, relied on the financial statements of Calibre Chemicals Pvt. Limited (Calibre), an Indian producer of potassium persulfates and other chemicals, which were submitted by the respondents, because this company is a producer of subject merchandise.

Due to the differing cost structures between Calibre's production of subject and non-subject merchandise, it is more reliable to calculate FOH as a percentage of the total raw material costs for subject merchandise, as opposed to calculating FOH as a percentage of total materials, labor, and energy costs for all products. Therefore, we used the methodology proposed by the petitioner in its February 16,1999, submission in order to calculate FOH. *See Factors Memorandum* at page 6. We adjusted the SG&A percentage that the respondents calculated from Calibre's financial statements as follows: (1) we used data from both Calibre's 1997 and 1998 fiscal years; (2) we considered Calibre's ''transportation and distribution'' expenses to be tied to the movement of finished goods and, therefore, excluded them from Calibre's cost of manufacturing; (3) we reclassified Calibre's ''service and job work'' expenses as SG&A expenses; (4) we excluded all depreciation cost, as we considered them to be part of FOH; and(5) we used Califbre's sale of scrap to offset its cost of manufacturing, not its SG&A expenses. We adjusted the profit percentage calculated by the respondents to reflect the average profit from both Calibre's 1997 and 1998 fiscal years. In addition, we removed from the profit calculation the excise duties and sales taxes. *See Persulfates Preliminary Determination,* 61 FR at 68236.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period December 27, 1999, through June 30, 2998.

Manufacturer/exporter	Martin (percent)
Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation	4.27
Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation	5.34

Interested parties may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication of this notice or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are also encouraged to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statues, regulations, and cases cited.

The Department will subsequently issue the final results of thus administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or at the hearing, if held, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

The Department shall determine and the Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of this review. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by this review and for future deposits of estimated duties. For assessment purposes, we do not have the information to calculate an estimated entered value. Accordingly, we have calculated importer specific duty assessment rates for the merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales and dividing this amount by the total quantity of those sales. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this antidumping duty administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for each reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) the cash deposit rate for Guangdong Petroleum will continue to be 34.97 percent, the company-specific rate from the LTFV investigation; (3) the cash deposit rate for all other PRC exporters will continue to be 119.02 percent, the PRC-wide rate established in the LTFV investigation; and (4) the cash deposit rate for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification of Interest Parties.

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

Dated: July 30, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–20337 Filed 8–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–504]

Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware From Mexico: Notice of Panel Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand

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

ACTION: Notice of panel decision and amendment to final results of antidumping duty administrative review in accordance with decision upon remand.

SUMMARY: As a result of a remand from a Binational Panel, convened pursuant to the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Department of Commerce is amending its final results in the ninth antidumping duty administrative review of Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico (December 1, 1994–November 30, 1995). The Department of Commerce has determined, in accordance with the instruction of the Binational Panel, the dumping margin for entries of porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico produced by Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. to be 16.97 percent. The margin for Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. is not affected by this remand.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katherine Johnson or David J. Goldberger, Office 2, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4929, or 482–4136, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 7, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 42496) the final results of antidumping duty administrative review for Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico. Subsequent to the final results, Columbian Home Products (the petitioner), Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. (Cinsa) and Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. (ENASA) challenged the Department's findings and requested that the Binational Panel (the Panel) review the final results.

Thereafter, the Panel remanded the Department's final results with respect to one issue—whether the Department should utilize the indirect selling expense ratio submitted by Yamaka China (Yamaka) in determining Yamaka's indirect selling expenses on its sales of porcelain-on-steel cookware produced by ENASA. Specifically, the Panel directed the Department (1) to determine, after addressing both the petitioner's ministerial error letter and Cinsa's submission opposing the petitioner's letter, whether the Department did in fact make a ministerial error; (2) if it did, to correct the error, and (3) in making any correction, to consider comments from the parties on the proper calculation, specifically address those comments in its remand determination, and explain the basis for the correction in detail.[1]

We have determined that the use of an indirect selling expense ratio for affiliated importer Global Imports, Inc., rather than the indirect selling expense ratio for affiliated importer and reseller Yamaka in calculating the margin for Yamaka's sales of porcelain-on-steel cookware produced by ENASA, was in fact a ministerial error and have, therefore, corrected that error. The Department submitted its remand determination on June 4, 1999.

On July 20, 1999, the Panel affirmed the remand determination of the Department. (*See* Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico (9th Administrative Review), USA–97–1904–07 (Final Panel Order).) As a result, the margin for ENASA increased from 2.74 to 16.97 percent. The margin for Cinsa is not affected by this remand because the sales through Yamaka consisted solely of ENASA-produced merchandise. Because the Department has since concluded additional administrative reviews, the cash deposit rate for ENASA remains that established by the most recently completed administrative review. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

This amendment to the final results of antidumping duty administrative review notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: July 30, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–20342 Filed 8–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] For a complete discussion of the Department's reasoning in the selection of an indirect selling expense ratio, see Redetermination on Remand: Certain Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (June 3, 1999).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–825]

Sebacic Acid From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review of Sebacic Acid from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sebacic acid from the People's Republic of China in response to requests from the petitioner, Union Camp Corporation, and the following three respondents: Tianjin Chemicals Import and Export Corporation, Guangdong Chemicals Import and Export Corporation, and Sinochem International Chemicals Company, Ltd. In addition to these three respondents, the petitioner also requested a review of Sinochem Jiangsu Import and Export Corporation. This review covers four exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review is July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998.

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value. Interested parties are invited to