company has a long track record of not using a program, the Department normally will determine that the mere availability of the program does not, by itself, indicate likelihood of continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy. (*See* section III.A.3.b of the Sunset Policy Bulletin.) We preliminarily determine, therefore, that there is no likelihood of a countervailable subsidy from the PITEX program were the order revoked.

With respect to the Bancomext program, CHP argues that Bancomext should be considered a replacement for FOMEX and, therefore, CHP does not independently address Bancomext. As noted above, the Department determined that the Bancomext program was separate from the FOMEX program. Further, Bancomext has been found to provide countervailable subsidies to the extent that loans are provided at preferential rates. None of the parties have argued that the Bancomext program has been terminated. Rather, respondents argue that, as a result of the 1985 Understanding, the GOM altered its practice and no longer provides loans on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations. The Department has reviewed the Bancomext program during reviews covering 1990, 1993, and 1994. In each of these reviews, the Department found countervailable subsidies were provided by the Bancomext program, albeit at *de minimis* rates. Therefore, we do not agree with respondents that the Bancomext no longer provides countervailable subsidies. However, we do agree, based on a history of *de minimis* findings, that there is no evidence to suggest that the Bancomext program is likely to provide above *de minimis* countervailable subsidies, if any, were the order revoked. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that the Bancomext program is not likely to confer a countervailable subsidy were the order revoked.

On the basis of the above analysis regarding the termination, non-use, and *de minimis* subsidies, we preliminarily determine that revocation of the countervailing duty order on POS cooking ware from Mexico is not likely to result in continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy.

Net Countervailable Subsidy

Parties' Comments

In its substantive and rebuttal comments, CHP argues that in accordance with the Department's policy, the Department should report to the Commission a net countervailable subsidy of 3.84 percent as the subsidy likely to prevail if the order were revoked. CHP argues that the Department should add to the 1.97 percent subsidy from the original investigation (attributable to FOMEX and FONEI) the 1.87 percent subsidy rate found in the 1990 administrative review attributable to PITEX.

In their substantive and rebuttal comments, the respondents argue that the zero or *de minimis* rates from the most recent administrative reviews are the rates likely to prevail if the order were revoked.

Department's Preliminary Determination

Because we preliminarily determine that a countervailable subsidy is not likely to continue or recur were the order revoked, there is no net countervailable subsidy to report to the Commission.

Nature of the Subsidy

Parties' Comments

Neither party specifically addressed this issue. As noted above, however, the GOM did argue that the Department must be able to demonstrate, with evidence, that any subsidy found likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked is a subsidy inconsistent with articles 3, 5, or 6 or the Subsidies Agreement.

Department's Position

Because we preliminarily determine that a countervailable subsidy is not likely to continue or recur were the order revoked, there is no nature of the subsidy to report to the Commission.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order would not be likely lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy. As a result of this determination, the Department, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, preliminarily intends to revoke the order on POS cooking ware from Mexico. Pursuant to section 751(c)(6)(A)(iv) of the Act, this revocation would be effective January 1, 2000.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on October 20, 1999. Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than October 11, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than October 18, 1999. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, no later than December 28, 1999.

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

Dated: August 20, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–22197 Filed 8–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–504]

Preliminary Results of Sunset Review: Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware From Mexico

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Sunset Review: porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico.

SUMMARY: On February 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting a full sunset review. As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Preliminary Results of Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th St. & Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 26, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review is being conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of

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

Scope

The merchandise subject to this antidumping duty order is porcelain-on-steel (''POS'') cooking ware from Mexico, which includes tea kettles, that do not have self-contained electric heating elements. All of the foregoing are constructed of steel and are enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') subheading 7323.94.00. Kitchenware currently entering under HTSUS subheading 7323.94.00.30 is not subject to the order. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope remains dispositive.

History of the Order

On October 10, 1986, the Department issued a final determination of sales at less than fair value on POS cooking ware from Mexico.[1] On December 2, 1986, the Department's antidumping duty order on the subject merchandise was published in the **Federal Register** (51 FR 43415).

Since the issuance of the order, Department has conducted several administrative reviews of the order on POS cooking ware from Mexico.[2] The order remains in effect for all producers and exporters of the subject merchandise. In the amended final results of the eleventh administrative review of this antidumping duty order, the Department found that antidumping duties were being absorbed by Cinsa and by ENASA.[3]

Background

On February 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on POS cooking ware from Mexico, pursuant to section 751(c). On February 16, 1999 we received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of Columbian Home Products, LLC (''CHP''), within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. CHP claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a domestic producer of POS cooking ware. CHP asserts that it is the only domestic producer of POS cooking ware.

We received complete substantive responses to the notice of initiation on March 3, 1999, on behalf of CHP, and Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. (''Cinsa'') and Emaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. (''ENASA'') (collectively ''respondents''). Cinsa and ENASA claimed interested party status within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)(A) as foreign manufacturers and exporters of POS cooking ware from Mexico. Cinsa contends that it manufactures light-gauge POS cooking ware, while ENASA contends that it manufactures heavy-gauge POS cooking ware. Cinsa asserts that it was a respondent in the original investigation and participant in all completed administrative reviews conducted by the Department. ENASA asserts that it has been a participant in reviews of this order since it began exporting to the United States (8th and 10th administrative review). Cinsa and ENASA further note that they are respondents in the 11th review and 12th review being conducted by the Department at the time of their submission.

In their substantive response, respondents provided information on the value of their exports of the subject merchandise for the calendar years 1994 to 1997, as well as the total value of exports of the subject merchandise to the U.S. Respondents represent significantly more than 50 percent of the value of total exports of the subject merchandise over the past five calendar years preceding the investigation of the sunset reviews. Because domestic and respondent interested parties provided adequate responses to the notice of initiation, the Department is conducting a full sunset review in accordance with section 351.218(e)(2)(i) of the Sunset Regulations.

On May 28, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on POS cooking ware from Mexico is extraordinarily complicated. In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an order in effect on January 1, 1995). (See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act). As a result of this determination, the Department extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this review until not later than August 20, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.[4]

Adequacy

In its rebuttal comments, CHP argues that the Department should determine that the foreign producers' response to

[1] *See Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Determination of Sales at less than Fair Value*, 51 FR 36435 (October 10, 1986).

[2] *See Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 55 FR 21061(May 22, 1990); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 55 FR 39186 (September 25, 1990); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 32095 (June 8, 1993); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 58 FR 4332 (Aug. 16, 1993), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 59 FR 23694 (May 6, 1994), and *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Accordance with Decision Upon Remand*, 63 FR 53643 (October 6, 1998); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 2378 (January 9, 1995), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 7521 (February 8, 1995), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Accordance with Decision Upon Remand*, 61 FR 53350 (October 11, 1996); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 54616 (October 21, 1996); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 25908 (May 12, 1997), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 35153 (June 30, 1997); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 42496 (August 7, 1997), as amended, *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*, 64 FR 42916 (August 6, 1999); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Administrative Review*, 61 FR 15463 (April 8, 1996); *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 38373 (July 16, 1998), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 43594 (August 13, 1998); and *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 26934 (May 18, 1999), as amended, *Porcelain-On-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 29262 (June 1, 1999).

[3] *See Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware From Mexico; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 29262 (June 1, 1999).

[4] *See POS Cooking Ware from Mexico: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Five-Year Reviews et. al.*, 64 FR 28983 (May 28, 1999).

the notice of initiation was inadequate and, therefore, the Department should conduct an expedited review. CHP asserts that the regulations require respondent interested parties to submit export data for calendar years 1994 through 1998. CHP then argues that since respondents did not submit export data for calendar year 1998 and the data submitted for 1994 through 1997 was not submitted on a calendar year basis, respondents' submission must be viewed as incomplete. In conclusion, CHP asserts that because no other Mexican producers submitted a response to the Notice of Initiation, the Department has not received a complete substantive response from any respondent interested party. As a result, CHP argues that the Department should issue an expedited determination based on facts available and apply an adverse inference against respondents.

In the preamble to the Sunset Regulations the Department explained that it may consider a substantive response that does not contain all of the information required to be complete where a party is unable to report certain required information and provides a reasonable explanation as to why it is unable to provide such information. In their substantive response, respondents explained that they were providing annual (December–November) export statistics corresponding to the administrative reviews conducted by the Department. Further, because the data on sales of subject merchandise during the 12th administrative review had not yet been calculated, respondents explained that data for the most recent year was not yet available. Cinsa explained that its accounting records are maintained on the basis of all light gauge POS products, which includes subject and non-subject merchandise. Therefore, the computerized sales tapes prepared for the Department's administrative reviews enable it to distinguish between subject and non-subject merchandise.

We determine that the respondents provided a reasonable explanation as to why information was not yet available and was reported based on a different time period. We note that our adequacy determinations are intended to determine whether there is sufficient participation of interested parties to warrant a full review. Where, as in this review, respondents have provided information sufficient to enable us to make that determination along with a reasonable explanation for any discrepancies, we do not intend to require respondents to recalculate information which is otherwise available in a slightly altered form. Therefore, we continue to conclude that we received adequate response from respondent interested parties to warrant a full review.

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c)(1) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping order. Pursuant to section 752(c)(3) of the Act, the Department shall provide to the International Trade Commission (''the Commission'') the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, parties' comments with respect to the continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Parties' Comments

In its substantive response CHP refers to the Department's Sunset Policy Bulletin and argues that the Department should find that dumping is likely to continue at significant margins if the order is revoked. In support of its assertion that dumping has continued over the life of the order, CHP cites to the final results of administrative reviews that have been completed. CHP asserts that Cinsa's company-specific margin has increased since the order was imposed from 1.63 percent in the first administrative review to 16.91 percent in the tenth review, and most recently to 64.02 percent in the preliminary results of the eleventh review.

With respect to import levels, CHP refers to official import statistics from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census to support its assertion that imports from Mexico have declined. Specifically, CHP asserts a 50 percent decrease in imports from 1994 (3.3 million units) to 1998 (1.7 million units).

CHP argues that this evidence is highly probative that dumping would be likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked. In conclusion, CHP argues that the combination of declining import volumes and simultaneously increasing dumping margins demonstrates that Mexican producers are unable to sell significant volumes of POS cooking ware in the United States without dumping.

The respondents argue revocation of the order would have minimal or *de minimis* effects on the POS cookware market in the United States. Respondents assert that the 17.47 percent margin assigned to Cinsa (from the investigation) and the 2.74 percent margin assigned to ENASA (from the 9th review) are substantially lower than the 29.52 percent weighted-average margin assigned to all others in the original investigation. Further, respondents assert that their dumping margins have generally declined from such initiation levels while their exports to the United States and market share of Mexican exports of POS cooking ware have increased significantly. On these bases, respondents argue that they are able to market and sell their merchandise in the United States without high dumping margins.

Additionally, respondents argue that revocation of the order would not result in a sudden increase in their exports because the Mexican domestic market is their primary market. Citing to official United States import statistics, respondents assert that in 1998, the Mexican share of total U.S. imports of POS cooking ware was only 6.66 percent and that imports from Mexico declined by approximately 57 percent from 1994 to 1998. Finally, respondents assert that even though Mexican imports of subject merchandise have declined since 1994, the imports in 1998 are still approximately 85 percent higher than they were in 1985, the year prior to the issuance of the order.

In its rebuttal comments CHP argues that contrary to respondents' assertion, dumping margins have increased during the history of this proceeding. CHP asserts that Cinsa's margin has steadily increased since the third administrative review and, as of the tenth review, is 16.91 percent. Further, CHP argues that ENASA's margin in the tenth review is 61.66 percent. CHP also argues that, if as respondents argue, dumping is not likely to continue or recur, respondents should argue that any margin likely to prevail is zero, not the 12.85 to 23.72 percent range respondents have suggested is the margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked. On the basis of above *de minimis* margins in every

review, margins which have increased to historically high levels in the most recently completed administrative review, CHP argues that the Department should determine that revocation of this order would be likely to lead to a continuation of dumping.

The respondents did not address likelihood in their rebuttal comments.

Department's Preliminary Determination

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action (''the SAA''), H.R. Doc. No. 103–316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103–826, pt.1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103–412 (1994), the Department issued its Sunset Policy Bulletin providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the basis for likelihood determinations. The Department clarified that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (*see* section II.A.2 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin). Additionally, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin).

As discussed in section II.A.3 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63–64, the existence of dumping margins after the order is highly probative of the likelihood of the continuation or recurrence of dumping. If companies continue to dump with the discipline of an order in place, it is reasonable to assume that dumping would continue if the discipline were revoked.

We agree with CHP that dumping margins above *de minimis* have continued over the life of the order. Further, deposit rates above *de minimis* remain in effect for all exports of POS cooking ware from Mexico. Using statistics provided by CHP and respondents, we find that imports have fluctuated over the order; steadily increasing in both volume and value from 1985 through 1994 and then steadily decreasing through 1998. Imports in 1998, however, remain slightly higher in value than in 1985 and are slightly lower in volume. Therefore, we do not agree with CHP's arguments that we should find likelihood on the basis of import volumes. However, since dumping margins have continued over the life of the order, the Department preliminarily determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

Parties' Comments

CHP asserts that, in this case, the Department should follow the guidance of the SAA and the Sunset Policy Bulletin, and provide to the Commission the margins from the original investigation. CHP suggests the Department apply 17.47 percent for Cinsa and 29.52, the ''all others'' rate from the original investigation should apply to all respondents that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued. Additionally, CHP notes that, in the eleventh review, the Department made a preliminary finding of duty absorption.

Respondents note that, according to the Sunset Policy Bulletin the Department normally determines that the weighted-average dumping margins from the original investigation are the margins likely to prevail if the antidumping duty order is revoked. Respondents assert, however, that in this case, consistent with the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department should apply a more recently calculated margin because declining dumping margins have been accompanied by steady or increasing imports which indicates that foreign companies do not have to dump to maintain market share in the United States and that dumping is less likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Respondents argue that Cinsa's company-specific margins have always been lower than the weighted-average margin calculated in the original investigation. Further, ENASA's first margin was significantly lower than the weighted-average margin from the original investigation. In addition, respondents argue that overall imports from Mexico and from respondents have increased significantly since the imposition of the order, although having declined since their 1994 peak.

Respondents argue that the weighted-average margin from the original investigation (*i.e.*, the all others rate of 29.52 percent) was calculated on the basis of the margin calculated for Cinsa (17.47 percent) and the substantially higher margin calculated for Troqueles Y Esmaltes, S.A. de C.V. (''TRES''), later known as Aceros Porcelanizados, S.A. de C.V. (''APSA''). Because TRES/APSA no longer exists, respondents argue that use of a weighted-average margin incorporating the TRES/APSA margin does not provide a reasonable indication of the margin likely to prevail for existing manufacturers and exporters. Respondents suggest alternatives for determining the appropriate margins likely to prevail if the order were revoked, all of which include weight averaging margins using the 1997 exports. On this basis, respondents calculate margins ranging from 12.85 percent to 23.72 percent. Finally, respondents acknowledge a preliminary determination of duty absorption in the eleventh administrative review.

In its rebuttal comments CHP argues that respondents' version of the facts is incorrect. In fact, according to CHP, imports have decreased while dumping margins have increased. Under these circumstances, CHP argues that there is no basis in this review to use any margins other than those determined in the original investigation.

In their rebuttal comments, respondents argue that the facts in this case require application of more recently calculated margins. Specifically, respondents assert that official U.S. import statistics demonstrate that imports of POS cooking ware from Mexico increased from $2,853,000 in calendar year 1985, peaking at $10,712,000 in 1994, and then settling to $4,442,000 in 1998. Further, respondents refer to company-specific proprietary data and argue that their exports have increased even more significantly from 1985 to 1997. In conclusion respondents argue that alternatives to the margins from the original investigation would be the simple average of company-specific margins calculated by the Department over the life of the order or the margins from the last completed administrative review.

Department's Preliminary Determination

In the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department stated that, consistent with the SAA and House Report, the Department will provide to the Commission the company-specific margins from the investigation because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order. Further, for companies not specifically investigated, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the all others rate from the investigation. (*See*

section II.B.1 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (*See* sections II.B.2 and 3 of the Sunset Policy Bulletin.)

Our review of import statistics covering total imports of POS cooking ware from Mexico and company-specific imports demonstrates that import volumes and values have fluctuated over the life of the order. While we agree with respondents that the Department may select a more recently calculated margin when declining (or no) margins are accompanied by steady or increasing imports, we do not agree that the facts of this case support such a determination. Imports from both Cinsa and ENASA have fluctuated over the 1994 through 1997 period. This fluctuation occurred at a time when company-specific calculated margins have been increasing. Therefore, the record does not reflect declining margins accompanied by steady or increasing imports. Because of this, the Department preliminarily finds that the use of a more recently calculated margin in its report to the Commission would be inappropriate.

Additionally, we do not agree with respondents that the all others margin from the original investigation is inappropriate because it includes the margin calculated for a company that is no longer in existence. We would normally determine that the margins calculated in the original investigation best reflect the behavior of producers/exporters without the discipline of the order.

In the final results of the 1996–1997 administrative review of this order, the Department found that antidumping duties have been absorbed by Cinsa on 68.03 percent of its U.S. sales of subject merchandise and by ENASA on 98.52 percent of its U.S. sales of subject merchandise (*see* Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 64 FR 29262 (June 1, 1999). Consistent with the statute and the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department will notify the Commission of its findings regarding such duty absorption for the Commission to consider in conducting a sunset review.

Additionally, the Sunset Policy Bulletin refers to the SAA at 885, and the House report at 60, and provides that where the Department has found duty absorption, the Department normally will provide to the Commission the higher of the margin that the Department otherwise would have reported to the Commission or the most recent margin for that company adjusted to account for the Department's findings on duty absorption. The Department explained that it normally will adjust a company's most recent margin to take into account its findings on duty absorption by increasing the margin by the amount of duty absorption on those sales for which the Department found duty absorption. In the administrative review covering the period December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997, the Department found dumping margins of 25.42 percent for Cinsa and 65.28 percent for ENASA. The all others rate remained at 29.54 percent. (*See* Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 64 FR 26934 (May 18, 1999), as amended, Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 64 FR 29262 (June 1, 1999)). Further, as noted above, the Department found that antidumping duties had been absorbed by both Cinsa and ENASA. Therefore, consistent with the Sunset Policy Bulletin, we are adjusting the most recent margin to account for duty absorption. Because the adjusted margins for Cinsa and ENASA are higher than the rates from the original investigation, we will report to the Commission the adjusted rates as indicated below.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated below.

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Cinsa, S.A.	42.71
Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V.	129.40
All Others	29.52

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on October 20, 1999. Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than October 11, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than October 18, 1999. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, no later than December 28, 1999.

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

Dated: August 20, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–22200 Filed 8–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)

Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology

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

ACTION: Request for nominations of members to serve on the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology.

SUMMARY: NIST invites and requests nomination of individuals for appointment to the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology (VCAT). The terms of some of the members of the VCAT will soon expire. 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 September 16, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Please submit nominations to Dr. Brian C. Belanger, Executive Director, Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology, 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, current membership list, and executive summary may be found on its electronic home page at: http://www.nist.gov/director/vcat/vcat.htm.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Brian C. Belanger, Executive Director, Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 1004, Gaithersburg, MD 20899–1004; telephone 301–975–4720, fax 301–948–1224; or via email at brian.belanger@nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. VCAT Information

The VCAT was established in accordance with 15 U.S.C. 278 and the