Frequency of Responses: Reporting: Other (one time).

Total Burden Hours: 817.

Rural Utility Service

Title: Water and Waste Disposal Programs Guaranteed Loans.

OMB Control Number: 0572–NEW.

Summary of Collection: The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) is authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to make loans to public agencies, nonprofit corporations, and Indian tribes for the development of water and waste disposal facilities primarily servicing rural residents. The guaranteed loan program encourages lender participation and provides specific guidance in the processing and servicing of guaranteed loans.

Need and Use of the Information: Rural Development's field offices will collect information from applicants/borrowers, lenders, and consultants to determine eligibility, project feasibility and to ensure borrowers operate on a sound basis and use loan funds for authorized purposes. There are agency forms required as well as other requirements that involve certifications from the borrower, lenders, and other parties. Failure to collect proper information could result in improper determinations of eligibility, use of funds and or unsound loans.

Description of Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 15.

Frequency of Responses: Reporting: On occasion.

Total Burden Hours: 858.

Forest Service

Title: Application for the Senior Community Service Employment Program.

OMB Control Number: 0596–0099.

Summary of Collection: The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) is administered in conjunction with Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended. The Secretary of Labor administers this program in order to foster and promote useful part-time opportunities in community services activities for unemployed low-income persons who are age 55 or older. The Forest Service (FS) participates as one of 10 national sponsors under a grant agreement from the Department of Labor and operates the SCSEP in 40 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Through the SCSEP the vast majority of applications become self-reliant and independent of welfare programs and have upgraded their skills and transitioned into the regular labor market. The FS will collect information using form FS 1800–21b ''Application for Senior Community Service Employment Program.''

Need and Use of the Information: FS will collect the following information: identification data (name, address, and birth date); eligibility information (number in family, income and signature); applicant's disposition (family income level determination, eligibility determination, community service assignment determination); and other information such as age, sex, education level, ethnic group, his/her veteran and handicapped position. The information will also be used to provide the administrative office within the Department of Labor data on the program's enrollment. If the FS does not collect the above data from each person applying to the SCSEP, participant eligibility determination could not be legally made and the Forest Service could forfeit its right to remain a viable program sponsor.

Description of Respondents: Individuals or households.

Number of Respondents: 6,500.

Frequency of Responses: Recordkeeping; Reporting: Other (initial application).

Total Burden Hours: 1,083.

Nancy B. Sternberg,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–27218 Filed 10–23–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–830]

Coumarin From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0666.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1999).

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

On February 9, 1995, the Department of Commerce published an antidumping duty order on coumarin from the People's Republic of China (60 FR 7751). The Department received requests to conduct an administrative review of this antidumping duty order. The review was initiated on March 30, 2000 for Jiangsu Native Produce Import & Export Corp. (Jiangsu) at the request of petitioner (65 FR 16875), and on June 2, 2000 for Netchem Inc. (Netchem) at the request of Netchem (65 FR 35320). On July 31, 2000, Jiangsu submitted a letter to the Department stating that it would no longer participate in the review. This antidumping duty administrative review covers the period of February 1, 1999 through January 31, 2000.

Because of the complexity of certain issues, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limit for the preliminary results to no later than February 28, 2001 (*See Memorandum from Barbara E. Tillman to Joseph A. Spetrini, Extension of Time Limit*, October 12, 2000).

Dated: October 13, 2000.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 00–27302 Filed 10–23–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–504]

Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware From Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Dduty Administrative 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 by the petitioner, Columbian Home Products, LLC (formerly General Housewares

Corporation), the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cookware from Mexico. This review covers Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. and Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V., manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period December 1, 1998, through November 30, 1999 (thirteenth review period).

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dinah McDougall or Rebecca Trainor, 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) 482–3773 or (202) 482–4007, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (April 1999).

Background

On October 10, 1986, the Department published in the **Federal Register**, 51 FR 36435, the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on certain porcelain-on-steel (POS) cookware from Mexico. We published an antidumping duty order on December 2, 1986, 51 FR 43415.

On December 14, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice advising of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order for the period December 1, 1998, through November 30, 1999 (the POR), 64 FR 69693. The Department received a request for an administrative review of Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. (Cinsa) and Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. (ENASA) from Columbian Home Products, LLC (CHP), formerly General Housewares Corporation (GHC) (hereinafter, the petitioner). We published a notice of initiation of the review on January 26, 2000, 65 FR 4228.

On January 12, 2000, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to Cinsa and ENASA. We issued supplemental questionnaires on May 16, and June 19, 2000. On March 13, 2000, June 5, 2000, and July 5, 2000, we received responses to the original questionnaire and to our two supplemental questionnaires. On July 14, 2000, the respondents filed a database containing December 1998 home market sales data, which the respondents claimed had been unintentionally omitted from their prior data submissions. We conducted verification of Cinsa/ENASA's antidumping duty questionnaire responses from July 17, 2000 through July 28, 2000, and issued our report on September 27, 2000, (see Memorandum to the File: Sales and Cost of Production Verification).

On August 7, 2000, we requested that the respondents submit revised home market sales, U.S. sales, and CV/COP databases to reflect certain verification findings. See letter dated August 7, 2000, and memo to the file dated August 21, 2000, on file in Room B–099 of the Commerce Department. On October 3, 2000, we returned respondents' July 14 and August 11, 2000 submissions because they contained certain home market sales information that was untimely filed. *See* letter to David Amerine dated October 3, 2000, on file in room B–099 of the Commerce Department. In accordance with the Department's request in that letter, the respondents submitted revised databases on October 5, 2000. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review are porcelain-on-steel cookware, including tea kettles, which 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 classifiable under HTSUS subheading 7323.94.00.30 is not subject to the order. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Reimbursement

During the eleventh review period (December 1, 1996 through November 30, 1997), the Department found that Cinsa and ENASA's U.S. affiliate, Cinsa International Co. (CIC), had been reimbursed for the payment of antidumping duties on entries of subject merchandise made during the fifth and seventh review periods and liquidated during the eleventh review period. Based on this reimbursement, the Department established a rebuttable presumption that CIC would also be reimbursed for its eleventh review entries. Cinsa and ENASA failed to rebut that presumption in the eleventh review, but did rebut the presumption during the twelfth review, i.e., the most recent prior review. *See Porcelain-On-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 65 FR 30068 (May 10, 2000). For this reason, and because there has been no new indication of reimbursement since the transfer made during the eleventh review period, the Department has not adopted any presumption of reimbursement as to entries made during this thirteenth review period.

Facts Available

In accordance with section 776(a)(2)(B) of the Act, we have determined that the use of partial adverse facts available is appropriate for Cinsa and ENASA in this case, because they did not report certain home market sales in a timely manner. In our January 12, 2000, questionnaire, we instructed the respondents to report all home market sales made during the POR, as well as those made three months prior to, and two months after, the POR. We reiterated this request in our June 19, 2000 supplemental questionnaire, and instructed the respondents to revise their databases to include all applicable sales. In their July 5, 2000, supplemental questionnaire response, Cinsa and ENASA stated that they had complied with this request. On July 14, 2000, three days before the beginning of verification, the respondents submitted for the record the December 1998 home market sales data for Cinsa and ENASA, which they stated had been erroneously omitted from their prior data submissions. On October 3, 2000, we returned to the respondents their submissions of July 14, 2000 and August 11, 2000, containing the December 1998 sales data that we determined to be new factual information untimely filed. The respondents resubmitted their sales data, excluding the December 1998 sales information, on October 5, 2000.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that, when selecting the facts available, adverse inferences may be used when a party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with the Department's requests for information. See also Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 103–316 at 868–870 (1994) (SAA). For the U.S. sales that would have matched to Cinsa's and ENASA's December 1998 home market sales, we have applied an adverse assumption, because Cinsa and ENASA did not act to the best of their ability in responding to the Department's repeated requests that they provide complete home market sales data by the questionnaire deadlines. As partial facts available, we have applied margins calculated for Cinsa and ENASA in previous segments of the proceeding to their U.S. sales that would otherwise have matched to the December 1998 home market sales. These margins are 17.47 percent for Cinsa, calculated in the less-than-fair-value investigation, and 61.66 percent for ENASA, calculated in the 10th administrative review. They are the highest calculated margins in any segment of the proceeding that have not been doubled as a result of a finding of reimbursement. *See Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value Investigation,* 51 FR 36435 (October 10, 1986) and *Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 43594 (August 13, 1998). For a detailed discussion of our treatment of these sales, see the October 16, 2000 Memorandum to the File: Calculation Memo for the Preliminary Results (Preliminary Results Calculation Memo) on file in room B–099 of the Commerce Department.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information used for facts available by reviewing independent sources reasonably at its disposal. Information from a prior segment of the proceeding, such as the prior review margins for Cinsa and ENASA that we are using here, constitute secondary information. The SAA provides that to ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. SAA at 870. As explained in *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan; Preliminary Results of Administrative Reviews,* 61 FR 57391, 57392 (Nov. 6, 1996), to corroborate secondary information, the Department will examine, to the extent practicable, the reliability and relevance of the information used.

Unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources from which the Department can derive calculated dumping margins; the only source for margins is administrative determinations. In an administrative review, if the Department chooses as facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period, because it was calculated in accordance with the statute.

With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. *See Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 61 FR 6812 (February 22, 1996), where the Department disregarded the highest dumping margin as best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin. There is no evidence of circumstances indicating that the margins we are using as facts available in this review are not appropriate. For example, we have expressly declined to use the margins from the eleventh review, which were doubled because of the reimbursement finding. Therefore, the requirements of section 776(c) of the Act are satisfied.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of POS cookware by Cinsa and ENASA to the United States were made at less than normal value, we compared constructed export price (CEP) to the normal value, as described in the ''Constructed Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice.

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the CEPs of individual U.S. transactions to the weighted-average normal value of the foreign like product where there were sales made in the ordinary course of trade at prices above the cost of production (COP), as discussed in the ''Cost of Production Analysis'' section, below.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by Cinsa and ENASA covered by the description in the ''Scope of the Review'' section, above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We compared U.S. sales to sales made in the home market within the contemporaneous window period, which extends from three months prior to the U.S. sale until two months after the sale. 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. In making the product comparisons, we compared individual cookware pieces with identical or similar pieces, and cookware sets to identical or similar sets. Within these groupings, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondents in the following order: Quality, gauge, cookware category, model, shape, wall shape, diameter, width, capacity, weight, interior coating, exterior coating, grade of frit (a material component of enamel), color, decoration, and cover, if any.

Constructed Export Price

We calculated CEP in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was first sold by CIC after importation into the United States. We based CEP on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for billing adjustments, discounts, rebates, U.S. and foreign inland freight, U.S. and Mexican brokerage and handling expenses, and U.S. duty in accordance with section 772(c)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.402(a). We made further deductions, where appropriate, for credit, commissions, and indirect selling expenses that were associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, pursuant to section 772(d)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.402(b). For those sales for which the payment date was not reported, we calculated credit based on the average number of days between shipment and payment using the sales for which payment information was reported. We made an adjustment for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the

Act. As a result of our verification findings, we deleted canceled sales from the U.S. sales database, recalculated U.S. duties, and adjusted the entered value for certain sales. *See* the Preliminary Results Calculation Memo for further detail.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Therefore, we based normal value on the price (exclusive of value-added tax) at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the home market, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, as noted below.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine normal value based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the export price or CEP transaction. The normal value LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when normal value is based on constructed value, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit. For export price, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from the exporter to an unaffiliated U.S. customer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to an affiliated importer, after the deductions required under section 772(d) of the Act. To determine whether normal value sales are at a LOT different from export price or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which normal value is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. For CEP sales, if the normal value level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level, and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between normal value and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust normal value under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa,* 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

In this review, Cinsa and ENASA had only CEP sales. They reported that comparison-market and CEP sales were made at different LOTs, and that comparison-market sales were made at a more advanced LOT than were sales to CIC in the United States. The respondents requested that the Department make a CEP offset in lieu of a LOT adjustment, as they were unable to quantify the price differences related to sales made at the different LOTs.

Cinsa and ENASA reported three channels of distribution in the home market: (1) Direct sales to customers from the Saltillo plant, (2) sales shipped from their Mexico city warehouse, and (3) sales shipped to supermarkets and discount stores. In analyzing the data in the home market sales listing by distribution channel and sales function, we found that the three home market channels are all handled by Cinsa's and ENASA's affiliated distributer, COMESCO, and did not differ significantly with respect to selling functions. Similar services were offered to all or some portion of customers in each channel. Based on this analysis, we find that the three home market channels of distribution comprise a single LOT.

All CEP sales were made through the same distribution channel: By the Mexican exporter to CIC, the U.S. affiliated reseller, which then sold the merchandise directly to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. The same selling functions/services were provided by Cinsa and ENASA to all customers in this distribution channel. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that all CEP sales constitute a single LOT in the United States.

To determine whether sales in the comparison market were at a different LOT than CEP sales, we examined the selling functions performed at the CEP level, after making the appropriate deductions under section 772(d) of the Act, and compared those selling functions to the selling functions performed in the home-market LOT.

In the comparison market, Cinsa and ENASA sold subject merchandise to their affiliated distributor, COMESCO, which then resold the POS product to unaffiliated customers. In the United States, Cinsa sold its and ENASA's subject merchandise to its affiliate, CIC, which then sold the subject merchandise directly to unaffiliated purchasers. Therefore, we compared the selling functions and the level of activity associated with Cinsa's sales to CIC with the sales by COMESCO to unaffiliated purchasers in the Mexican market. We found that several of the functions performed in making the starting-price sale in the comparison market either were not performed in connection with sales to CIC (*e.g.,* market research, order solicitation, after sale services/warranties, and advertising), or were only performed to a small degree in connection with sales to CIC (*e.g.,* inventory maintenance), thus supporting respondents' contention that different LOTs exist between comparison-market and CEP sales.

These differences also support the respondents' assertion that the comparison-market merchandise is sold at a more advanced LOT (*see* the Preamble to the Department's Regulations, 62 FR 27295, 27371 (May 19, 1997) (''Each more remote level must be characterized by an additional layer of selling activities, amounting in the aggregate to a substantially different selling function.'') Furthermore, many of the same selling functions that are performed at the comparison-market LOT are performed, not at the CEP LOT, but by the respondents' U.S. affiliate. Based on this analysis, we preliminarily conclude that the comparison-market and CEP channels of distribution are sufficiently different to determine that two different LOTs exist, and that the comparison-market sales are made at a more advanced LOT than are the CEP sales.

We note that the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) has held that the Department's practice of determining LOTs for CEP transactions after CEP deductions is an impermissible interpretation of section 772(d) of the Act. *See Borden, Inc.* v. *United States,* 4 F. Supp. 2d 1221, 1241–42 (CIT 1998) (*Borden*). The Department believes, however, that its practice is in full compliance with the statute. On June 4, 1999, the CIT entered final judgement in Borden on the LOT issue. *See Borden Inc.* v. *United States,* Court No. 96–08–01970, Slip Op. 99–50 (CIT June 4, 1999). The government has filed an appeal of *Borden* which is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Consequently, the Department has continued to follow its normal practice of adjusting CEP under section 772(d) prior to starting a LOT analysis, as articulated by the Department's regulations at section 351.412.

Because there is only one LOT in the home market, it is not possible to determine if there is a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which normal value is based

and comparison market (*i.e.,* home market) sales at the LOT of the export transaction. Thus, the data available do not provide an appropriate basis to calculate an LOT adjustment. Therefore, we made a CEP offset to normal value. In accordance with section 773(a)(7) of the Act, we calculated the CEP offset as the lesser of the following:

1. The indirect selling expenses on the comparison-market sale, or
2. The indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP.

Cost of Production Analysis

The Department disregarded certain sales made by Cinsa and ENASA for the period December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998 (the most recently completed review of Cinsa and ENASA), pursuant to a finding in that review that sales failed the cost test (*see Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 65 FR 320068 (May 10, 2000)). Thus, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that respondents Cinsa and ENASA made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise in the current review period. As a result, the Department initiated investigations to determine whether the respondents made home-market sales during the POR at prices below their COP within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act.

A. Calculation of COP

We calculated the COP on a product-specific basis, based on the sum of Cinsa's and ENASA's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home-market SG&A and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. Because Cinsa and ENASA reported monthly costs, we created an annual average COP on a product-specific basis.

We relied on COP information submitted by Cinsa and ENASA, except in the following instances where it was not appropriately quantified or valued: (1) Enamel frit prices from an affiliated supplier did not approximate fair market value prices; therefore, we increased Cinsa's and ENASA's enamel frit prices to account for the portion of the reported cost savings to affiliated parties which was not due to market-based savings; (2) we excluded Cinsa's and ENASA's negative interest expense. *See* the Preliminary Results Calculation Memo for further details.

B. Test of Home Market Prices

We compared the weighted-average, per-unit COP figures for the POR to home market sales of the foreign like product, as required by section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether: (1) Within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities; and (2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP (net of selling expenses) to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges, rebates, discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses.

C. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C), where less than 20 percent of the respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where twenty percent or more of the respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales where such sales were found to be made at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time (in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act).

The results of our cost tests for Cinsa and ENASA indicated for certain home market models, less than twenty percent of the sales of the model were at prices below COP. We therefore retained all sales of these models in our analysis and used them as the basis for determining normal value. Our cost tests also indicated that for certain other home market models more than twenty percent of home market sales within an extended period of time were at prices below COP and would not permit the full recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we therefore excluded the below-cost sales of these models from our analysis and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value.

Price-to-Price Comparisons

For both respondents, we calculated normal value based on the value-added tax-exclusive, home market gross unit price and deducted, where appropriate, inland freight, discounts, and rebates in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.401. We made a deduction for credit expenses, where appropriate, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410(c). We also deducted commissions and the lesser of comparison-market indirect selling expenses and the indirect selling expenses deducted from CEP (the CEP offset) pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412(f). For those comparison-market sales for which the payment date was not reported, we calculated credit based on the average number of days between shipment and payment using the sales for which payment information was reported. We made adjustments to normal value for differences in packing expenses. We also made adjustments to normal value, where appropriate, for differences in costs attributable to differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. In accordance with our verification findings, we deleted canceled sales from the home market database, and recalculated inventory carrying costs and credit expenses. *See* the Preliminary Calculation Memo for further details.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with section 773A of the Act based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the weighted-average dumping margins for the period December 1, 1998, through November 30, 1999, are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Cinsa	12/1/98–11/30/99	1.99
ENASA	12/1/98–11/30/99	6.99

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this proceeding within five days of the publication date of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.224(b). Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). If requested, a hearing will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter.

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case briefs and rebuttal briefs. Case briefs from interested parties and rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted not later than 30 days and 37 days, respectively, from the date of publication of these preliminary results. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c) and (d). Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue 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 statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

The Department will issue the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any written briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Room B–099, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c).

Assessment Rates

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 the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties. We will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis*. For assessment purposes, we intend to calculate importer-specific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales examined and dividing this amount by the total entered value of the sales examined.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those established in the final results of this review; (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 these reviews, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 29.52 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV normal value investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: October 12, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–27078 Filed 10–23–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Issuance of an Amended Export Trade Certificate of Review, Application No. 84–11A12.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce has issued an amendment to the Export Trade Certificate of Review granted to Northwest Fruit Exporters (''NFE'') on June 11, 1984. Notice of issuance of the Certificate was published in the **Federal Register** on June 14, 1984 (49 FR 24581).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Morton Schnabel, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, (202) 482–5131 (this is not a toll-free number) or E-mail at oetca@ita.doc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. Sections 4001–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. The regulations implementing Title III are found at 15 CFR Part 325 (1999).

The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs (''OETCA'') is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Department of Commerce to publish a summary of the certification in the **Federal Register**. Under Section 305(a) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

Description of Amended Certificate

Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 84–00012, was issued to NFE on June 11, 1984 (49 FR 24581, June 14, 1984) and previously amended on May 2, 1988 (53 FR 16306, May 6, 1988); September 21, 1988 (53 FR 37628, September 27, 1988); September 20, 1989 (54 FR 39454, September 26, 1989); November 19, 1992 (57 FR 55510, November 25, 1992); August 16, 1994 (59 FR 43093, August 22, 1994); November 4, 1996 (61 FR 57850, November 8, 1996); October 22, 1997 (62 FR 55783, October 28, 1997); November 2, 1998 (63 FR 60304, November 9, 1998); and October 20, 1999 (64 FR 57438, October 25, 1999).

NFE's Export Trade Certificate of Review has been amended to:

1. Add each of the following companies as a new ''Member'' of the Certificate within the meaning of