payable and reported in the new computer field EXCHNG provided by Wolverine to the Department on March 25, 1999. Petitioner states that the Department should add the computer field EXCHNG to the revised cost of production (RCOP). Wolverine added a new computer field EXCHNG to its COP and CV databases for exchange losses associated with its accounts payable to include additional costs that were not reported in the original computer field TOTCOM. Wolverine did include these additional costs in the computer field for revised TOTCOM (RTOTCOM). However, because the Department started its cost calculations using the original computer field TOTCOM, the additional costs included in EXCHNG were not included in the Department's final margin analysis.

Wolverine did not comment on the clerical error allegations.

After reviewing the petitioners' allegations, we have determined, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224, that the final results includes the above-mentioned clerical errors. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(e), we are amending the final results of the antidumping duty review of brass sheet and strip from Canada. The revised dumping margin is listed below.

Exporter/producer	Margin percentage
Wolverine	0.83

In addition, we note that the assessment instructions in the original final results of review misstated the way in which the assessment rates were calculated. Therefore, this amended final results of review provides the corrected formulation given below.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will issue importer-specific appraisement instructions to Customs. For assessment purposes, we have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the entered value of sales used to calculate those duties. This notice serves as a final 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 doubled antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 351.213, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: December 27, 1999.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–28 Filed 1–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–047]

Elemental Sulphur From Canada: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is extending the time limit for the final results of the review of elemental sulphur from Canada. This review covers the period December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998.

DATE EFFECTIVE: January 4, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rick Johnson at (202) 482–3818; Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendment made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA).

Postponement of Final Results

The Department has determined that it is not practicable to issue its final results of the administrative review within the original time limit of December 31, 1999. *See Decision Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III to Robert LaRussa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.* Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until January 21, 2000, in accordance with Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: December 22, 1999.

Richard O. Weible,

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

[FR Doc. 00–29 Filed 1–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3570–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–825]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Korea: Notice of Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from respondents, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated an administrative review of SeAH Steel Corporation, Ltd. (''SeAH''), on October 1, 1999. The review covered one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, SeAH and its U.S. sales subsidiaries (Pusan Pipe America, Inc. and State Pipe & Supply Co.). The period of review is August 1, 1998 through July 31, 1999. The Department received a request for withdrawal on December 3, 1999 from respondent. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department is now terminating this review because the respondent has withdrawn its request for review and no other interested parties have requested a review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 4, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Lyons, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0374.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations

to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations as codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

On August 11, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 41058) the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods from Korea. The Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity To Request Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1998–1999 review period on August 11, 1999 (64 FR 43649). On August 31, 1999, SeAH requested an administrative review for its entries during the 1998–1999 period of review. No other interested party requested review of this antidumping duty order. On October 1, 1999, in accordance with Section 751 of the Act, the Department initiated the review (64 FR 53318). On December 3, 1999 respondent withdrew its request for review.

Section 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations stipulates that the Secretary may permit a party that requests a review to withdraw the request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. In this case, respondent has withdrawn its request for review within the 90-day period. No other interested party requested a review and we have received no other submissions regarding respondent's withdrawal of its request for review. Therefore, we are terminating this review of the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods from Korea.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: December 28, 1999.

Richard O. Weible,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–97 Filed 1–3–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–504]

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

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico.

SUMMARY: On August 26, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from both domestic and respondent interested parties. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of this order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final 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 Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5050 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 4, 2000.

Statute and Regulations

This review was 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) and 19 CFR Part 351 (1999) in general. 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 cooking ware (''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 of the order remains dispositive.

Background

On August 26, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 46651) the Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware from Mexico, (''Preliminary Results''). In the Preliminary Results, we found that revocation of the order would likely result in the continuation or recurrence of dumping. In addition, we preliminarily determined that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked was 42.71 percent for Cinsa, S.A. (''Cinsa''), 129.40 percent for Esmaltaciones de Norte America, S.A. de C.V. (''ENASA''), and 29.52 percent for ''all others.''

On October 12, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i), we received comments on behalf of Cinsa and ENASA (collectively, ''the respondents''). On October 12, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(d)(1), we received rebuttal comments from Columbian Home Products (''CHP''), the domestic interested party in this review. We have addressed the comments received below.

Comments

Comment 1: The respondents assert that, in the amended final results of the eleventh administrative review, the Department's presumption that duties were being absorbed fails to meet the requirement that the Department carry out a meaningful analysis of whether antidumping duties are absorbed. The respondents assert that if in duty absorption inquiries the Department need not actually analyze absorption but, rather, may simply presume it from the existence of dumping alone, the statute's duty absorption provisions are rendered superfluous. Additionally, the respondents assert that the Department's presumption is, in effect, impossible to rebut. Therefore, the respondents argue that application of the duty absorption methodology to calculate Cinsa's and ENASA's likely margins if the order were revoked is contrary to law.

In its rebuttal comments CHP argues that Cinsa and ENASA did not challenge the Department's duty absorption determination in either their case brief on the Department's preliminary results of the eleventh administrative review nor in their