Accordingly, we are revoking the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Wafangdian.

Analysis of Comments Received

We have addressed all of the comments regarding the ministerial error allegations in the *Memorandum to Susan Kuhbach*, ''Ministerial Error Allegations for Final Results of Review'' (February 12, 2001). As explained in that memorandum, correction of the ministerial errors for Wafangdian resulted in a zero margin for Wafangdian (*see Memorandum to File*, ''Calculations for Amended Final Results for Wafangdian'' (February 12, 2001) for the calculation changes made to the final results). Accordingly, as noted above, we have determined to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to Wafangdian.

In the *Final Results*, we did not address certain comments regarding revocation raised in the briefs and rebuttal briefs of interested parties, noting that those issues were moot because we found the respondents ineligible for revocation (either based on the fact that they did not make sales above normal value in the instant review or that they did not make sales in commercial quantities during the three-year period being analyzed).[4] Since, in light of Wafangdian's amended zero margin, these issues are no longer moot, we have addressed parties' comments regarding revocation in a separate memorandum. *See Memorandum from Richard W. Moreland, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to Bernard T. Carreau, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration*, ''Issues and Decision Memorandum for Amended Final Results'' (February 14, 2001). Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these amended final results and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B–099 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of this memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/summary/list.htm. The paper copy and electronic version of this memorandum are identical in content.

Amended Final Results

Based on our review of comments received regarding ministerial errors, we have made the following change to the *Final Results.* We have incorporated into our calculation of Wafangdian's weighted average margin the revisions to certain packing material and labor figures, as detailed in exhibits 6 and 7 of Wafangdian's March 14, 2000 submission.

We have also corrected a typographical error in the PRC-wide cash deposit rate in the final results. The correct PRC-wide (country-wide) cash deposit rate is 33.18 percent.

Based on these revisions, we determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999:

Manufacturer/exporter	Revised margin (percent)
Wafangdian	0.00
Wanxiang	0.00
CMC	0.82
ZMC	7.37
Liaoning	0.00
Hailin	0.00
Weihai	0.00
Luoyang	4.37
Premier	7.36

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections section 751(a)(1) and 771(i) of the Act.

Dated: February 16, 2001.

Timothy J. Hauser,

Acting Under Secretary for International Trade.

Appendix—List of Comments and Issues in the Decision Memorandum

Comment 1: The Department Should Grant Revocations
Comment 2: Limiting Revocation to Certain Trading Companies
Comment 3: Limiting Revocation to Particular Models

[FR Doc. 01–4657 Filed 2–23–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[4] *See Final Results* and accompanying Decision Memo at Comments 18–21.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for 1999–2000 Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the thirteenth review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China. The period of review is June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000. This extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jarrod Goldfeder or Melani Miller, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189 or (202) 482–0116, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act'') by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and all citations to the regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to issue the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend these deadlines to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively.

Background

On July 31, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China, covering the period June 1, 1999, through May 31, 2000 (65 FR 46687).[1] The preliminary results for the antidumping duty administrative review of tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China are

[1] Due to a clerical error, this FR notice failed to portray accurately all the companies participating in the review. An updated company list was reflected in a subsequent **Federal Register** notice. *See Amended Notice of Initiation and Rescission in Part for the 1999–2000 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 48968 (August 10, 2000).

currently due no later than March 2, 2001.

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Due to the number of companies and complexity of the issues, it is not practicable to complete this review within the originally anticipated time limit (i.e., March 2, 2001). See Memorandum from Team to Richard W. Moreland, ''Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results,'' dated, February 20, 2001. Therefore, the Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results to not later than June 29, 2001, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: February 20, 2001.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 01–4660 Filed 2–23–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[CPSC Docket No. 01–C0005]

The West Bend Company, a Subsidiary of Illinois Tool Works, Inc., Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: It is the policy of the Commission to publish settlements which it provisionally accepts under the Consumer Product Safety Act in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the terms of 16 CFR 1118.20. Published below is a provisionally-accepted Settlement Agreement with The West Bend Company, A Subsidiary of Illinois Tool Works, Inc., containing a civil penalty of $225,000.

DATES: Any interested person may ask the Commission not to accept this agreement or otherwise comment on its contents by filing a written request with the Office of the Secretary by March 13, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to comment on this Settlement Agreement should send written comments to the Comment 01–C0005, Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jimmie L. Williams, Trial Attorney, Office of Compliance and Enforcement, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207; telephone (301) 504–0626, 1376.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The text of the Agreement and Order appears below.

Dated: February 20, 2001.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary.

Settlement Agreement and Order

1. The West Bend Company (''West Bend''), a Subsidiary of Illinois Tool Works, Inc. enters into this Settlement Agreement and Order with the staff (''the staff'') of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (''the Commission'') in accordance with 16 CFR Part 1118, section 20 of the Commission's Procedures for Investigations, Inspections, and Inquiries under the Consumer Product Safety Act (''CPSA'').

I. The Parties

2. The Commission is an independent federal regulatory agency responsible for the enforcement of the Consumer Product Safety Act, 15 U.S.C. 2051–2084.

3. West Bend is a subsidiary of Illinois Tool Works, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. West Bend's principal offices are located at 400 Washington Street, West Bend, Wisconsin 53095.

II. Staff Allegations

4. Between May, 1997 and December, 1998, West Bend manufactured and sold approximately 16,004 120 volt model 10120 water distillers. These units were manufactured for sale to several companies, who sold the product under their private labels, and to distributors both inside and outside of the United States. These water distillers were then sold to consumers throughout the U.S. for use in or around households or residences. Therefore, West Bend is a ''manufacturer'' of a ''consumer product'' ''distributed in commerce'' pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(1), (4) and (11).

5. The water distiller consists of three pieces: a main housing, a boiling chamber and a depository tank. The boiling chamber is filled with water, and the consumer pushes a button to turn the product on. The main housing then heats up the water, and directs the residual steam through condensing coils. A motor, which sits on top of the distiller, activates and operates a cooling fan that blows over the condensing coils. The water then condenses and drips into the depository tank. The total time for distilling one gallon of water is four hours.

6. A defect within the water distiller's motor made the unit susceptible to voltage surges. When subjected to these surges, the motor produced electrical arcs and would catch on fire. The resultant motor fire would destroy the water distiller, and presented a fire hazard to the consumer.

7. In November, 1998, West Bend learned from its regional distributor that two (2) of its water distillers failed in Taiwan. The consumers reported hearing explosive and popping sounds, and observed flames and smoke coming out of the top of the product. The fires then spread to surrounding combustibles, and damaged the consumers' homes. The regional distributor informed West Bend that he suspected that the motor burned and was the source of the fires.

8. In December, 1998, West Bend contracted with an outside consultant to help it determine the cause of their failures, and received the failed Taiwan unit in Wisconsin. In the interim, West Bend elected to place a fuse in line with the motor circuit, and made the housing material more flame retardant. Upon its initial examination of the failed Taiwan units, West Bend preliminarily opined that voltage surges were causing the product's motor to fail.

9. In January, 1999, West Bend learned of a third water distiller failure in Taiwan in which the unit was reported to have melted. The following day West Bend's General Counsel sent a letter to the Hong Kong counsel of the motor manufacturer, and notified him of West Bend's intent to seek indemnification for the above incidents.

10. On February 1, 1999, the West Bend consultant arranged for the first tests to be conducted on sample water distiller motors. These voltage surge tests were run on February 11, 1999, and reproduced the failure scenario. On February 22, 1999, West Bend's consultant inquired about the ''need to determine whether a recall is required.'' IN April, 1999, West Bend elected to recall the water distillers sold in Taiwan. On April 30, 1999, West Bend's consultant reported that the motors were susceptible to voltage surges, and could fail in castastrophic fashion. Between April, 1999 and August, 1999, six (6) similar water distiller failures occurred in the United States. Again, the fires spead outside of the product, and damaged the consumers' homes. The above information reasonably supported the conclusion that the product contained a defect that could create a substantial product hazard.