

production process generates manganese rich slag as a subsidiary product. Eramet provided invoices from a market-economy producer and a U.S. producer showing that manganese rich slag has a significant market value. However, relative to the market value of ferromanganese, it should be considered a by-product and valued in accordance with GAAP. Eramet proposes valuing manganese rich slag by adjusting the price of manganese ore by a ratio to account for differences in manganese content. Eramet calculates this ratio using the above referenced invoices. Bayi and Emei argue that manganese rich slag is a waste product with no commercial value, and as such, no factor input value should be used for it in the NV calculations.

We preliminarily disagree with both parties on this point. Manganese rich slag, used in conjunction with manganese ore, is clearly a major input into the production process of silicomanganese and we have valued it using Indian values. Moreover, the above-mentioned ratio is not a reliable basis for adjusting Indian Import values of manganese ore. *See Factor Memorandum.*

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exists for the period December 1, 1997 through November 30, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Guangxi Bayi Ferroalloy Works	57.71
Sichuan Emei Ferroalloy Import and Export Co., Ltd ...	67.97

Interested parties may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of the publication of this notice or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the 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 subsequently issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in

any such written briefs or at a hearing, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries for assessment purposes. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), where we analyze and use a company's response, we intend to calculate an importer-specific duty assessment rate by dividing the total amount of dumping margins calculated for sales to each importer by the total number of units of those same sales sold to that importer. The unit dollar amount will be assessed uniformly against each unit of merchandise of that specific importer's entries during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this antidumping duty administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) For Bayi and Emei, which both have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will be 57.71 percent and 67.97 percent, respectively; (2) for any previously reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporter with a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the company- and product-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) the cash deposit rate for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other PRC exporters will continue to be 150.00 percent, the PRC-wide rate established in the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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

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

Dated: November 1, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-29203 Filed 11-5-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Administrative Review and New Shipper 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 fourth administrative review and new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. The period of review for both segments of the proceeding is February 1, 1998 through January 31, 1999. 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: November 8, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zak Smith, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0189.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because of the extraordinary complicated issues involved in these reviews it is not practicable to complete the reviews within the originally anticipated time limit (*i.e.*, November 1, 1999). Therefore, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results to not later than February 28, 2000, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("the Act"). *See* October 25, 1999, Memorandum from Susan Kuhbach to Richard Moreland on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, B-099 of the Department.

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

Dated: October 25, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-29200 Filed 11-5-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-833]

Stainless Steel Bar from Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of
antidumping administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Japan in response to a request from a respondent, Aichi Steel Corporation. This review covers the period February 1, 1998, through January 31, 1999.

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 8, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Minoo Hatten or Robin Gray, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1690 or (202) 482-4023, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On February 26, 1999, the Department received a request from Aichi Steel Corporation (Aichi) to conduct an

administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from Japan. On March 29, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of Aichi, covering the period February 1, 1998, through January 31, 1999, in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 14860).

On March 25, 1999, Aichi requested that it be permitted to limit the scope of products reported to include home-market sales of only hot-rolled merchandise, as was permitted in the 97/98 review. On March 30, 1999, we granted Aichi's request, given that Aichi confirmed that the same facts apply in this review that applied in the 97/98 review. As was the case in that review, Aichi claims that there are a limited number of home-market sales of stainless steel bar during the period of review (POR) to which U.S. sales would match when calculating dumping margins. See Preliminary Results Analysis Memorandum from case analyst to file, dated October 19, 1999 (98/99 review), in room B-099 of the main Department building; see also Preliminary Results Analysis Memorandum from case analyst to file, dated February 22, 1999 (97/98 review), in room B-099 for additional details.

On April 28, 1999, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Dunkirk, N.Y., Carpenter Technology Corp., Reading, PA, Republic Engineered Steels, Inc., Massillon, OH, Slater Steels Corp., Fort Wayne, IN, Talley Metals Technology, Inc., Hartsville, SC, and the United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC, collectively the petitioners in the less-than-fair value (LTFV) investigation (hereafter petitioners), requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed in the event that the subject merchandise was sold during the POR in the United States through an importer affiliated with the respondent. As all of Aichi's sales to the United States during the POR were through an unaffiliated importer, duty absorption was not an issue.

On May 17, 1999, the petitioners requested that the Department initiate a sales-below-cost investigation of Aichi's home-market sales. On June 28, 1999, based on section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, since we disregarded certain home-market sales below the cost of production (COP) in the 97/98 review, we initiated a cost investigation for this review. See *Stainless Steel Bar From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 64 FR 36333 (July 6, 1999).

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this review is stainless steel bar (SSB). For purposes of this review, the term "stainless steel bar" means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons or other convex polygons. SSB includes cold-finished SSBs that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi-finished products, cut-length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut-length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), wire (*i.e.*, cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), and angles, shapes, and sections.

The SSB subject to this order is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.11.0005, 7222.19.0005, 7222.11.0050, 7222.19.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

United States Price

In calculating the price to the United States, we used export price (EP) as defined in section 772(a) of the Act because the subject merchandise was sold to an unaffiliated U.S. purchaser in the United States prior to the date of importation into the United States and the use of constructed export price was not indicated by the facts of record.

We calculated EP for U.S. sales based on F.O.B. Japan port prices to the United States. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for domestic inland freight, warehousing expenses, and brokerage and handling in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. We used the shipment date as the date of