

Mexico S.A. (TAMSA), did not submit any ministerial error allegations.

The Department has reviewed its preliminary calculations and agrees with the petitioners, in part, that the Department made certain ministerial errors within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.224(f) and (g). The Department inadvertently deducted from the home market price two imputed credit expenses. We intended to deduct only one credit expense from each home market sale. Further, since we were able to match U.S. sales to NV at the same LOT, no CEP offset should have been made. However, we disagree with the petitioners' allegation concerning the currency conversion applied in one of the imputed credit expense calculations. See "Ministerial Error Allegations for the Preliminary Determination" memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration, Group II, dated February 24, 2000, on file in room B-099 of the Main Commerce building.

As a result of our analysis of the petitioners' allegations, we are amending our preliminary determination to revise the antidumping rate for TAMSA in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(e), along with the corresponding correction to the "all others" rate, as listed below. Suspension of liquidation will be revised accordingly and parties shall be notified of this determination, in accordance with sections 733(d) and (f) of the Act.

The revised weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
TAMSA	14.20
All Others	14.20

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-6266 Filed 3-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-817]

Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 14, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Phyllis Hall at (202) 482-1398 or Dena Aliadinov at (202) 482-2667, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On September 9, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico, covering the period August 1, 1998 through July 31, 1999 (64 FR 48983). The preliminary results are currently due no later than May 2, 2000.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than August 30, 2000. See Decision Memorandum from Richard Weible to

Joseph A. Spetrini, dated March 8, 2000, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Commerce building. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 8, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III.

[FR Doc. 00-6268 Filed 3-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 14, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley at (202) 482-0631, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On August 24, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department)

published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand, covering the period July 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999 (64 FR 47167). The preliminary results are currently due no later than April 3, 2000.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit for the reasons stated in our memorandum from Gary Taverman to Holly Kuga, dated March 6, 2000, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Commerce building. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than July 31, 2000. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 6, 2000.

Holly Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-6267 Filed 3-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-833]

Stainless Steel Bar From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping administrative review.

SUMMARY: On November 8, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Japan. This review covers one producer/exporter, Aichi Steel Corporation, during the period February 1, 1998, through January 31, 1999.

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 14, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Minoo Hatten or Robin Gray, Office 3 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 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 of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

On November 9, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Japan. *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Stainless Steel Bar from Japan*, 64 FR 60788 (preliminary results). Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Dunkirk, NY; 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 petitioners in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation (hereafter petitioners), submitted their case brief on December 8, 1999. Aichi Steel Corporation (Aichi), respondent in this review, also submitted its case brief on December 8, 1999. The petitioners and Aichi submitted rebuttal briefs on December 13, 1999. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

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 7222.10.0005, 7222.10.0050, 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.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by interested parties to this administrative review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memo) from Richard W. Moreland, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to Robert S. La Russa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated March 6, 2000, which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference into this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memo, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in B-099. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/frn/. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Sales Below Cost in the Home Market

The Department disregarded Aichi's home-market below-cost sales which failed the cost test in these final results of review.