

Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to 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 regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1999). 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*").

Background

On November 2, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from the PRC (64 FR 59160), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of American Silicon Technologies ("AST"), Elkem Metals Company ("Elkem"), and Globe Metallurgical Inc. ("Globe") (collectively, "domestic interested parties"), within the applicable deadline (November 15, 1999) specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). Domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. producers of a domestic like product.

On December 1, 1999, we received a complete substantive response from domestic interested parties, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). Domestic interested parties claim that, in 1990, Elkem, Globe, and four other domestic producers filed the petition that resulted in the issuance of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from the PRC (*see* December 1, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 2). Domestic interested parties also claim that at least one of them has actively participated in each of the administrative reviews conducted by the Department, as well as in the new shipper review rescinded on July 28, 1999. *Id.* at 3. Without a substantive response from respondent interested parties, the Department, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day review of this order.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an order in effect on January 1, 1995). This review concerns a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Accordingly, on February 29, 2000, the Department determined that the sunset review of silicon metal from the PRC is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than May 30, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.¹

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this review is silicon metal containing at least 96.00 percent, but less than 99.99 percent of silicon by weight. Also covered by this review is silicon metal containing between 89.00 and 96.00 percent silicon by weight but which contains a higher aluminum content than the silicon metal containing at least 96.00 percent but less than 99.99 percent silicon by weight (58 FR 27542, May 10, 1993). Silicon metal is currently provided for under subheadings 2804.69.10 and 2804.69.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") as a chemical product, but is commonly referred to as a metal. Semiconductor-grade silicon (silicon metal containing by weight not less than 99.99 percent of silicon and provided for in subheading 2804.61.00 of the HTS) is not subject to this order. Although the HTS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this sunset review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memo") from Jeffrey A. May, Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Troy H. Cribb, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 30, 2000, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and

¹ See *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Expedited Five-Year Reviews*, 65 FR 11761 (March 6, 2000).

the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo 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 Memo are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from the PRC would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margin:

Manufacturer/exporters	Margin (percent)
All Chinese producers/exporters	139.49

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 30, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-14028 Filed 6-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-437-601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Hungary: 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: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is rescinding the June

1, 1998 through May 31, 1999 antidumping duty administrative review of tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from Hungary.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 5, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elfi Blum at (202) 482-0197, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Scope of the Review

This antidumping review covers tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (TRBs), from the Republic of Hungary. The merchandise under review is currently classified under subheadings 8482.20.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.15, 8482.99.45, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, and 8483.90.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Rescission of 1998-99 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

On July 29, 1999, in response to a request by Daewoo-MGM Rt., the Department published a Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Administrative Reviews (64 FR 41075). Daewoo-MGM Rt. was the only party which requested a review. On March 20, 2000, Daewoo-MGM Rt. withdrew its request for review. We are therefore rescinding this review in its entirety in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) of the Act and § 351.213(d)(1) of our regulations.

The rescission of this review does not affect the reclassification of the Republic of Hungary to market economy status for antidumping purposes (see Decision Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa on *Market vs. Non-Market Economy Analysis of the Republic of Hungary*, dated February 23, 2000). This notice is published in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1677(f) and § 351.213(d)(4) of our regulations.

Dated: May 26, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-14021 Filed 6-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Coastal Zone Management: Federal Consistency Appeal by Mobil Oil Exploration and Producing Southeast, Inc.; Consistency Appeal of Objections by the State of North Carolina

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

ACTION: Notice of decision.

On September 2, 1994, the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) declined to override two objections by the State of North Carolina to the proposed drilling discharges (PDD) and overall Plan of Exploration (POE) by Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc. (Mobil) at a site about 38 miles offshore North Carolina. The Secretary made these decisions pursuant to section 307(c)(3) of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). Mobil challenged the Secretary's decisions in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia claiming they were made in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. On March 11, 1996, the court ordered a stay of the litigation and remanded the matter to the Secretary for a determination whether the administrative record should be reopened to receive two recently produced studies, one on the impacts of Mobil's proposed actions on benthic resources and one on their impacts on socio-economic resources. *Mobil, et al. v. Brown, et al.*, 920 F. Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1996).

The Secretary's decision was held in abeyance pending settlement discussions and the outcome of related litigation.

On December 8, 1999, the Secretary issued a decision declining to reopen the record to admit the two studies at issue in *Mobil v. Brown*, for two reasons. First, both this Department and parties to appeals under the CZMA have an interest in the finality of Secretarial decisions and the administrative process. Once the administrative record is closed, a decision should be made, and new materials should not be submitted or considered without a showing of good cause. No good cause was shown in this case. Second, the two studies do not address all of the

information gaps identified by the Secretary's 1994 decisions. The Secretary's decision has been submitted to the District Court in response to the court's order in *Mobil v. Brown*. Copies of the decision may be obtained from:

Karl Gleaves, Assistant General Counsel for Ocean Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce, 1305 East-West Highway, Room 6111, Silver Spring, MD 20910, (301) 713-2967.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog No. 11.419 Coastal Zone Management Program Assistance)

Dated: May 26, 2000.

James A. Dorskind,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 00-13971 Filed 6-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Request for Comments on Issues Related to Policies and Agenda for the National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council

AGENCIES: U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, as Co-Chairs, National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council.

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Members of the National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council (the Council) seek public comment on issues associated with the Council's mission. Interested members of the public are invited to present written comments on any of the topics outlined in the Supplementary Information section of this Notice.

DATES: All comments are due by June 20, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to offer written comments should address those comments to Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Box 4, Washington, D.C. 20231, marked to the attention of Elizabeth Shaw. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile transmission to (703) 305-8885, or by electronic mail through the Internet to elizabeth.shaw@uspto.gov. All comments will be maintained for public inspection in Room 902, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Shaw by telephone at (703)