case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument and (3) a table of authorities. Further, we would appreciate it if parties submitting written comments would provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, if requested, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

#### **Assessment Rate**

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department calculated an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise. Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer-specific assessment rates calculated in the final results are above de minimis (i.e., at or above 0.5 percent) the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries by applying the assessment rate to the entered value of the merchandise. For assessment purposes, we calculated importerspecific assessment rates for the subject merchandise by aggregating the dumping margins for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing the amount by the total entered value of the sales to that importer. Where appropriate, in order to calculate the entered value, we subtracted international movement expenses (e.g., international freight) from the gross sales value.

### **Cash Deposit Requirements**

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each producer and/or exporter included in this administrative review, we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales during the review period.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of certain pasta from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Filiz will be

zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value ("LTFV") investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 51.49 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation. See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey, 61 FR 38546 (July 24, 1996).

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

# **Notification to Importers**

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: July 31, 2000.

# Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–19947 Filed 8–7–00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

# International Trade Administration [A-489-805]

Certain Pasta From Turkey: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 8, 2000.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cindy Robinson or Darla Brown, AD/ CVD Enforcement, Office VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3797 or (202) 482–2849, respectively.

# **Time Limits**

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department of Commerce (the Department) to make a preliminary determination within 180 days after the date on which the review is initiated and a final determination within 90 days after the date the preliminary determination is issued. However, if the Department concludes that the case is extraordinarily complicated such that it cannot complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 300 days and 150 days for the final determination from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

# Background

On February 23, 2000, the Department published a notice of initiation of new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Turkey, covering the period July 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999 (65 FR 8949). The preliminary results are currently due no later than August 9, 2000.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that this case is extraordinarily complicated. Consequently, we are not able to complete the preliminary results of this review within the time limit. Therefore the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results for the full 120 days, until no later than December 7, 2000. See Decision Memorandum from Melissa Skinner to Holly Kuga, dated July 24, 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 90 days after the publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

Dated: July 28, 2000.

#### Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, Group II.

[FR Doc. 00–20030 Filed 8–7–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

# **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; Amended Final Results of 1990/1991, 1991/1992, and 1992/1993 Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, United States Department of Commerce. ACTION: Notice of amended final results of administrative reviews.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Court of International Trade and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit have affirmed the Department of Commerce's final remand results affecting final assessment rates for the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China. The periods of review are June 1, 1990 through May 31, 1991, June 1, 1991 through May 31, 1992, and June 1, 1992 through May 31, 1993. As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in these cases. we are amending the final results of reviews and we will instruct the

Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these reviews.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 8, 2000.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George Callen or Robin Gray, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0180 or (202) 482–4023, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Applicable Statute**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions in effect as of December 31, 1994. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR part 353 (1995).

## **Background**

On December 13, 1996, the Department published final results of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (TRBs), from the People's Republic of China covering the periods June 1, 1990 through May 31, 1991, June 1, 1991 through May 31, 1992, and June 1, 1992 through May 31, 1993. See Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China, Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 61 FR 65527 (December 13, 1996) (Final Results).

The Peer Bearing Company and the Timken Company contested the

Department's decision in the Final *Results.* In issuing its decision in this case, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) instructed the Department to make the following changes to its margin calculations for the Final Results: (1) change the bestinformation-available (BIA) rate for Chin Jun Industrial, Ltd. (Chin Jun), (2) correct a clerical error in the calculation of inland freight, (3) recalculate marine insurance expense on a value, rather than weight, basis, and (4) recalculate the exporter's-sales-price (ESP) offset of foreign market value (FMV). See Peer Bearing Company v. United States, Consol. Court No. 97-01-00023, Slip Op. 98-70 (CIT May 27, 1998). The Department issued final results of redetermination on remand on August 26, 1998, and the CIT affirmed the Department's final remand results. See Peer Bearing Company v. United States, Slip Op. 98-161 (CIT December 7, 1998) aff'd mem., sub nom. The Timken Co. v. United States, No. 99-1204 (Fed. Cir. October 6, 1999). As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending our final results of reviews, and we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these reviews.

#### **Amendment to Final Results**

Pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Act, we are now amending the final results of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the People's Republic of China for the periods of review 6/90 through 5/91, 6/91 through 5/92, and 6/92 through 5/93. The revised weighted-average margins are as follows:

Company	6/90 through 5/91	6/91 through 5/92	6/92 through 5/93
Premier Bearing and Equipment, Ltd	<sup>1</sup> 4.24	<sup>1</sup> 5.251	<sup>1</sup> 5.25
Guizhou Machinery Import and Export Corporation	2.59	<sup>1</sup> 3.70	0.00
Henan Machinery and Equipment Import and Export Corporation	0.00	0.14	0.00
Luoyang Bearing Factory	1.14	0.00	0.00
Shanghai General Bearing Company, Ltd.	0.00	0.00	0.25
Jilin Machinary Import and Export Corporation	4.21	5.04	0.00
Chin Jun Industrial, Ltd.	<sup>2</sup> 7.07	0.48	1.23
Wafangdian Bearing Factory	<sup>2</sup> 7.07	6.15	No Sales
Lianoning Co., Ltd.	<sup>2</sup> 7.07	3.47	0.73
PRC rate	7.07	7.07	7.07

<sup>1</sup> As cooperative BIA, we assigned in each review the higher of (1) the highest rate ever applicable to that company in the investigation or any previous review; or (2) the highest calculated margin for any respondent in the same review.

Accordingly, the Department will determine and the Customs Service will assess appropriate antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise exported by firms covered by these reviews. We will instruct the Customs Service to apply 7.07 percent in its liquidation of entries from companies to which we assigned a BIA rate or which did not receive a separate rate.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>This party did not respond to the questionnaire or did not respond to the supplemental questionnaire; therefore, as uncooperative BIA, we assigned the highest rate calculated in the investigation or in this or any other review of sales of subject merchandise from the PRC. This does not constitute a separate-rate finding for this firm.