under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.2580, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6595, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.70.6060, 8708.70.8050, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.5000, 8708.93.6000, 8708.93.75, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.31, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.5800, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

The size or precision grade of a bearing does not influence whether the bearing is covered by the order. For a further discussion of the scope of the order being reviewed, including recent scope determinations, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 63 FR 33320 (June 18, 1998). Although the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

Successorship

According to its July 16, 1999 submission, Tsubakimoto was the surviving company of its merger with Nakashima and is currently operating under the name Tsubaki-Nakashima Co. Since December 17, 1996, Tsubakimoto has been assigned a 7.77 percent antidumping duty cash deposit rate (see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 61 FR 66472 (December 17, 1996)). Thus Tsubaki-Nakashima requested that the Department make a determination that Tsubaki-Nakashima should receive the same antidumping duty treatment as the former Tsubakimoto with respect to ball bearings.

Upon examining the factors of: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base, the Department has determined that the resulting operation of Tsubaki-Nakashima is the same as that of its predecessor, Tsubakimoto, and thus the Department has determined that Tsubaki-Nakashima is the successor-in-interest to Tsubakimoto for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability. For a complete discussion of the basis for this decision, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From Japan; Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed-Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 64 FR 43341 (August 10, 1999).

Comments

Although we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results, none were submitted.

Final Results of Review

We determine that Tsubaki-Nakashima is successor-in-interest to Tsubakimoto and, accordingly, Tsubaki-Nakashima will receive the same antidumping duty treatment as the former Tsubakimoto, *i.e.*, 7.77 percent antidumping duty cash deposit rate. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service accordingly.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and section 351.216 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: September 29, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary For Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–26723 Filed 10–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–549–813]

1997/1998 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand

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 of the final results of the 1997/1998 antidumping duty administrative review of canned pineapple fruit from Thailand. This review covers the period July 1, 1997, through June 30, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 14, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia Thirumalai or Gregory Campbell, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4087 or 482–2239, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for completion of this administrative review until October 29, 1999, because it is not practicable to complete it within the original time limit, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(3)(A)).

Dated: October 4, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I.

[FR Doc. 99–26841 Filed 10–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–820]

Certain Compact Ductile Iron Waterworks Fittings and Glands From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Certain Compact Ductile Iron Waterworks Fittings and Glands (''CDIW'') from the People's Republic of China in response to requests by the respondent, Beijing Metals and Minerals Import and Export Corporation, and its Cheng Hong Foundry (collectively known as ''BMMIEC''). The period of review is September 1, 1997, through August 31, 1998.

We have preliminarily determined that U.S. sales of subject merchandise by BMMIEC have not been made below normal value. Since BMMIEC submitted full responses to the antidumping questionnaire and it has been established that it is sufficiently

independent, it is entitled to a separate rate.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties on entries from BMMIEC.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 14, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyman Armstrong, Jim Terpstra or Paige Rivas, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office IV, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3601, (202) 482–3965, or (202) 482–0651 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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

Background

The Department received a request for review from BMMIEC on September 30, 1997. We published a notice of initiation of this review on October 29, 1997 (63 FR 58010).

On December 1, 1998, we issued an antidumping questionnaire to BMMIEC. The Department received responses to Section A on January 6, 1999 and Sections C and D on February 11, 1999.

We issued a supplemental questionnaire to BMMIEC on March 18, 1999. The response to this supplemental questionnaire was received on April 12, 1999. On April 27, 1999, the Department issued a second supplemental questionnaire to BMMIEC. The response to the second supplemental questionnaire was received on May 5, 1999.

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for issuing a preliminary determination in an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary review within the statutory time limit of 245 days. On May 13, 1999, the Department published a notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in this case to September 30, 1999. *See CDIW From the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Time Limit,* 64 FR 27960 (May 24, 1999).

In August 1999, BMMIEC submitted publicly available information and comments for consideration in valuing the factors of production. On August 16, 1999, BMMIEC submitted revised sales and factors of production data.

Scope of Review

The products subject to this antidumping duty order are (1) certain compact ductile iron waterworks (CDIW) fittings of 3 to 16 inches nominal diameter regardless of shape, including bends, tees, crosses, wyes, reducers, adapters, and other shapes, whether or not cement line, and whether or not covered with bitumen or similar substance, conforming to American Water Works Association/American National Standards Institute (AWWA/ANSI) specification C153/A21.53, and rated for water working pressure of 350 PSI; and (2) certain CDIW standard ductile iron glands for fittings in sizes 3 to 16 inches, conforming to AWWA/ANSI specification C111/A21.11 and rated for water working pressure of 350 PSI. All accessory packs (including accessory packs containing glands), are excluded from the scope of this order.

The types of CDIW fittings covered by this order are compact ductile iron mechanical joint waterworks fittings and compact ductile iron push-on joint waterwork fittings, both of which are used for the same application. CDIW fittings are used to join water main pressure pipes, valves, or hydrants in straight lines, and change, divert, divide, or direct the flow of raw and/or treated water in piping systems. CDIW fittings attach to the pipe, valve, or hydrant at a joint and are used principally for municipal water distribution systems. CDIW glands are used to join mechanical joint CDIW fittings to pipes.

CDIW fittings with nominal diameters greater than 16 inches, are specifically excluded from the scope of the order. Nonmalleable cast iron fittings (also called gray iron fittings) and full-bodied ductile fittings are also specifically excluded from the scope of this order. Nonmalleable cast iron fittings have little ductility and are generally rated only 150 to 250 PSI. Full-bodied ductile fittings have a longer body design than a compact fitting because in the compact design the straight section of the body is omitted to provide a more compact and less heavy fitting without reducing strength or flow characteristics. In addition, the full-bodied ductile fittings are thicker walled than the compact fittings. Full-bodied fittings are made of either gray iron or ductile iron, in sizes of 3 to 48 inches, conform to AWWA/ANSI specification C110/C21.10, and are rated to a maximum of only 250 PSI. In addition, compact ductile iron flanged fittings are excluded from the scope of this order, as they have significantly different characteristics and uses than CDIW fittings.

CDIW fittings are classifiable under subheading 7307.19.30.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Standard ductile iron glands are classifiable under HTSUS subheading 7325.99.10.00. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Separate Rates

It is the Department's policy to assign all exporters of the merchandise subject to review in non-market-economy (NME) countries a single rate, unless an exporter can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to exports. To establish whether an exporter is sufficiently independent of government control to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes the exporter in light of the criteria established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China,* 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China,* 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. Evidence relevant to a *de facto* absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four factors, whether the respondent: (1) Sets its own export prices independent from the government and other exporters; (2) can retain the proceeds from its export sales; (3) has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts; and (4) has autonomy from the government regarding the selection of management. *See Silicon Carbide,* 59 FR at 22587; *see also Sparklers,* 56 FR at 20589.

BMMIEC responded to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates, by providing the requested documentation. We have determined that the evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to BMMIEC's exports, in accordance with the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide*. For further information, *see Separate Rates Memo* dated September 30, 1999. As a result, BMMIEC is entitled to a separate rate.

Export Price

We calculated EP in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and constructed export price (CEP) methodology was not otherwise warranted, based on the facts of record. We calculated EP based on packed, CIF U.S. port, or FOB PRC port, prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States, as appropriate. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for ocean freight services which were provided by market economy suppliers. We also deducted from the starting price, where appropriate, an amount for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling. As these movement services were provided by NME suppliers, we valued them using Indian rates. *See* ''Normal Value'' section below for further discussion.

Normal Value

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine the normal value (NV) using a factors-of-production methodology if: (1) The merchandise is exported from an NME country; and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

The Department has treated the PRC as an NME country in all previous antidumping cases. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Therefore, we treated the PRC as an NME country for purposes of this review. Furthermore, available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home market prices, third country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act. As a result, we calculated NV by valuing the factors of production in a comparable market economy country which is a significant producer of comparable merchandise.

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.408 direct us to select a surrogate country that is economically comparable to the PRC. On the basis of per capita gross domestic product (GDP), the growth rate in per capita GDP, and the national distribution of labor, we find that India is a comparable economy to the PRC. *See Memorandum from Director, Office of Policy, to Office Director, AD/CVD Group II, Office IV*, dated May 21, 1999.

Section 773(c)(4) of the Act also requires that, to the extent possible, the Department use a surrogate country that is a significant producer of merchandise comparable to CDIW. For purposes of the LTFV investigation, we found that India was a significant producer of comparable merchandise. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: CDIW Fittings and Accessories from the People's Republic of China*, 58 FR 37908 (July 14, 1993) (*CDIW Final Determination*). For purposes of this administrative review, we find that India is a producer of CDIW based on information submitted by the respondents in their August 1999 submission. Therefore, we have continued to use India as the surrogate country and have used publicly available information relating to India, unless otherwise noted, to value the various factors of production.

For purposes of calculating NV, we valued PRC factors of production, in accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act. Factors of production include, but are not limited to: hours of labor employed; quantities of raw materials required; amounts of energy and other utilities consumed; and representative capital cost, including depreciation. In examining surrogate values, we selected, where possible, the publicly available value which was: an average non-export value; representative of a range of prices within the POR or most contemporaneous with the POR; product-specific; and tax-exclusive. For a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in calculating various surrogate values, *see Preliminary Results Factors Valuation Memorandum from the Team to the File*, dated September 30, 1999 (*Factors Memorandum*). In accordance with this methodology, we valued the factors of production as follows:

To value sand, bentonite, and graphite, we relied on import prices contained in the September and November 1997, as well as the March 1998, issues of *Indian Import Statistics*. For pig iron, ferrosilicon, limestone, and perlite, we used the import prices contained in the September and November 1997, as well as the March 1998 issues of *Indian Import Statistics*. For ferrosilico manganese, we relied on import prices contained in the September 1997 and March 1998 issues of *Indian Import Statistics*. For coke (hard), we used the November 1997 issue of *Indian Import Statistics*. For firewood and cement, we relied on import prices contained in the April 1997 through March 1998 issues of *Indian Import Statistics*. For those values not contemporaneous with the POR, we adjusted for inflation using the wholesale price indices (WPI) published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We made further adjustments to account for freight costs between the suppliers and BMMIEC's manufacturing facilities.

In accordance with our practice, we added to CIF import values from India a surrogate freight cost using the shorter of the reported distances from either the closest PRC port to the factory, or from the domestic supplier to the factory. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 61977 (November 20, 1997).

We valued labor based on a regression-based wage rate, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3).

For electricity, we relied upon public information from the 1995 edition of *IEA Energy Prices and Taxes* to obtain an average price for electricity provided to industries in India. We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

For the reported packing materials (*i.e.*, bituminous pitch, steel angles and straps, and welding rod), we relied upon Indian import data in the April 1997 through March 1998 issues of *Indian Import Statistics*. We adjusted the values to reflect inflation up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF. Additionally, we adjusted these values to account for freight costs incurred between the suppliers and BMMIEC.

For foreign inland freight, we used the August 1998 truck rate from *Rahul Roadlines*. For foreign brokerage and handling, we used the average of the rates reported in the questionnaire response in the antidumping duty investigation of Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India. *See Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative and New Shipper Review*. 63 FR 48184 (September 9, 1998); *Factors Memorandum*. We adjusted the values to reflect inflation

up to the POR using the WPI published by the IMF.

For factory overhead (FOH), selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit, we relied on the 1997 financial statements of Jayaswal Neco, Ltd, an Indian producer of certain compact ductile iron waterworks fittings and glands, which were submitted by the respondents, because this company is a producer of subject merchandise.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following *de minimis* margin exists for the period September 1, 1997 through August 31, 1998:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Beijing Metals and Minerals Import and Export Corporation	.09

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.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

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 BMMIEC, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for any previously reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporter with a separate rate (including those companies and products where we terminated the review), 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 127.38 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: September 30, 1999.

Robert La Russa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–26721 Filed 10–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–839, A–583–833]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 14, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Kane (Republic of Korea) or Alysia Wilson (Taiwan), AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–2815 or 482–0108, respectively.

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

On April 29, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its notice of initiation of antidumping investigations of certain polyester staple fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan. *See Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan,* 64 FR 23053. The initiation notice stated that we would issue our preliminary determinations by September 9, 1999. On August 25, 1999, at the request of E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc.; Arteva Specialities S.a.r.l., d/b/a KoSa; Wellman, Inc.; and Intercontinental Polymers, Inc. (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''the petitioners'' [1]), the Department extended the preliminary determinations until no later than September 29, 1999. *See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan,* 64 FR 47766 (September 1, 1999). On September 29, 1999, at the request of petitioners, the Department extended the preliminary determinations until no later than October 4, 1999.[2]

Based on petitioners' September 29, 1999 request, we are further extending the determinations in these investigations until no later than October 29, 1999.

This extension and notice are in accordance with section 733(c) of the Act.

Dated: October 4, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–26722 Filed 10–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Corrected Preliminary Results of Full Sunset Review: Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel [C–508–605]

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

ACTION: Notice of Correction to Preliminary Results of Full Sunset

[1] E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc. is not a petitioner in the Taiwan case.

[2] At the time this notice was prepared, the postponement of the preliminary determination until October 4, 1999 had not yet been published in the **Federal Register**.