with the core and are referred to as ''topical modules.''

The topical modules for the 2000 Panel Wave 3 collect information about:

- Medical Expenses and Utilization of Health Care
- Work Related Expenses and Child Support Paid
- Assets, Liabilities, and Eligibility

Wave 3 interviews will be conducted from October 2000 through January 2001.

II. Method of Collection

The SIPP is designed as a continuing series of national panels of interviewed households that are introduced every few years with each panel having durations of 1 to 4 years. All household members 15 years old or over are interviewed using regular proxy-respondent rules. During the 2000 panel, respondents are interviewed at least three times (3 waves) at 4-month intervals making the SIPP a longitudinal survey. Sample people (all household members present at the time of the first interview) who move within the country and reasonably close to a SIPP primary sampling unit will be followed and interviewed at their new address. Individuals 15 years old or over who enter the household after Wave 1 will be interviewed; however, if these individuals move, they are not followed unless they happen to move along with a Wave 1 sample individual.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0607–0865.

Form Number: SIPP/CAPI Automated Instrument.

Type of Review: Regular.

Affected Public: Individuals or Households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 24,150.

Estimated Time Per Response: 30 minutes per person.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 37,658.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: The only cost to respondents is their time.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Legal Authority: Title 13, United States Code, Section 182.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 1, 2000.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–5452 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–817]

Electroluminescent Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor From Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Sunset Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty sunset review.

SUMMARY: On August 2, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the notice of initiation of sunset review of the antidumping duty order on electroluminescent (''EL'') high information content flat panel displays (''FPD'') and display glass therefor from Japan. The merchandise covered by this order is EL FPDs. On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in this case no response) from respondent interested parties, we determined to conduct an expedited sunset review. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we find that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of the Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5050.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders,* 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) (''*Sunset Regulations*''), and 19 CFR Part 351 (1999) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department 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 August 2, 1999, the Department published the notice of initiation of sunset review of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs (64 FR 41915). We invited parties to comment. On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive response filed on behalf of a domestic interested party, and inadequate response (in this case no response) from respondent interested parties, we determined to conduct an expedited sunset review. The Department has conducted this sunset review in accordance with sections 751 and 752 of the Act.

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 covers a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, on December 3, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs from Japan is extraordinarily complicated and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than February 28, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.[1]

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this order is EL FPDs. EL FPDs are large area, matrix addressed displays, no greater than four inches in depth, with a pixel count of 120,000 or greater, whether complete or incomplete, assembled or unassembled. EL FPDs

[1] *Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews,* 64 FR 67847 (December 3, 1999).

incorporate a matrix of electrodes that, when activated, apply an electrical current to a solid compound of electroluminescent material (*e.g.,* zinc sulfide) causing it to emit light. Included are monochromatic, limited color, and full color displays used to display text, graphics, and video. EL FPD glass, whether or not integrated with additional components, exclusively dedicated to and designed for use in EL FPDs, is defined as processed glass substrates that incorporate patterned row, column, or both types of electrodes, and also typically incorporate a material that reacts to a change in voltage (*e.g.,* phosphor) and contact pads for interconnecting drive electronics. All types of FPDs described above are currently classifiable under subheadings 8543, 8803, 9013, 9014, 9017.90.00, 9018, 9022, 9026, 9027, 9030, 9031, 8471.92.30, 8471.92.40, 8473.10.00, 8473.21.00, 8473.30.40, 8442,40.00, 8466, 8517.90.00, 8528.10.80, 8529.90.00, 8531.20.00, 8531.90.00, and 8541 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Since the issuance of the order on EL FPDs from Japan, the Department clarified that certain that certain EL FPDs used in Graphic Control Panels models GP–410 and GP–430 are within the scope of the order (*see Notice of Scope Rulings,* 59 FR 8910 (February 24, 1994)).

Although domestic interested parties suggested that other scope rulings on FPDs, particularly those involving Sharp, may be related to this order, our review of those scope rulings reveal they were not.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the substantive response 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 Robert S. LaRussa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated February 28, 2000 which is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference into 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 the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in B–099.

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/, under the heading ''Japan''. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Sharp Corporation	7.02
All Others	7.02

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 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.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: February 28, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–5508 Filed 3–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–047]

Elemental Sulphur From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review of elemental sulphur from Canada.

SUMMARY: On September 7, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results and partial rescission of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on elemental sulphur from Canada (64 FR 48587). This review covers Husky Oil, Ltd. (''Husky''), a manufacturer and exporter, and Petrosul International, Ltd. (''Petrosul''), a reseller, of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have modified our determination for the final results with respect to Petrosul. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of the Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon Farlander or Rick Johnson, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0182 or (202) 482–3818, 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 Rounds Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On September 7, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 48587) the preliminary results and partial rescission of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on elemental sulphur from Canada (''*Preliminary Results*''). This review covers Husky Oil, Ltd. (''Husky''), a manufacturer and exporter, and Petrosul International, Ltd. (''Petrosul''), a reseller, of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (''POR'') is December 1, 1997, through November 30, 1998. We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review.

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit. On December 22, 1999, the Department extended the time limit for the final results in this review to January 21, 2000. *See Elemental Sulphur From Canada: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of the Antidumping Duty*