Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3814 or (202) 482–5346, respectively.

POSTPONEMENT OF PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION: On November 18, 1998, the Department initiated the antidumping duty investigation of imports of DRAMs from Taiwan. The notice of initiation stated that we would issue our preliminary determination by April 1, 1999 (63 FR 60404, November 18, 1998).

On February 18, 1999, petitioner, Micron Technology, Inc., made a timely request pursuant to19 CFR 351.205(e) of the Department's regulations for a postponement of the preliminary determination, pursuant to section 733(c)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Petitioner requested a postponement in order to allow additional time for the Department to analyze the anticipated voluminous, and unusually complex, sales and cost of production issues in this investigation.

For the reasons identified by petitioner, we are postponing the preliminary determination under section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act (*See* memorandum from Holly Kuga to Robert LaRussa, dated February 26, 1999). We will make our preliminary determination no later than May 21, 1999.

This notice is published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f).

Dated: February 26, 1999.

Holly Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–5394 Filed 3–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–837]

Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, From Japan: Postponement of Preliminary Results of the First and Second Administrative Reviews of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in the first and second administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on large newspaper printing presses from Japan.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the first and second administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on large newspaper printing presses from Japan. These reviews cover the period September 5, 1996, through August 31, 1998 for Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (''MHI'')[1] and for the period September 1, 1997, through August 31, 1998 for Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho (''TKS'').[2]

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 4, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kate Johnson, at (202) 482–4929, or Dinah McDougall, at (202) 482–3773, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20230.

POSTPONEMENT OF PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW: The Department initiated reviews of the antidumping duty order on LNPP from Japan on October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58009) for MHI, and on November 30, 1998 (63 FR 6548) for TKS. The current deadline for the preliminary results in these reviews is June 2, 1999. In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the first and second administrative reviews of the antidumping order on large newspaper printing presses from Japan within this time limit. Specifically, the Department finds that additional time is needed to adequately consider the complexity of the issues involved in these reviews. (*See* memorandum from Holly Kuga to Robert LaRussa, dated February 26, 1999). Thus the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of these reviews until September 30, 1999, which is 365 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the order. The final determination will occur within 120 days of the publication of the preliminary results.

Dated: February 26, 1999.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–5395 Filed 3–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] The initiation of the first administrative review of this antidumping duty order on LNPPs from Japan with respect to MHI (covering the period September 5, 1996 through August 31, 1997) was deferred at the request of the petitioner, until the initiation of the second administrative review (covering the period September 1, 1997 through August 31, 1998). Thus both reviews with respect to MHI are being conducted concurrently.

[2] There was no request for an administrative review of the LNPP order with respect to TKS for the period September 5, 1996 through August 31, 1997.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–847]

Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Postponement of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending by 120 days the time limit of the preliminary results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period December 27, 1996, through June 30, 1998, since it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 4, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sunkyu Kim, at (202) 482–2613; or James M. Nunno II, at (202) 482–0783, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

POSTPONEMENT OF PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF REVIEW: Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to make a preliminary determination in an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act provides that when it is not practicable to complete the review within the specified time period, the Department may extend this time period by 120 days. We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time frame. *See* Decision Memorandum from Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, to Robert S. LaRussa, Assistant Secretary. Accordingly, the deadline for issuing the preliminary results of this review is now due no later than July 31, 1999. In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we plan to issue the final results of this administrative review within 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

Dated: February 26, 1999.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–5397 Filed 3–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–833]

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

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Japan in response to a request from a respondent, Aichi Steel Works, Ltd. This review covers the period February 1, 1997, through January 31, 1998.

We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 4, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Minoo Hatten or Robin Gray, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–1690 or (202) 482–4023, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, 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 (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 February 27, 1998, the Department received a request from Aichi Steel Works, Ltd. (Aichi) to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from Japan. On March 23, 1998, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of Aichi, covering the period February 1, 1997, through January 31, 1998, in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 13837).

On May 29, 1998, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Dunkirk, N.Y., 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), requested that the Department conduct an investigation to determine if Aichi made sales at prices below its cost of production (COP) during the 1997–1998 review period.

On July 10, 1998, based on petitioners' allegation and the evidence on the record, the Department determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Aichi made sales at prices below its COP, in accordance with section 773(b)(2) (A)(i) of the Act, and initiated a COP investigation of Aichi pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act (see the Memorandum To File (July 10, 1998) located in Room B–099 of the main Commerce building).

On September 28, 1998, the Department conducted a sales verification using standard verification procedures. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report (*see* verification report from analysts to file, dated December 21, 1998).

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 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, groves, 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.

United States Price

In calculating the price to the United States, we used export price (EP) as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to an unaffiliated U.S. purchaser in the United States prior to the date of importation into the United States and the use of constructed export price was not indicated by the facts of record.

We calculated EP for U.S. sales based on F.O.B. Japan port prices to the United States. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for domestic inland freight, warehousing expenses, and brokerage and handling, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

Aichi claimed that an upward adjustment to EP was appropriate to account for a ''duty drawback'' program. As stated in Certain Welded Carbon Standard Steel Pipes and Tubes from India (62 FR 47632, 47635, September 10, 1997), ''we determine whether an adjustment to U.S. price for a respondent's claimed duty drawback is appropriate when the respondent can demonstrate that it meets both parts of our two-part test. There must be: (1) a sufficient link between the import duty