SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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 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 gray portland cement and cement clinker from Japan (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 is conducting 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 concerns 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 gray portland cement and cement clinker 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 products covered by this order are gray portland cement and cement clinker (''portland cement'') from Japan. Gray portland cement is a hydraulic cement and the primary component of concrete. Cement clinker, an intermediate material produced when manufacturing cement, has no use other than grinding into finished cement. Microfine cement was specifically excluded from the antidumping duty order. Gray portland cement is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (''HTS'') item number 2523.29, and cement clinker is currently classifiable under HTS item number 2523.10. Gray portland cement has also been entered under item number 2523.90 as *other hydraulic cements.* The Department made two scope rulings regarding the subject merchandise.[2]

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in substantive responses 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 Joseph A. Spetrini Acting Assistant Secretary, 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 Memo 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)
Nihon	69.89
Onoda	70.52
All others	70.23

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 section 751(c), 752, and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: February 28, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–5213 Filed 3–2–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

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

[2] *See Scope Rulings,* 57 FR 19602 (May 7, 1992), classes G and H of *oil well cement* are within the scope of the order; and *Scope Rulings,* 58 FR 27542 (May 10, 1993), nittetsu super fine cements is not within the scope of the order.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–601]

Tapered Roller Bearings From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Full Sunset Review:

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Tapered Roller Bearings from the Peoples Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On October 22, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings (''TRBs'') from the People's Republic of China (64 FR 57034) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). We provided interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from both domestic and respondent interested parties and held a public hearing. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of this order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1930 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

Effective Date: March 3, 2000.

Statute and Regulations:

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of 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 in 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'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 October 22, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** a notice of preliminary results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). In our preliminary results, we found that revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. In addition, we preliminarily determined the following margins likely to prevail if the order were revoked:

Producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Zheijiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co. (''ZCCBC'')	0.00
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''CMC'')	0.03
Zheijiang Wanxiang Group	0.03
Zheijiang Machinery Import & Export Corp	0.11
Luoyang	3.20
Premier	5.43
Liaoning	9.72
Guizhou Machinery	21.79
Wafangdian	29.40
Jilin	29.40
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''CMEC'')	29.40
Guizhou Automotive	29.40
Tianshui Hailin	29.40
Xiangyiang	29.40
Xibei	29.40
All Others	29.40

On December 7, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.209(c)(1)(i), we received a case brief on behalf of domestic interested parties, The Timken Company (''Timken'') and The Torrington Company (''Torrington'') (collectively ''domestic interested parties''). We also received a case brief on behalf of Zheijiang Machinery Import & Export Corporation (''Zheijiang Machinery''); Liaoning Mec Group, Ltd. (''Liaoning''); Luoyang Bearing Corporation (Group) (''Luoyang''); Zheijiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co., Ltd. (''ZCCBC''); Zheijiang Wanxiang Group (''Wanxiang''); China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation (''CMC''); [1] Xibei Bearing Group Import & Export Co., Ltd. (''Xibei''); Xiangyiang Bearing Factory (''Xiangyiang''); and the China TRB Sunset Coalition (''China Coalition'') (collectively ''respondent interested parties''). On December 13, 1999, within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.309(d), the Department received rebuttal comments from domestic and respondent interested parties. On December 15, 1999, the Department held a public hearing.

Scope of Review

The merchandise covered by this antidumping duty order (52 FR 22667, June 15, 1987) includes TRBs and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the PRC; flange, take up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. The subject merchandise was originally classified under item numbers 680.30, 680.39, 681.10, 692.32 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (''TSUSA''); currently, according to the U.S. Customs Service, they are classifiable under item numbers 8482.20.00.10, 8482.20.00.20, 8482.20.00.30, 8482.20.00.40, 8482.20.00.50, 8482.20.00.60, 8482.20.00.70, 8482.20.00.80, 8482.91.00.50, 8482.99.15.00, 8482.99.15.40, 8482.99.15.80, 8483.20.40.80, 8483.20.80.80, 8483.30.80.20, 8708.99.80.15 and 8708.99.80.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') (*see* June 8, 1999, Memorandum to File: HTSUS Numbers for Tapered Roller Bearings). Although the above HTSUS and TSUSA subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

In the ninth administrative review (62 FR 61276, 61289, November 17, 1997), the Department clarified the scope of the order when it added two additional HTSUS numbers (8708.99.90.15 and 8708.99.80.80) applicable to imports of the subject merchandise which previously had not been identified in the order. The above HTSUS numbers correspond to subject merchandise previously classified under TSUSA item number 692.32 in the original antidumping order. We note that scope rulings are made on an order-wide basis.

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 Robert S. La Russa, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated February 25, 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 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/, under the heading ''China.'' 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 TRBs from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturer/exporters	Margin (percent)
Producer/Exporter:	
Zheijiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co. (''ZCCBC'')	0.00
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''CMC'')	0.03
Zheijiang Wanxiang Group	0.03
Zheijiang Machinery Import & Export Corp.	0.11
Luoyang	3.20
Premier	5.43
Liaoning	9.72
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''CMEC'')	29.40
All Others	29.40

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

[1] CMC is a different and distinct company from CMEC.

Dated: February 25, 2000.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–5211 Filed 3–2–00; 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: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 3, 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.

Time Limits

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within these time periods, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On July 29, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, from Hungary, covering the period June 1, 1998 through May 31, 1999 (64 FR 41075). The preliminary results are currently due no later than February 29, 2000.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than June 28, 2000. *See* Decision Memorandum from Edward C. Yang to Joseph A. Spetrini, dated February 25, 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 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results notice.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: February 25, 2000.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 00–5214 Filed 3–2–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–823–802]

Uranium From Ukraine; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Uranium from Ukraine.

SUMMARY: On August 2, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on uranium from Ukraine (64 FR 41915) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1930 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 3, 2000.

Statute and Regulations

This review is being conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of 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 in 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'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 August 2, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on uranium from Ukraine (64 FR 41915), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received Notices of Intent to Participate on behalf of domestic interested parties, the Ad Hoc Committee of Domestic Uranium Producers (''the Ad Hoc Committee''), including Rio Algom Mining Corporation (''Rio Algom'') and Uranium Resources Inc. (''URI''),[1] USEC, Inc. and its subsidiary, the United States Enrichment Corporation (collectively, ''USEC''), and Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, AFL–CIO (''PACE''), within the applicable deadline (August 17, 1999) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. On August 27, 1999, we received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of the Ad Hoc Utilities Group (''AHUG'').[2] The Ad Hoc Committee claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as the only

[1] The Ad Hoc Committee included Cotter corporation in its Notice of Intent to Participate; however, Cotter Corporation was not included in the Ad Hoc Committee's substantive response of September 1, 1999.

[2] AHUG consists of Ameren UE, Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., Carolina Power and Light Co., Commonwealth Edison Co., Consumers Energy, Duke Power Co., Entergy Services, Inc., FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Co., Florida Power and Light Co., Northern States Power Co., PECO Energy Co., Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Texas Utilities Electric Co., and Virginia Power.