instituted, sunset reviews (64 FR 53320 and 64 FR 53412, respectively) of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from the PRC and India, and the countervailing duty order on sulfanilic acid from India, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of its reviews, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail were the orders to be revoked.[1] In addition, the Department determined that revocation of the countervailing duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of countervailable subsidies and notified the Commission of the net countervailable subsidies likely to prevail were the order revoked.[2]

On May 26, 2000, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from the PRC and India, and the countervailing duty order on sulfanilic acid from India, would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (*see Sulfanilic Acid from China and India,* 65 FR 34232 (May 26, 2000) and USITC Publication 3301, Investigations Nos. 701–TA–318 (Review), and 731–TA–538 and 561 (Review) (May 2000)).

Scope of the Orders

The products covered by these orders are all grades of sulfanilic acid from the PRC and India, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid (sodium sulfanilate). The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry free flowing powders. Technical sulfanilic acid contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Sodium salt of sulfanilic acid (sodium sulfanilate) is a granular or crystalline material containing 75 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content. The merchandise is classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') subheadings 2921.42.22 and 2921. 42.24.20.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these orders are dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of these antidumping and countervailing duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from the PRC and India, and the countervailing duty order on sulfanilic acid from India. The Department will instruct the Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping and countervailing duty deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of continuation of these orders will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this Notice of Continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) and 751(c)(6) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than May 2005.

Dated: June 2, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–14499 Filed 6–7–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] See Sulfanilic Acid From India and The People's Republic of China, 65 FR 6156 (February 8, 2000).

[2] See Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Sulfanilic Acid From India, 65 FR 6171 (February 8, 2000), as amended, Notice of Correction to Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Sulfanilic Acid From India, 65 FR 18070 (April 6, 2000).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–836]

Glycine From the People's Republic of China; 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: Glycine from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On February 3, 2000, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the notice of initiation of sunset review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (''PRC'') (65 FR 5308), 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 response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties 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: June 8, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eun W. Cho or Carole Showers, 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) 482–1698 or (202) 482–3217, respectively.

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 February 3, 2000, the Department published the notice of initiation of sunset review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the PRC (64 FR 67247). We invited parties to comment. On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive response 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 sunset review. The Department is conducting this sunset review in accordance with sections 751 and 752 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this order is glycine, which is a free-flowing crystalline material, like salt or sugar. Glycine is produced at varying levels of purity and is used as a sweetener/taste enhancer, a buffering agent, re-absorbable amino acid, chemical intermediate, and a metal complexing agent. Glycine is currently classified under subheading 2922.49.4020 of the Harmonized Tariff schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). The scope of this order includes glycine of all purity levels. In a separate scope ruling, the Department determined that D(-)Phenylglycine Ethyl Dane Salt is outside the scope of the order.[1]

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

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 Troy H. Cribb, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated June 2, 2000, which is hereby adopted by 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 room B–099, the Central Records Unit, 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. 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 margin:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
PRC-wide	155.59

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 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials 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: June 2, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–14500 Filed 6–7–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] See Notice of Scope Rulings, 62 FR 62288 (November 21, 1997).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–506]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty new shipper review.

SUMMARY: On November 30, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods (''OCTG'') from Canada. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Atlas Tube, Inc. (''Atlas''), and the period June 1, 1998 through November 30, 1998.

We received comments by petitioners, Lone Star Steel Company and Maverick Tube Corporation, (collectively ''the petitioners''), and rebuttal comments from Atlas. Based on our analysis of comments received and corrections from verification, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below, in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 8, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Manning or Nithya Nagarajan, 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) 482–3936 or (202) 482–5253, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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

Background

On November 30, 1999, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on OCTG from Canada (64 FR 66886). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter. The period of review (''POR'') is June 1, 1998 through November 30, 1998. We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. None of the interested parties requested a public hearing; therefore, none was held. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review include shipments of OCTG from Canada. This includes American Petroleum Institute (''API'') specification OCTG and all other pipe with the following characteristics except entries which the Department determined through its end-use certification procedure were not used in OCTG applications: Length of at least 16 feet; outside diameter of standard sizes published in the API or proprietary specifications for OCTG with tolerances of plus ⅛ inch for diameters less than or equal to 8⅝ inches and plus ¼ inch for diameters greater than 8⅝ inches, minimum wall thickness as identified for a given outer diameter as published in the API or proprietary specifications for OCTG; a minimum of 40,000 PSI yield strength and a minimum 60,000 PSI tensile strength; and if with seams, must be electric resistance welded.