under section 751 of the Act or determination under section 753 of the Act, or (4) any other information placed on the record. We have determined to use the highest rate determined in any segment of the proceeding, 44.20 percent.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information using independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. No. 103–316, 870 (1994) (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. *See* SAA, at 870.

In accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, to corroborate secondary information the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. In this case, we have chosen to use the highest rate from any segment of the proceeding, which has been the ''all others rate'' throughout this proceeding, was used as the best information available rate for Nippon and Sumitomo in the investigation, and was used as the adverse FA rate for NKK in a previous review of this order (see OCTG Review 1). We corroborated the rate, which was originally taken from the petition, in OCTG Review 1, explaining: ''That rate was based upon the difference between U.S. price of a representative OCTG product sold by one Japanese company and constructed value for that product. Our review of the information in the original petition pertaining to the price of the product and to the major inputs (*e.g.*, iron ore, coke, scrap) and processes (ironmaking, steelmaking, and bloom and pipe production) used for the production of the final merchandise did not indicate that the analysis of the OCTG market in the petition is no longer appropriate to use as a basis for facts available.'' 62 FR at 25890. Nothing on the record of this review suggests that the rate we have selected does not represent reliable and relevant information. Moreover, because these four non-responding companies did not answer our questionnaire, we have no basis for comparing the circumstances of their sales, if they had any, to those facts submitted in the petition to ensure that the selected adverse FA rate is relevant. Furthermore, as this is the rate currently applicable to these respondents, we presume that if any of them could have demonstrated that its margin is lower, it would have participated and attempted to do so. Thus, in accordance with section 776(c), we have corroborated this rate ''to the extent practicable.''

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist:

Exporter/manufacturer	Percent [1]
Hallmark Tubulars Ltd	44.20
Itochu Corp	44.20
Itochu Project Management Corp	44.20
Nippon Steel Corp	44.20

[1] Weighted-average margin percentage.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d), any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Upon issuance of the final results of review, 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 Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of these reviews for all shipments of OCTGs from Japan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of these reviews; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in these reviews but covered in the original investigation of sales at less than fair value (LTFV) or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this or a previous review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 44.20 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (58 FR 7531, February 8, 1993).

These deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review. This notice also 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 and notice are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and (a)(2)(C) of the Act (19 USC 1675(a)(1) and (a)(2)(C)), and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: August 30, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–23255 Filed 9–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Initiation of Antidumping New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of initiation of antidumping new shipper review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce has received a request to conduct a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.214, we are initiating this new shipper review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 11, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Blanche Ziv or Ryan Langan, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4207 or (202) 482–1279, respectively.

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, all references to the Department of Commerce's (''the Department's'') regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (April 1999).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 3, 2000, the Department received a request from Snowdrop Trading PVT. LTD. (''Snowdrop''), pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(b), to conduct a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. This order has an August semi-annual anniversary month.

Initiation of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b), in its request of August 3, 2000, Snowdrop certified that it did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation (''POI'') (July 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993) and that it is not now and never has been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review ('' POR''). Snowdrop submitted documentation establishing: (i) The date on which its stainless steel bar was first entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, or if the exporter or producer could not establish the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the subject merchandise for export in the United States; (ii) the volume of that and subsequent shipments; and (iii) the date of the first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214, we are initiating a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(h)(i), we intend to issue the preliminary results of this review not later than 180 days from the date of publication of this notice. All provisions of 19 CFR 351.214 will apply to Snowdrop throughout the duration of this new shipper review. The standard period of review in a new shipper review initiated in the month immediately following the semiannual anniversary month is the six-month period immediately preceding the semiannual anniversary month.

Antidumping duty proceeding	Period to be reviewed
India: Stainless Steel Bar, A–533–810: Snowdrop Trading PVT. LTD.	02/01/00—7/31/00

Concurrent with publication of this notice, and in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(e), we will instruct the Customs Service to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the merchandise exported by the company listed above, until the completion of the review.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation notice is in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.214.

Dated: September 1, 2000.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–23254 Filed 9–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–845]

Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstance Antidumping Duty Review, and Determination To Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Final results of changed circumstance antidumping duty review, and determination to revoke order in part.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 11, 2000.

SUMMARY: On July 31, 2000, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published a notice of initiation of a changed circumstances antidumping duty review and preliminary results of review with intent to revoke, in part, the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Japan. We are now revoking this order in part, with regard to the following product: stainless steel razor blade, medical surgical blade, and industrial blades, as described in the ''Scope'' section of this notice, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no further interest in the relief provided by the order with respect to the importation or sale of this stainless steel coil, as so described.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alex Villanueva, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–6412.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

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's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1, 1999).

Background

On October 22, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') received a request on behalf of Techni Edge Manufacturing Co., (''Techni Edge'') for a changed circumstance review and an intent to revoke in part the antidumping duty (AD) order with respect to specific stainless steel sheet and strip from Japan. The Department received a letter on May 12, 2000 from petitioners (Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, Armco, Inc., J&L Specialty Steel, Inc., Washington Steel Division of Bethlehem Steel Corporation (formerly Lukens, Inc.), the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC, the Butler Armco Independent Union and the Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. of CA) expressing no opposition to the request of Techni Edge for revocation in part of the order pursuant to a changed circumstance review with respect to the subject merchandise defined in the Scope of the Review section below.

We preliminarily determined that petitioners' affirmative statement of no interest constituted changed