following changes to the margin calculation:

- We revised the U.S. warehousing expenses and inventory carrying costs reported by Corus for its JIT sales. We based the calculation on the transaction-specific number of inventory carrying days rather than the reported order-wide average number of inventory carrying days .
- We corrected a clerical error involving adjustments to U.S. expenses incurred in euros.
- We have amended our draft liquidation instructions to correct a clerical error concerning shipments produced by Corus, and imported by other importers.

These changes are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memorandum.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average percentage margin exists for the period November 1, 2002, to October 31, 2003:

Manufacturer / Exporter	Weighted Average Margin (percentage)
Corus Staal BV	4.42

Assessment

The Department shall determine and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Thus, in accordance with 19 C.F.R. § 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate an importer-specific *ad valorem* assessment rate for merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. Where the importer-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise by that importer. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the period of review. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of the final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously–reviewed producers and exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period for which they were reviewed; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less than fair value (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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rate of 2.59 percent, which is the ''All Others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 55637 (November 2, 2001). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 C.F.R. § 351.402(f)(2) 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 the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 C.F.R. § 351.305, that continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 4, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

Issues in Decision Memorandum

1. Treatment of non–dumped sales
2. Classification of JIT sales as CEP
3. Inventory period of JIT sales
4. Clerical error related to invoice currency field
5. Liquidation instructions

[FR Doc. E5–1657 Filed 4–8–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–605, A–580–507]

Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings From Japan and the Republic of Korea: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: On January 3, 2005, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated the second sunset review of the antidumping duty orders on malleable cast iron pipe fittings from Japan and the Republic of Korea (70 FR 75). Because the domestic interested parties did not participate in this sunset review, the Department is revoking these antidumping duty orders.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 28, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hilary E. Sadler, Esq., Office of Policy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4340.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The merchandise subject to these orders is certain malleable cast iron pipe fittings, other than grooved and alloy cast iron, from Japan and the Republic of Korea. In the original orders, the merchandise was classified in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, Annotated, under item numbers 610.7000 and 610.7400. The merchandise is currently classified under item numbers 7307.19.90.30, 7307.19.90.60 and 7307.19.90.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTS''). The HTS number is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Background

On May 23, 1986, the Department issued an antidumping duty order on malleable cast iron pipe fittings from the Republic of Korea (51 FR 18917). On July 6, 1987, the Department issued an antidumping duty order on malleable cast iron pipe fittings from Japan (52 FR 25281). On February 28, 2000, the Department published its notice of continuation of the antidumping duty orders, following a sunset review. *See Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders: Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from Japan and Korea,* 65 FR 10469 (February 28, 2000). Pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR part 351, the Department initiated the second sunset review of this order by publishing the notice of the initiation in the **Federal Register** *Initiation of Five Year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 70 FR 75 (January 3, 2005). In addition, as a courtesy to interested parties, the Department sent letters, via certified and registered mail, to each party listed on the Department's most current service list for these proceedings to inform them of the automatic initiation of a sunset review of these orders.

We received no response from the domestic industry by the deadline dates (*see* 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i)). As a result, the Department determined that no domestic party intends to participate in these sunset reviews, and on January 27, 2005, we notified the International Trade Commission, in writing, that we intended to issue a final determination revoking these antidumping duty orders. *See* 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(iii)(B).

Determination To Revoke

Pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(iii)(B)(3), if no domestic interested party responds to the notice of initiation, the Department shall issue a final determination, within 90 days after the initiation of the review, revoking the order. Because no domestic interested party filed a notice of intent or substantive response, the Department finds that no domestic interested party is participating in this review of these antidumping duty orders, and we are revoking these antidumping duty orders effective February 28, 2005, the fifth anniversary of the date of the determination to continue the order, consistent with 19 CFR 351.222(i)(2)(i) and section 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act.

Effective Date of Revocation

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(3)(A) and 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.222(i)(2)(i), the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to terminate the suspension of liquidation of the merchandise subject to this order entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, on or after February 28, 2005. Entries of subject merchandise prior to the effective date of revocation will continue to be subject to suspension of liquidation and antidumping duty deposit requirements. The Department will complete any pending administrative reviews of these orders and will conduct administrative reviews of subject merchandise entered prior to the effective date of revocation in response to appropriately filed requests for review.

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

Dated: April 4, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5–1660 Filed 4–8–05; 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: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to timely requests by the petitioners,[1] the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Japan with respect to one company. The period of review is July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004. We preliminarily determine that, because the respondent did not participate in this review, it is appropriate to base its rate on adverse facts available.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. If these preliminary results are adapted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 11, 2005.

[1] The petitioners are Allegheny Ludlum, North American Stainless, Local 3303 United Auto Worker, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO/CLC, and Zanesville Armco Independent Organization.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sophie Castro or P. Lee Smith, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, Room B–099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0588 or (202) 482–1655, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 8, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an amended final determination and antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Japan (64 FR 30573).

In response to a timely request by the petitioners, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review with respect to the following company: Kawasaki Steel Corporation (KSC) and its alleged successor-in-interest JFE Steel Corporation (JFE) (69 FR 52857, August 30, 2004). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004.

On September 8, 2004, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to KSC, which included questions addressing whether JFE is KSC's successor-in-interest. The response to the questionnaire was due on October 15, 2004, and subsequently extended to October 20, 2004. On September 16, 2004, counsel filed a notice of appearance indicating that it was representing JFE, and noting that KSC had changed its name to JFE prior to the POR. Moreover, in that letter, counsel pointed out that if the Department required notification of appearance on behalf of KSC based on the Department's initiation of the review with respect to both JFE and KSC, then the Department should consider the notice of appearance on behalf of JFE to serve as such notification for KSC (*see,* Letter to the Secretary of Commerce from KSC/JFE, dated September 16, 2004). On October 20, 2004, KSC/JFE's counsel contacted the Department to state that KSC/JFE would not be submitting a response to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. KSC/JFE's counsel did not give any indication as to why KSC/JFE would not be submitting a response. *See* Memorandum from P. Lee Smith to the File, dated October 15, 2004, and Memorandum from Sophie Castro and P. Lee Smith to the File, dated October 20, 2004, regarding phone conversations with counsel for KSC/JFE.