

manner in which it calculated MCSA's bevelling costs that had not been submitted to the Department previously. According to petitioner, the Department must strike this information from the record and may not consider it in the final determination.

DOC Position

We disagree with petitioner. With respect to the portions of Mannesmann's case brief referred to above concerning class or kind and end use, we note that the information contained therein further corroborates data previously submitted on the record by respondent (see Mannesmann's submissions dated October 21, 1994, October 31, 1994, and March 27, 1994). With respect to bevelling costs, we did not rely on the information referred to by petitioner for purposes of the final determination (see DOC Position to Comment 7 above).

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act 19 USC 1673b(d)(1), we directed the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of seamless pipe from Brazil, as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 27, 1995.

Pursuant to the results of this final determination, we will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated dumping margin, as shown below, for entries of seamless pipe from Brazil that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption from the date of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percent
Mannesmann S.A.	125.00
All Others	125.00

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry, within 45 days of the publication of this notice. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury, does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or cancelled. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat

of material injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) in these investigations of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 USC 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

Dated: June 12, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14937 Filed 6-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-428-820]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel, Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irene Darzenta or Fabian Rivelis, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-6320 or (202) 482-3853, respectively.

FINAL DETERMINATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) determines that small diameter circular seamless carbon and alloy steel, standard, line and pressure pipe (seamless pipe) from Germany is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the notice of the preliminary determination published on January 27, 1995, (60 FR 5355), the following events have occurred.

On February 8, 1995, petitioner alleged that the Department made a ministerial error in its preliminary margin calculations. The Department determined on February 17, 1995, that the allegation raised by petitioners was

methodological in nature and improperly raised under Section 751(f) of the Act.

In our notice of preliminary determination we stated that we would solicit further information on various scope-related issues, including class or kind of merchandise.

On February 10, 1995, we issued a questionnaire to interested parties to request further information on whether the scope of the investigation constitutes more than one class or kind of merchandise. Responses to this questionnaire were submitted on March 27, 1995.

On February 10, 1995, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to Mannesmannrohr-Werke AG (MRW). MRW submitted its supplemental responses and revised home market and U.S. sales listings on February 28, 1995, and March 6, 1995, respectively.

Pursuant to requests by petitioner and respondent, on February 16, 1995, a notice was published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 9012) announcing the postponement of the final determination until June 12, 1995.

In March and April 1995, we conducted verification of MRW's questionnaire responses. Our verification reports were issued in May 1995.

On April 27, 1995, Koppel Steel Corporation, a U.S. producer of subject merchandise which appeared as an interested party from the outset of this investigation, requested co-petitioner status.

Respondent and petitioner submitted case briefs on May 16, 1995, and rebuttal briefs on May 23, 1995. No public hearing was requested. On May 23, 1995, we returned portions of MRW's case brief because we determined that it contained new factual information submitted after the deadline specified in 19 CFR 353.31 (a)(i) for the submission of factual information. On May 24, 1995, MRW refiled its case brief with the new information deleted.

Scope of Investigation

The following scope language reflects certain modifications made for purposes of the final determination, where appropriate, as discussed in the "Scope Issues" section below.

The scope of this investigation includes seamless pipes produced to the ASTM A-335, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L specifications and meeting the physical parameters described below, regardless of application. The scope of this investigation also includes all products used in standard, line, or pressure pipe

applications and meeting the physical parameters below, regardless of specification.

For purposes of this investigation, seamless pipes are seamless carbon and alloy (other than stainless) steel pipes, of circular cross-section, not more than 114.3 mm (4.5 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, manufacturing process (hot-finished or cold-drawn), end finish (plain end, bevelled end, upset end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or surface finish. These pipes are commonly known as standard pipe, line pipe or pressure pipe, depending upon the application. They may also be used in structural applications. Pipes produced in non-standard wall thicknesses are commonly referred to as tubes.

The seamless pipes subject to these investigations are currently classifiable under subheadings 7304.10.10.20, 7304.10.50.20, 7304.31.60.50, 7304.39.00.16, 7304.39.00.20, 7304.39.00.24, 7304.39.00.28, 7304.39.00.32, 7304.51.50.05, 7304.51.50.60, 7304.59.60.00, 7304.59.80.10, 7304.59.80.15, 7304.59.80.20, and 7304.59.80.25 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

The following information further defines the scope of this investigation, which covers pipes meeting the physical parameters described above:

Specifications, Characteristics and Uses: Seamless pressure pipes are intended for the conveyance of water, steam, petrochemicals, chemicals, oil products, natural gas and other liquids and gasses in industrial piping systems. They may carry these substances at elevated pressures and temperatures and may be subject to the application of external heat. Seamless carbon steel pressure pipe meeting the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard A-106 may be used in temperatures of up to 1000 degrees fahrenheit, at various American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) code stress levels. Alloy pipes made to ASTM standard A-335 must be used if temperatures and stress levels exceed those allowed for A-106 and the ASME codes. Seamless pressure pipes sold in the United States are commonly produced to the ASTM A-106 standard.

Seamless standard pipes are most commonly produced to the ASTM A-53 specification and generally are not intended for high temperature service. They are intended for the low temperature and pressure conveyance of water, steam, natural gas, air and other liquids and gasses in plumbing and heating systems, air conditioning units, automatic sprinkler systems, and other

related uses. Standard pipes (depending on type and code) may carry liquids at elevated temperatures but must not exceed relevant ASME code requirements.

Seamless line pipes are intended for the conveyance of oil and natural gas or other fluids in pipe lines. Seamless line pipes are produced to the API 5L specification.

Seamless pipes are commonly produced and certified to meet ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L specifications. Such triple certification of pipes is common because all pipes meeting the stringent A-106 specification necessarily meet the API 5L and ASTM A-53 specifications. Pipes meeting the API 5L specification necessarily meet the ASTM A-53 specification. However, pipes meeting the A-53 or API 5L specifications do not necessarily meet the A-106 specification. To avoid maintaining separate production runs and separate inventories, manufacturers triple certify the pipes. Since distributors sell the vast majority of this product, they can thereby maintain a single inventory to service all customers.

The primary application of ASTM A-106 pressure pipes and triple certified pipes is in pressure piping systems by refineries, petrochemical plants and chemical plants. Other applications are in power generation plants (electrical-fossil fuel or nuclear), and in some oil field uses (on shore and off shore) such as for separator lines, gathering lines and metering runs. A minor application of this product is for use as oil and gas distribution lines for commercial applications. These applications constitute the majority of the market for the subject seamless pipes. However, A-106 pipes may be used in some boiler applications.

The scope of this investigation includes all seamless pipe meeting the physical parameters described above and produced to one of the specifications listed above, regardless of application, and whether or not also certified to a non-covered specification. Standard, line and pressure applications and the above-listed specifications are defining characteristics of the scope of this investigation. Therefore, seamless pipes meeting the physical description above, but not produced to the A-335, A-106, A-53, or API 5L standards shall be covered if used in a standard, line or pressure application.

For example, there are certain other ASTM specifications of pipe which, because of overlapping characteristics, could potentially be used in A-106 applications. These specifications generally include A-162, A-192, A-210,

A-333, and A-524. When such pipes are used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, such products are covered by the scope of this investigation.

Specifically excluded from this investigation are boiler tubing and mechanical tubing, if such products are not produced to A-335, A-106, A-53 or API 5L specifications and are not used in standard, line or pressure applications. In addition, finished and unfinished OCTG are excluded from the scope of this investigation, if covered by the scope of another antidumping duty order from the same country. If not covered by such an OCTG order, finished and unfinished OCTG are included in this scope when used in standard, line or pressure applications. Finally, also excluded from this investigation are redraw hollows for cold-drawing when used in the production of cold-drawn pipe or tube.

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

Scope Issues

Interested parties in these investigations have raised several issues related to the scope. We considered these issues in our preliminary determination and invited additional comments from the parties. These issues, which are discussed below, are: (A) Whether to continue to include end use as a factor in defining the scope of these investigations; (B) whether the seamless pipe subject to these investigations constitutes more than one class or kind of merchandise; and (C) miscellaneous scope clarification issues and scope exclusion requests.

A. End Use

We stated in our preliminary determination that we agreed with petitioner that pipe products identified as potential substitutes used in the same applications as the four standard, line, and pressure pipe specifications listed in the scope would fall within the class or kind of subject merchandise and, therefore, within the scope of any orders issued in these investigations. However, we acknowledged the difficulties involved with requiring end-use certifications, particularly the burdens placed on the Department, the U.S. Customs Service, and the parties, and stated that we would strive to simplify any procedures in this regard.

For purposes of these final determinations, we have considered carefully additional comments submitted by the parties and have determined that it is appropriate to

continue to employ end use to define the scope of these cases with respect to non-listed specifications. We find that the generally accepted definition of standard, line and pressure seamless pipes is based largely on end use, and that end use is implicit in the description of the subject merchandise. Thus, end use must be considered a significant defining characteristic of the subject merchandise. Given our past experience with substitution after the imposition of antidumping orders on steel pipe products¹, we agree with petitioner that if products produced to a non-listed specification (e.g., seamless pipe produced to A-162, a non-listed specification in the scope) were actually used as standard, line, or pressure pipe, then such product would fall within the same class or kind of merchandise subject to these investigations.

Furthermore, we disagree with respondents' general contention that using end use for the scope of an antidumping case is beyond the purview of the U.S. antidumping law. The Department has interpreted scope language in other cases as including an end-use specification. See *Ipsco Inc. v. United States*, 715 F.Supp. 1104 (CIT 1989)(*Ipsco*). In *Ipsco*, the Department had clarified the scope of certain orders, in particular the phrase, "intended for use in drilling for oil and gas," as covering not only API specification OCTG pipe but, "all other pipe with [certain specified] characteristics used in OCTG applications * * *". *Ipsco* at 1105. In reaching this determination, the Department also provided an additional description of the covered merchandise, and initiated an end-use certification procedure.

Regarding implementation of the end use provision of the scope of these investigations, and any orders which may be issued in these investigations, we are well aware of the difficulty and burden associated with such certifications. Therefore, in order to maintain the effectiveness of any order that may be issued in light of actual substitution in the future (which the end-use criterion is meant to achieve), yet administer certification procedures in the least problematic manner, we have developed an approach which simplifies these procedures to the greatest extent possible.

First, we will not require end-use certification until such time as petitioner or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or

suspect that substitution is occurring.² Second, we will require end-use certification only for the product(s) (or specification(s)) for which evidence is provided that substitution is occurring. For example, if, based on evidence provided by petitioner, the Department finds a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that seamless pipe produced to A-162 specification is being used as pressure pipe, we will require end-use certifications for imports of A-162 specification. Third, normally we will require only the importer of record to certify to the end use of the imported merchandise. If it later proves necessary for adequate implementation, we may also require producers who export such products to the United States to provide such certification on invoices accompanying shipments to the United States. For a complete discussion of interested party comments and the Department's analysis on this topic, see June 12, 1995, *End Use Decision Memorandum* from Deputy Assistant Secretary Barbara Stafford (DAS) to Assistant Secretary Susan Esserman (AS).

B. Class or Kind

In the course of these investigations, certain respondents have argued that the scope of the investigations should be divided into two classes or kinds. Siderca S.A.I.C., the Argentine respondent, has argued that the scope should be divided according to size: seamless pipe with an outside diameter of 2 inches or less and pipe with an outside diameter of greater than 2 inches constitute two classes or kinds. Mannesmann S.A., the Brazilian respondent, and Mannesmannrohr-Werke AG, the German respondent, argued that the scope should be divided based upon material composition: carbon and alloy steel seamless pipe constitute two classes or kinds.

In our preliminary determinations, we found insufficient evidence on the record that the merchandise subject to these investigations constitutes more than one class or kind. We also indicated that there were a number of areas where clarification and additional comment were needed. For purposes of the final determination, we considered a significant amount of additional information submitted by the parties on this issue, as well as information from other sources. This information strongly supports a finding of one class or kind of merchandise. As detailed in the June 12, 1995, *Class or Kind Decision Memorandum* from DAS to AS, we

analyzed this issue based on the criteria set forth by the Court of International Trade in *Diversified Products v. United States*, 6 CIT 155, 572 F. Supp. 883 (1983). These criteria are as follows: (1) The general physical characteristics of the merchandise; (2) expectations of the ultimate purchaser; (3) the ultimate use of the merchandise; (4) the channels of trade in which the merchandise moves; and (5) the cost of that merchandise.

In the past, the Department has divided a single class or kind in a petition into multiple classes or kinds where analysis of the *Diversified Products* criteria indicates that the subject merchandise constitutes more than one class or kind. See, for example, *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Anti-Friction Bearings (Apart from Tapered Roller Bearings) from Germany*, 54 FR 18992, 18998 (May 3, 1989) ("AFBs from Germany"); *Pure and Alloy Magnesium from Canada: Final Affirmative Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 57 FR 30939 (July 13, 1992).

1. Physical Characteristics

We find little meaningful difference in physical characteristics between seamless pipe above and below two inches. Both are covered by the same technical specifications, which contains detailed requirements.³ While we recognize that carbon and alloy pipe do have some important physical differences (primarily the enhanced heat and pressure tolerances associated with alloy grade steels), it is difficult to say where carbon steel ends and alloy steel begins. As we have discussed in our *Class or Kind Decision Memorandum* of June 12, 1995, carbon steel products themselves contain alloys, and there is a range of percentages of alloy content present in merchandise made of carbon steel. We find that alloy grade steels, and pipes made therefrom, represent the upper end of a single continuum of steel grades and associated attributes.⁴

³ The relevant ASTM specifications, as well as product definitions from other independent sources (e.g., American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI)), describe the sizes for standard, line, and pressure pipe, as ranging from 1/2 inch to 60 inches (depending on application). None of these descriptions suggest a break point at two inches.

⁴ The Department has had numerous cases where steel products including carbon and alloy grades were considered to be within the same class or kind. See, e.g., *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Oil Country Tubular Goods from Austria, et al.*, 60 FR 6512 (February 2, 1995); *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Certain Alloy and Carbon Hot-Rolled Bars, Rods, and Semi-Finished Products of Special Bar Quality Engineered Steel from Brazil*, 58 FR 31496 (June 3, 1993); *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom*, 60 FR 22045 (May 9, 1995).

¹ See *Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Scope Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipes from Brazil, the Republic of Korea, Mexico and Venezuela*, 59 FR 1929, January 13, 1994.

² This approach is consistent with petitioner's request.

In those prior determinations where the Department divided a single class or kind, the Department emphasized that differences in physical characteristics also affected the capabilities of the merchandise (either the mechanical capabilities, as in *AFBs from Germany*, 54 FR at 18999, 19002-03, or the chemical capabilities, as in *Pure and Alloy Magnesium from Canada*, 57 FR at 30939), which in turn established the boundaries of the ultimate use and customer expectations of the products involved.

As the Department said in *AFBs from Germany*,

[t]he real question is whether the physical differences are so material as to alter the essential nature of the product, and, therefore, rise to the level of class or kind distinctions. We believe that the physical differences between the five classes or kinds of the subject merchandise are fundamental and are more than simply minor variations on a theme.

54 Fed. Reg. at 19002. In the present cases, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the differences between pipe over 2 inches in outside diameter and 2 inches or less in outside diameter, rise to the level of a class or kind distinction.

Furthermore, with regard to Siderca's allegation that a two-inch breakpoint is widely recognized in the U.S. market for seamless pipe, the Department has found only one technical source of U.S. market data for seamless pipe, the *Preston Pipe Report*. The *Preston Pipe Report*, which routinely collects and publishes U.S. market data for this merchandise, publishes shipment data for the size ranges 1/2 to 4 1/2 inches: It does not recognize a break point at 2 inches. Accordingly, the Department does not agree with Siderca that "the U.S. market" recognizes 2 inches as a physical boundary line for the subject merchandise.

In these present cases, therefore, the Department finds that there is insufficient evidence that any physical differences between pipe over 2 inches in outside diameter and 2 inches or less in outside diameter, or between carbon and alloy steel, rise to the level of class or kind distinctions.

2. Ultimate Use and Purchaser Expectations

We find no evidence that pipe above and below two inches is used exclusively in any specific applications. Rather, the record indicates that there are overlapping applications. For example, pipe above and below two inches may both be used as line and pressure pipe. The technical definitions for line and pressure pipe provided by

ASTM, AISI, and a variety of other sources do not recognize a distinction between pipe over and under two inches.

Likewise, despite the fact that alloy grade steels are associated with enhanced heat and pressure tolerances, there is no evidence that the carbon or alloy content of the subject merchandise can be differentiated in the ultimate use or expectations of the ultimate purchaser of seamless pipe.

3. Channels of Trade

Based on information supplied by the parties, we determine that the vast majority of the subject merchandise is sold through the same channel of distribution in the United States and is triple-stenciled in order to meet the greatest number of applications.

Accordingly, the channels of trade offer no basis for dividing the subject merchandise into multiple classes or kinds based on either the size of the outside diameter or on pipe having a carbon or alloy content.

4. Cost

Based on the evidence on the record, we find that cost differences between the various products do exist. However, the parties varied considerably in the factors which they characterized as most significant in terms of affecting cost. There is no evidence that the size ranges above and below two inches, and the difference between carbon and alloy grade steels, form a break point in cost which would support a finding of separate classes or kinds.

In conclusion, while we recognize that certain differences do exist between the products in the proposed class or kind of merchandise, we find that the similarities significantly outweigh any differences. Therefore, for purposes of the final determination, we will continue to consider the scope as constituting one class or kind of merchandise.

C. Miscellaneous Scope Clarification Issues and Exclusion Requests

The miscellaneous scope issues include: (1) Whether OCTG and unfinished OCTG are excluded from the scope of these investigations; (2) whether pipes produced to non-standard wall thicknesses (commonly referred to as "tubes") are covered by the scope; (3) whether certain merchandise (e.g., boiler tubing, mechanical tubing) produced to a specification listed in the scope but used in an application excluded from the scope is covered by the scope; and (4) whether redraw hollows used for cold drawing are excluded from the

scope. For a complete discussion of interested party comments and the Department's analysis on these topics, see June 12, 1995, *Additional Scope Clarifications Decision Memorandum* from DAS to AS.

Regarding OCTG, petitioner requested that OCTG and unfinished OCTG be included within the scope of these investigations if used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application. However, OCTG and unfinished OCTG, even when used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, may come within the scope of certain separate, concurrent investigations. We intend that merchandise from a particular country not be classified simultaneously as subject to both an OCTG order and a seamless pipe order. Thus, to eliminate any confusion, we have revised the scope language above to exclude finished and unfinished OCTG, if covered by the scope of another antidumping duty order from the same country. If not covered by such an OCTG order, finished and unfinished OCTG are included in this scope when used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, and, as with other non-listed specifications, may be subject to end-use certification if there is evidence of substitution.

Regarding pipe produced in non-standard wall thicknesses, we determine that these products are clearly within the parameters of the scope of these investigations. For clarification purposes, we note that the physical parameters of the scope include all seamless carbon and alloy steel pipes, of circular cross-section, not more than 4.5 inches in outside diameter, *regardless of wall thickness*. Therefore, the fact that such products may be referred to as tubes by some parties, and may be multiple-stenciled, does not render them outside the scope.

Regarding pipe produced to a covered specification but used in a non-covered application, we determine that these products are within the scope. We agree with the petitioner that the scope of this investigation includes all merchandise produced to the covered specifications and meeting the physical parameters of the scope, regardless of application. The end-use criteria included in the scope is only applicable to products which can be substituted in the applications to which the covered specifications are put *i.e.* standard, line, and pressure applications.

It is apparent that at least one party in this case interpreted the scope incorrectly. Therefore, we have clarified the scope to make it more explicit that all products made to ASTM A-335,

ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L are covered, regardless of end use.

With respect to redraw hollows for cold drawing, the scope language excludes such products specifically when used in the production of cold-drawn pipe or tube. We understand that petitioner included this exclusion language expressly and intentionally to ensure that hollows imported into the United States are sold as intermediate products, not as merchandise to be used in a covered application.

Standing

The Argentine, Brazilian, and German respondents have challenged the standing of Gulf States Tube to file the petition with respect to pipe and tube between 2.0 and 4.5 inches in outside diameter, arguing that Gulf States Tube does not produce these products.

Pursuant to section 732(b)(1) of the Act, an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act has standing to file a petition. (See also 19 CFR 353.12(a).) Section 771(9)(C) of the Act defines "interested party," *inter alia*, as a producer of the like product. For the reasons outlined in the "Scope Issues" section above, we have determined that the subject merchandise constitutes a single class or kind of merchandise. The International Trade Commission (ITC) has also preliminarily determined that there is a single like product consisting of circular seamless carbon and alloy steel standard, line, and pressure pipe, and tubes not more than 4.5 inches in outside diameter, and including redraw hollows. (See USITC Publication 2734, August 1994 at 18). For purposes of determining standing, the Department has determined to accept the ITC's definition of like product, for the reasons set forth in the ITC's preliminary determination. Because Gulf States is a producer of the like product, it has standing to file a petition with respect to the class or kind of merchandise under investigation. Further, as noted in the "Case History" section of this notice, on April 27, 1995, Koppel, a U.S. producer of the product size range at issue, filed a request for co-petitioner status, which the Department granted. As a producer of the like product, Koppel also has standing.

The Argentine respondent argues that Koppel's request was filed too late to confer legality on the initiation of these proceedings with regard to the products at issue. Gulf States Tube maintains that the Department has discretion to permit the amendment of a petition for purposes of adding co-petitioners who produce the domestic like product, at such time and upon such circumstances

as deemed appropriate by the Department.

The Court of International Trade (CIT) has upheld in very broad terms the Department's ability to allow amendments to petitions. For example, in *Citrosuco Paulista, S.A. v. United States*, 704 F. Supp. 1075 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1988), the Court sustained the Department's granting of requests for co-petitioner status filed by six domestic producers on five different dates during an investigation. The Court held that the addition of the co-petitioners cured any defect in the petition, and that allowing the petition to be amended was within Commerce's discretion:

[S]ince Commerce has statutory discretion to allow amendment of a dumping petition at any time, and since Commerce may self-initiate a dumping petition, any defect in a petition filed by [a domestic party is] cured when domestic producers of the like product [are] added as co-petitioners and Commerce [is] not required to start a new investigation.

Citrosuco, 704 F. Supp. at 1079 (emphasis added). The Court reasoned that if Commerce were to have dismissed the petition for lack of standing, and to have required the co-petitioners to refile at a later date, it "would have elevated form over substance and fruitlessly delayed the antidumping investigation . . . when Congress clearly intended these cases to proceed expeditiously." *Id.* at 1083-84.

Koppel has been an interested party and a participant in these investigations from the outset. The timing of Koppel's request for co-petitioner status and the fact that it made its request in response to Siderca's challenge to Gulf States' Tube's standing does not render its request invalid. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination; Live Swine and Fresh, Chilled, and Frozen Pork Products from Canada*, 50 FR 25097 (June 17, 1985). The Department has rejected a request to add a co-petitioner based on the untimeliness of the request only where the Department determined that there was not adequate time for opposing parties to submit comments and for the Department to consider the relevant arguments. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Stainless Steel Hollow Products from Sweden*, 52 FR 5794, 5795, 5803 (February 26, 1987). In this investigation, the respondents have had an opportunity to comment on Koppel's request for co-petitioner status, and the Argentine respondent has done so in its case brief. Therefore, we have determined that, because respondents would not be prejudiced or unduly burdened, amendment of the petition to add Koppel as co-petitioner is appropriate.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) is January 1, through June 30, 1994.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Such or Similar Comparisons

We have determined that all the products covered by this investigation constitute a single category of such or similar merchandise.

Best Information Available (BIA)

We have determined that the questionnaire responses submitted by MRW are unusable because we were unable to verify their accuracy. Most importantly, we found at verification that MRW failed to include the costs incurred by one of its two manufacturing facilities which produced subject merchandise during the POI among the costs reported for differences-in-merchandise (difmer) adjustment purposes, despite the fact that the response had indicated, and MRW claimed up until the final hours of verification, that its reported costs reflected a weighted-average of the two plants. Accurate difmer information is crucial to the Department's analysis in this case because there are very few, if any, comparisons of identical merchandise. In general, seamless pipe in Germany is produced and sold to DIN specifications while seamless pipe exported to the United States is produced to ASTM specifications.

Other significant problems were discovered at verification. Company officials could not explain or provide adequate support documentation to explain numerous discrepancies and omissions. MRW was unable to tie the reported difmer data to its financial statements. MRW also failed to adequately demonstrate that the sales data reported to the Department took into account changes in price, quantity and date of sale. Finally, numerous other errors were found ranging in magnitude from significant discrepancies to minor clerical errors, for the majority of the items we attempted to verify. Collectively, these discrepancies and omissions demonstrate that MRW's questionnaire response is unreliable and unusable for purposes of the final determination.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that if the Department is unable to verify, within the time specified, the accuracy and completeness of the factual information submitted, it shall

use BIA as the basis for its determination. Consequently, we have based this determination on BIA. (See decision memorandum from The Team to Barbara R. Stafford dated June 12, 1995, for a detailed discussion of our verification findings and BIA recommendation.)

In determining what rate to use as BIA, the Department follows a two-tiered BIA methodology, whereby the Department may impose the most adverse rate upon those respondents who refuse to cooperate or otherwise significantly impede the proceeding, or assign a lower rate for those respondents who have cooperated in an investigation. When a company is deemed uncooperative, it has been the Department's practice to apply as BIA the higher of the highest margin alleged in the petition or the highest rate calculated for any respondent. The Department's practice for applying BIA to cooperative respondents is to use the higher of the average of the margins alleged in the petition or the highest calculated margin for another firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the Federal Republic of Germany*, 54 FR 18992, 19033 (May 3, 1989). The Department's two-tier methodology for assigning BIA based on the degree of respondents' cooperation has been upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. (See *Allied-Signal Aerospace Co. v. the United States*, 996 F2d 1185 (Fed Cir. 1993); see also *Krupp Stahl AG. et al v. the United States*, 822 F. Supp. 789 (CIT 1993).)

We have determined that MRW was uncooperative during this proceeding and have assigned a margin based on uncooperative BIA. Because there are no other respondents in this investigation we are assigning, as BIA, the highest margin among the margins alleged in the petition. MRW significantly impeded our administration of the case by misrepresenting the methodology it used in the response regarding the costs of the unreported plant.

MRW did not alert the Department at any time to any difficulties in providing the information requested in the questionnaire concerning the unreported manufacturing facility, and had indicated that the plant's costs had been included in a weighted-average calculation. In addition, much of the documentation we requested at verification was received late in the verification process, was incomplete, or, in some cases, not received at all. MRW

was unable to demonstrate: (1) How many of the figures reported on the sales listing were calculated; (2) how they tied to source documentation; and (3) a tie to financial statements. Therefore, we are assigning MRW the highest margin alleged in the petition as uncooperative BIA.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of subject merchandise from Germany to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared United States price (USP) to foreign market value (FMV) as reported in the petition. See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation of Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe From Argentina, Brazil, Germany and Italy* (59 FR 37025, July 20, 1994).

Interested Party Comments

General Issues

Comment 1. MRW argues that petitioner lacks standing to seek the imposition of antidumping duties on products that it does not produce. According to MRW, petitioner has admitted that it is incapable of manufacturing seamless pipe and tube in dimensions above two inches in outside diameter. Therefore, respondent maintains that petitioner is not an "interested party" with respect to this merchandise. Accordingly, the Department should amend the scope of the investigation to limit it only to those dimensions and pipe types that petitioner has a proven ability to manufacture.

Gulf States Tube contends that the antidumping statute neither requires nor permits the Department to limit the scope of the investigation to products that the petitioner itself produces. Gulf States Tube also maintains that respondent's standing claim is untimely and may not be considered by the Department at this stage of the proceeding. Nevertheless, Gulf States Tube asserts that the issue is rendered moot by the request of Koppel Steel Corporation, a domestic producer of subject merchandise in sizes larger two inches in outside diameter, for co-petitioner status.

DOC Position. We agree with petitioner for the reasons outlined in the "Standing" section of this notice.

Comment 2. MRW contends that including an end-use certification requirement in the scope would be both illegal and unworkable. Respondent maintains that petitioner is effectively seeking to circumvent the established legal procedure by arguing for an open-

ended scope definition that encompasses products that it does not manufacture and that petitioner has conceded are not causing present injury. In addition, respondent states that it is clear that any end-use certification procedure designed to implement such a scope definition is wholly unworkable because of the manner in which the subject products are sold. That is, in almost all cases the importer of record never knows the ultimate use of the pipe products it sells, and in many instances, neither do its customers. According to MRW, as a practical matter, the effect of an end-use certification requirement would be to ask the impossible of importers. Furthermore, respondent states that the anticircumvention procedures of the antidumping law provide ample remedy to petitioner in cases of circumvention via product substitution. MRW emphasizes that absent the detailed inquiry required by anti-circumvention legal provisions, the Department cannot include within the scope of this investigation other merchandise simply because such other products might in theory be utilized for the same purposes as pipe meeting the listed specifications. According to respondent, to do otherwise is contrary to the antidumping law and deprives respondents of their right to a full and fair hearing on any circumvention allegations that might be advanced by petitioner at some later date.

Petitioner argues that there is no factual or legal basis for eliminating end-use as a defining element of the scope of the investigation. Furthermore, not only is the feasibility of specific enforcement mechanisms irrelevant to the scope determination, but it is also untrue that any end-use certification procedure would be unworkable. According to petitioner, there is no evidence on the record of this investigation that an end-use certification program must require the submission of an end-use certificate by the importer at the time of importation. Rather, petitioner envisions a program whereby the end-use certificate travels with the pipe to the ultimate end-user, who may then send it back up the line of distribution. When final duties are assessed, the Department may assume that any pipe for which no certificates can be produced was used in subject applications. Contrary to MRW's arguments, petitioner maintains that the Department and the U.S. Customs Service are perfectly capable of administering an order that includes end use in its scope definition. In the event that products meeting the

physical description of subject merchandise, but which are not certified to one or more of the covered specifications are being substituted into one of the listed applications, the burden would be on the petitioner, other domestic producers or interested parties, to notify Customs and the Department with some objective evidence supporting a reasonable belief that substitution is occurring. However, it is both unnecessary and inappropriate at this point to engage in debate about the feasibility and desirability of specific end-use certification procedures. According to petitioner, the facts and policy considerations relevant to such a debate are not available on this record, and the selection of a specific enforcement mechanism is beyond the Department's responsibilities in this proceeding.

DOC Position. We disagree with respondent's assertion that including end-use in the scope of the investigation would be unlawful. The Department has interpreted scope language in other cases as including an end-use specification. See *Ipsco Inc. v. United States*, 715 F. Supp. 1104 (CIT 1989). See the "Scope Issues" section of this notice for further discussion on end-use.

Comment 3. MRW contends that the carbon and alloy pipe products subject to investigation are distinct classes or kinds of merchandise. MRW asserts that the criteria set out in *Diversified Products* support a division between carbon and alloy products. Specifically, MRW argues that carbon and alloy pipes differ in terms of physical characteristics, uses, customer expectations and cost. With respect to physical characteristics, alloy seamless pipes contain higher grade steel than carbon seamless pipe, and because of their different chemistries, these products have different performance characteristics. With respect to end use which, according to respondent, is inherently tied to physical characteristics, carbon pipe is not as versatile as alloy steel pipe and is not suited for the more sophisticated applications, such as operations in high temperature environments. Respondent asserts that the Department has consistently emphasized the relationship between physical characteristics and end use in past cases (e.g., *Torrington Co. v. United States*, 745 F.Supp. at 726 (CIT 1990)). In addition, respondent states that customer expectations vary depending upon the ability of specific merchandise to perform a given task. With regard to alloy and carbon steel pipe, the ultimate purchaser does not expect these two types of pipe to be interchangeable, and

is willing to pay more for alloy steel pipe because it must perform under more adverse conditions than those for which carbon pipe is suited. With respect to cost, respondent states that the cost of alloy pipe is higher than that of carbon pipe because of the more expensive raw materials and production costs incurred in producing alloy pipe. Finally, with respect to channels of trade, respondent states that carbon and alloy pipe move in similar channels; however, this factor is not determinative as to class or kind of merchandise.

Petitioner maintains that the subject merchandise constitutes a single class or kind. With respect to MRW's proposal for a split in class or kind on the basis of material composition, petitioner asserts that the factual evidence does not support such a division. Petitioner's state that the application of the criteria employed by the Department in *Diversified Products* compels the conclusion that there is a single class or kind of merchandise. According to petitioner, the physical characteristics of carbon and alloy pipe represent a single continuum of product produced with varying chemical compositions to meet a range of heat, pressure and tensile requirements. According to petitioner, there is simply no bright dividing line between the physical characteristics of the products. Petitioner states that the customer's expectations and use of the product are dictated by the engineering specification required by the intended application. Because the majority of all subject seamless pipe is triple-certified, the pipe may be put to any of the uses that apply to each of the individual specifications to which it is certified. Petitioner points out that the vast majority of seamless pipe is sold through the same channel of trade—distributors. Finally, petitioner adds that because the majority of seamless pipe is triple-certified, it has identical costs regardless of the customer to whom it is sold.

DOC Position. We agree with petitioner that the subject merchandise constitutes a single class or kind for the reasons outlined in the "Scope Issues" section of this notice.

Company-Specific Issues

For a number of reasons articulated in its briefs, with which we concur, petitioner argues that the final determination should be based on BIA, and that MRW should be found to be uncooperative.

MRW disagrees and argues that the Department's verification report does not offer a balanced assessment of the verification. MRW states that the

Department verified the accuracy of its reported sales information and that the discrepancies found at verification were minor. Furthermore, respondent argues that the minor discrepancies detailed in the verification report should be evaluated in the context of the vast majority of data that tied exactly to source documentation. Respondent states that the minor discrepancies found at verification do not affect the Department's ability to perform its antidumping analysis.

Respondent states that the delays in providing information requested by the Department at verification were a result of the manner in which its records are kept in the ordinary course of business. MRW cites to *Nippon Pillow Block Sales Co. v. United States*, 820 F. Supp. 1444, 1449 (CIT 1993), and *Fresh Cut Roses from Colombia (Final)* 60 FR 6980, 7009 (February 6, 1995) as examples of Department policy that respondents cannot be penalized because of the way their records are kept.

Regarding its failure to include the costs of one of its plants in its reported difmer costs, MRW states the manner in which it reported difmer costs is reasonable given that this plant is a newly acquired facility located in the former German Democratic Republic, which was a non-market economy until recently. Furthermore, MRW states that it is extraordinarily difficult to calculate actual, verifiable costs for a plant that has operated under a planned economy and that it is appropriate to use the surrogate costs of a plant in the Federal Republic of Germany to perform antidumping calculations.

DOC Position. We agree with petitioner that the magnitude and nature of the problems found at verification require that we base MRW's margin on BIA. (See *Best Information Available (BIA)* section of this notice).

We disagree with respondent's assertion that it is being penalized for the way its records are kept. We must hold all respondents to a basic standard of accuracy and completeness at verification while taking into account the limitations existing with respect to the respondent's sales and cost accounting systems. We require all respondents, regardless of record keeping systems, to prepare for verification in such a manner that the Department's questions can be answered within a specified period of time. To this end, we supply all respondents with an outline which specifies the type of documentation that needs to be available at verification. MRW did not have the necessary documentation readily available, which prevented us from verifying its response. Most

significantly, respondents are expected to be forthcoming in their responses to the Department's requests for information. In this case, respondent failed to report fundamental information—cost data relating to one of its plants producing subject merchandise. In other words, respondent withheld information critical to verification and thus BIA is required.

Other Comments

Petitioner and respondent made additional comments on various charges and adjustments contained in MRW's home market and U.S. sales listings. However, since we are basing our final determination on BIA, we consider these comments to be moot.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) of the Act, 19 USC 1673b(d)(1), we directed the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of seamless pipe from Germany, as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 27, 1995.

Pursuant to the results of this final determination, we will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated final dumping margin, as shown below for entries of seamless pipe from Germany that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percent
Mannesmannrohren-Werke AG	58.23
All Others	58.23

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 45 days of the publication of this notice. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or canceled. However, if the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) in these investigations of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 USC 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

Dated: June 12, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14938 Filed 6-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-475-814]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel, Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Italy

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 19, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dolores Peck or James Terpstra, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4929 or 482-3965, respectively.

FINAL DETERMINATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) determines that small diameter circular seamless carbon and alloy steel, standard, line and pressure pipe (seamless pipe) from Italy is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act") (1994). The estimated weighted-average margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since our negative preliminary determination on January 19, 1995 (60 FR 5358, January 27, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On February 1, 1995, we initiated a sales below cost investigation of the respondent, Dalmine, S.p.A. ("Dalmine"). We instructed Dalmine to respond to the complete cost questionnaire which it had previously used to only report constructed value data. Dalmine submitted its response to

this questionnaire on March 7. Supplemental cost and sales responses and revisions were submitted in February, March, and April 1995.

On February 8, 1995, we postponed the final determination until not later than June 12, 1995 (60 FR 9012, February 16, 1995).

We conducted verifications of Dalmine's sales and cost questionnaire responses in Italy and the United States in March and April 1995. Verification reports were issued in May 1995.

On April 27, 1995, Koppel Steel Corporation, an interested party to this investigation, requested that it be granted co-petitioner status, which the Department granted.

The petitioner and the respondent submitted case briefs on May 18 and rebuttal briefs on May 24, 1995.

On May 22, and May 30, 1995, respectively, the Department returned the respondent's case and rebuttal briefs and instructed the respondent to refile the briefs redacting new information. The respondent did so on May 25, and June 2, 1995.

Scope of the Investigation

The following scope language reflects certain modifications made for purposes of the final determination, where appropriate, as discussed in the "Scope Issues" section below.

The scope of this investigation includes seamless pipes produced to the ASTM A-335, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L specifications and meeting the physical parameters described below, regardless of application. The scope of this investigation also includes all products used in standard, line, or pressure pipe applications and meeting the physical parameters below, regardless of specification.

For purposes of this investigation, seamless pipes are seamless carbon and alloy (other than stainless) steel pipes, of circular cross-section, not more than 114.3 mm (4.5 inches) in outside diameter, regardless of wall thickness, manufacturing process (hot-finished or cold-drawn), end finish (plain end, bevelled end, upset end, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or surface finish. These pipes are commonly known as standard pipe, line pipe or pressure pipe, depending upon the application. They may also be used in structural applications. Pipes produced in non-standard wall thicknesses are commonly referred to as tubes.

The seamless pipes subject to these investigations are currently classifiable under subheadings 7304.10.10.20, 7304.10.50.20, 7304.31.60.50, 7304.39.00.16, 7304.39.00.20,