DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–401–401]

Certain Carbon Steel Products From Sweden; Final Results of Expended Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expended sunset review: Certain carbon steel products from Sweden.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) initiated a sunset review of the countervailing duty order on certain carbon steel products from Sweden (64 FR 47767) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, as amended (“the Act”). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic interested parties, as well as inadequate response from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited (120-day) sunset review. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we find that revocation of the countervailing duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the levels listed below in the section entitled Final Results of the Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn B. McCormick or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1930 or (202) 482–1380, 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).

Background

On September 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the countervailing duty order on carbon steel products from Sweden (64 FR 47767), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Inland Isapit Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, and U.S. Steel Group, a unit of USX Corporation (“domestic interested parties”), within the applicable deadline (September 15, 1999) specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. Domestic interested parties claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as U.S. producers of a domestic like product.

On September 24, 1999, we received a request for an extension to file rebuttal comments from domestic interested parties. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.302(b), the Department extended the deadline for all participants eligible to file rebuttal comments until October 15, 1999.

On October 1, 1999, we received a complete substantive response from domestic interested parties, within the 30-day deadline specified in the Sunset Regulations under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). Domestic interested parties claim that United States Steel Corporation (“USSC”) now USX, was the petitioner in the original investigation, and one or more of the domestic interested parties participated in all subsequent administrative reviews (see October 1, 1999, Substantive Response of domestic interested parties at 5).

On September 29, 1999, and we received a response from the European Union Delegation of the European Commission (“EC”) expressing its intent to participate in this review as the authority responsible for defending the interest of the Member States of the European Union (see September 29, 1999, Substantive Response of the EU at 3). On September 30, 1999, we received a response from the Government of Sweden. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we calculated importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rates for the class or kind of merchandise based on entered value. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Moreover, the following deposit rates will be effective upon the publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of certain welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand 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 company will be that established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate 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 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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.67 percent, the “All Others” rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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. These preliminary results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.


Robert S. LaRussa,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
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Sweden ("GOS") expressing its intent to participate in this review, as the government of a country in which subject merchandise is produced and exported. The GOS notes that it has in the past participated in this proceeding (see September 30, 1999, Substantive Response of GOS at 2).

The Department did not receive a substantive response from any foreign producer/exporter of the subject merchandise as defined under section 771(9)(A) of the Act. Thus, pursuant to section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A) of the Sunset Regulations, the Department determined the EC's and GOS's substantive responses to be inadequate for purposes of conducting a full review. Consequently, on October 21, 1999, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(A), the Department determined to conduct an expedited (120-day) sunset review of this order.3

The Department did not receive rebuttal comments from any interested parties. In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (i.e., an order in effect on January 1, 1995). This review concerns a transition order within the meaning of section 751(c)(6)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, on December 22, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of cold-rolled carbon steel products from Sweden is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than March 29, 2000, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.4

Scope of Review

The scope of this order covers carbon steel products from Sweden. These products include cold-rolled carbon steel, flat-rolled products, whether or not corrugated, or crimped; whether or not pickled, not cut, not pressed and not stamped to non-rectangular shape; not coated or plated with metal and not clad; over 12 inches in width and of any thickness; whether or not in coils. Such merchandise is classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") item numbers: 7209.11.0000, 7209.12.0000, 7209.13.0000, 7209.21.0000, 7209.22.0000, 7209.23.0000, 7209.24.5000, 7209.31.0000, 7209.32.0000, 7209.33.0000, 7209.34.0000, 7209.41.0000, 7209.43.0000, 7209.44.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7211.30.5000, 7211.41.7000, and 7211.49.5000. The written description remains 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 Robert S. LaRusso, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated March 29, 2000, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the attached Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of subsidy, the net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail were the order revoked, and the nature of the subsidy. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in B-099, 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

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the countervailing duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy at the rate listed below for all Swedish producers/exporters, except for Surahammar Bruk AB, which was excluded from the order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Producer/exporter</th>
<th>Net countervailable subsidy (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Producers/Exporters from Sweden</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of the Subsidy

In the Sunset Policy Bulletin, the Department states that, consistent with section 752(a)(6) of the Act, the Department will provide to the Commission information concerning the nature of the subsidy, and whether the subsidy is a subsidy described in Article 3 or Article 6.1 of the Subsidies Agreement. Because some programs not falling within the definition of an import subsidy under Article 3.1(a) of the Subsidies Agreement, could be found to be inconsistent with Article 6 if the net countervailable subsidy exceeds five percent (as measured in accordance with Annex IV of the Subsidies Agreement), we are providing the Commission with program descriptions in our Decision Memo.5

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. 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.


Joseph A. Spettrini,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
[FR Doc. 00–8692 Filed 4–6–00; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

[C–401–804]

Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Sweden; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Sweden.

SUMMARY: On September 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the countervailing duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Sweden (64 FR 47767) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic interested parties, as well as inadequate responses from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited (120-day) sunset review.


4 See Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Expedited Five-Year Reviews, 64 FR 71726 (December 22, 1998).

5 We note that as of January 1, 2000, Article 6.1 has ceased to apply (see Article 31 of the Subsidies Agreement).