

exercise control of Saldanha's assets. Furthermore, both companies produce the subject merchandise. See the public version of *Memo to File, "Cross-Ownership of Iscor, Ltd., in Saldanha Steel Ltd."*, dated April 13, 2001 (case number C-791-810), which has been placed on the record of this investigation. In light of these facts, and because Iscor's and Saldanha's refusal to cooperate in this investigation has impeded our analysis of this issue, the Department infers that there is significant potential for the manipulation of prices or production between these two companies within the meaning of section 351.401(f)(2) of the Department's regulations. Thus, we preliminarily determine, in accordance with 351.401(f)(1) of the Department's regulations, that Saldanha and Iscor should be treated as a single entity for purposes of this antidumping proceeding, and have determined one dumping margin for this single entity.

Verification

In accordance with section 782(i) of the Act, we intend to verify information to be used in making our final determination.

All Others

Section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act provides that, where the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for all exporters and producers individually investigated are zero or de minimis margins, or are determined entirely under section 776 of the Act, the Department may use any reasonable method to establish the estimated "all others" rate for exporters and producers not individually investigated. This provision contemplates that we weight-average margins other than facts available margins to establish the "all others" rate. Where the data do not permit weight-averaging such rates, the SAA, at 873, provides that we may use other reasonable methods. Because the petition contained only an estimated price-to-CV dumping margin, which the Department adjusted for purposes of initiation, there are no additional estimated margins available with which to create the "all others" rate. Therefore, we applied the published margin of 9.28 percent as the "all others" rate.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(2) of the Act, the Department will direct the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of HR products from South Africa that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of

publication in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated preliminary dumping margin indicated in the chart below. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The preliminary weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

	Margin (percent)
Exporter/Manufacturer:	
Highveld	9.28
Iscor/Saldanha	9.28
All Others	9.28

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination, or 45 days after our final determination, whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs for this investigation must be submitted no later than one week after the issuance of the verification reports. Rebuttal briefs must be filed within five days after the deadline for submission of case briefs. A list of authorities used, a table of contents, and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Executive summaries should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes.

Section 774 of the Act provides that the Department will hold a hearing to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs, provided that such a hearing is requested by any interested party. If a request for a hearing is made in an investigation, the hearing will tentatively be held two days after the deadline for submission of the rebuttal briefs, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. In the event that the Department receives requests for hearings from parties to several HR products cases, the Department may schedule a single hearing to encompass all those cases. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time. Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or participate if one is requested, must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests

should specify the number of participants and provide a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination no later than 75 days after the date of this preliminary determination.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act. Effective January 20, 2001, Bernard T. Carreau is fulfilling the duties of the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Dated: April 23, 2001.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-10851 Filed 5-2-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-357-814]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Argentina

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 3, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley or Charles Riggall at (202) 482-0631 and (202) 482-0650, respectively; AD/CVD, Enforcement, Office 5, Group II, Import Administration, Room 1870, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

The 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 Department of Commerce (the Department) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (April 2000).

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products (HRS) from Argentina are being, or are likely to be sold, in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 733 of

the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the *Suspension of Liquidation* section of this notice.

Case History

On November 13, 2000, the Department received a petition on hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Argentina filed in proper form by Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Gallatin Steel Company, IPSCO Steel Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, Nucor Corporation, Steel Dynamics, Inc., U.S. Steel Group (a unit of USX Corporation), Weirton Steel Corporation, and Independent Steelworkers Union. On November 16, 2000, the United Steel Workers of America joined as co-petitioners in this case.

This investigation was initiated on December 4, 2000. See *Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Argentina, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, the People's Republic of China, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine*, 65 FR 77568 (December 12, 2000) (*Initiation Notice*). Since the initiation of these investigations, the following events have occurred.

The Department set aside a period for all interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. See *Initiation Notice* at 77569. We received no comments from any parties in this investigation. The Department did, however, receive comments regarding product coverage in the concurrent investigation of HRS products from the Netherlands. In that investigation we received comments from Duracell Global Business Management Group on December 11, 2000, from Energizer on December 15, 2000, from Bouffard Metal Goods, Inc., and Truelove & Maclean, Inc., on December 18, 2000, from Corus Staal BV and Corus Steel U.S.A., Inc. (collectively referred to as Corus), from Thomas Steel Strip Corporation on December 27, 2000, and from Rayovac Corporation on March 12, 2001.

On December 22, 2000, the Department issued a letter to interested parties in all of the concurrent HRS antidumping investigations, providing an opportunity to comment on the Department's proposed model matching characteristics and hierarchy. Comments were submitted by: The petitioners (January 5, 2001); Corus, respondent in the Netherlands investigation (January 3, 2001); Iscor Limited, respondent in the South Africa investigation (January 3, 2001); and Zaporizhstal, respondent in the Ukraine investigation (January 3, 2001).

Petitioners agreed with the Department's proposed characteristics and hierarchy of characteristics. Corus suggested adding a product characteristic to distinguish prime merchandise from non-prime merchandise. Neither Iscor nor Zaporizhstal proposed any changes to the either the list of product characteristics proposed by the Department or the hierarchy of those product characteristics but, rather, provided information relating to its own products that was not relevant in the context of determining what information to include in the Department's questionnaires. For purposes of the questionnaires subsequently issued by the Department to the respondents, no changes were made to the product characteristics or the hierarchy of those characteristics from those originally proposed by the Department in its December 22, 2000 letter. With respect to Corus' request, the additional product characteristic suggested by Corus, to distinguish prime merchandise from non-prime merchandise, is unnecessary. The Department already asks respondents to distinguish prime from non-prime merchandise in field number 2.2 "Prime vs. Secondary Merchandise." See the Department's Antidumping Duty Questionnaire, at B-7 and C-7 (January 4, 2001). These fields are used in the model match program to prevent matches of prime merchandise to non-prime merchandise. After careful review of the comments received, we made no changes to the model matching characteristics and hierarchy proposed in the Department's letter.

On December 28, 2000, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that imports of the products subject to this investigation are threatening or materially injuring an industry in the United States producing the domestic like product. See *Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Argentina, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine*, 66 FR 805 (January 4, 2001).

On January 4, 2001, the Department issued an antidumping questionnaire to Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros SA (Acindar) and Siderar Saic (Siderar), the mandatory respondents in this case. On January 16, 2001, Siderar notified the Department that it would not be responding to the Department's questionnaire due to the burdens involved in submitting a response. It provided no further elaboration, nor did it suggest alternatives to the

Department's requirements pursuant to section 782 (c) of the Act. On January 17, 2001, the Government of Argentina also notified the Department that Siderar would not be participating in the investigation. On January 17, 2001, Acindar informed the Department that it did not sell the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation (POI) and, therefore, had no sales to report. Upon reviewing U.S. Customs data, the Department confirmed that Acindar did not sell the subject merchandise to the United States during the POI and as such any future exports from Acindar will be subject to the "all-others" rate.

Period of Investigation

The POI for this investigation is October 1, 1999 through September 30, 2000. This period corresponds to the four most recent fiscal quarters prior to the month of the filing of the petition (*i.e.*, November 2000).

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, the products covered are certain HRS of a rectangular shape, of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal and whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other non-metallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers), regardless of thickness, and in straight length, of a thickness of less than 4.75 mm and of a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness. Universal mill plate (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm, but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a thickness of not less than 4.0 mm, not in coils and without patterns in relief) of a thickness not less than 4.0 mm is not included within the scope of this investigation.

Specifically included within the scope are vacuum degassed, fully stabilized (commonly referred to as interstitial-free (IF)) steels, high strength low alloy (HSLA) steels, and the substrate for motor lamination steels. IF steels are recognized as low carbon steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as titanium or niobium (also commonly referred to as columbium), or both, added to stabilize carbon and nitrogen elements. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, vanadium, and molybdenum. The substrate for motor lamination steels contains micro-alloying levels of elements such as silicon and aluminum.

Steel products to be included in the scope of this investigation, regardless of

definitions in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), are products in which: (i) Iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements; (ii) the carbon content is 2 percent or less, by weight; and (iii) none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity, by weight, respectively indicated:

- 1.80 percent of manganese, or
- 2.25 percent of silicon, or
- 1.00 percent of copper, or
- 0.50 percent of aluminum, or
- 1.25 percent of chromium, or
- 0.30 percent of cobalt, or
- 0.40 percent of lead, or
- 1.25 percent of nickel, or
- 0.30 percent of tungsten, or
- 0.10 percent of molybdenum, or
- 0.10 percent of niobium, or
- 0.15 percent of vanadium, or
- 0.15 percent of zirconium.

All products that meet the physical and chemical description provided above are within the scope of this investigation unless otherwise excluded. The following products, by way of example, are outside or specifically excluded from the scope:

- Alloy hot-rolled steel products in which at least one of the chemical elements exceeds those listed above (including, *e.g.*, American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) specifications A543, A387, A514, A517, A506).
- Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE)/American Iron & Steel Institute (AISI) grades of series 2300 and higher.
- Ball bearing steels, as defined in the HTSUS.
- Tool steels, as defined in the HTSUS.
- Silico-manganese (as defined in the HTSUS) or silicon electrical steel with a silicon level exceeding 2.25 percent.
- ASTM specifications A710 and A736.
- USS abrasion-resistant steels (USS AR 400, USS AR 500).
- All products (proprietary or otherwise) based on an alloy ASTM specification (sample specifications: ASTM A506, A507).
- Non-rectangular shapes, not in coils, which are the result of having been processed by cutting or stamping and which have assumed the character of articles or products classified outside chapter 72 of the HTSUS.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classified in the HTSUS at subheadings: 7208.10.15.00, 7208.10.30.00, 7208.10.60.00, 7208.25.30.00, 7208.25.60.00, 7208.26.00.30, 7208.26.00.60, 7208.27.00.30, 7208.27.00.60,

7208.36.00.30, 7208.36.00.60, 7208.37.00.30, 7208.37.00.60, 7208.38.00.15, 7208.38.00.30, 7208.38.00.90, 7208.39.00.15, 7208.39.00.90, 7208.39.00.90, 7208.40.60.30, 7208.40.60.60, 7208.53.00.00, 7208.54.00.00, 7208.90.00.00, 7211.14.00.90, 7211.19.15.00, 7211.19.20.00, 7211.19.30.00, 7211.19.45.00, 7211.19.60.00, 7211.19.75.30, 7211.19.75.60, and 7211.19.75.90. Certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products covered by this investigation, including vacuum degassed fully stabilized, high strength low alloy, and the substrate for motor lamination steel may also enter under the following tariff classification numbers: 7225.11.00.00, 7225.19.00.00, 7225.30.30.50, 7225.30.70.00, 7225.40.70.00, 7225.99.00.90, 7226.11.10.00, 7226.11.90.30, 7226.11.90.60, 7226.19.10.00, 7226.19.90.00, 7226.91.50.00, 7226.91.70.00, 7226.91.80.00, and 7226.99.00.00. Subject merchandise may also enter under 7210.70.30.00, 7210.90.90.00, 7211.14.00.30, 7212.40.10.00, 7212.40.50.00, and 7212.50.00.00.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

Facts Available

1. Application of Facts Available

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that, if an interested party (A) withholds information requested by the Department, (B) fails to provide such information by the deadline, or in the form or manner requested, (C) significantly impedes a proceeding, or (D) provides information that cannot be verified, the Department shall use, subject to sections 782(d) and (e) of the Act, facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. Pursuant to section 782(e) of the Act, the Department shall not decline to consider submitted information if all of the following requirements are met: (1) The information is submitted by the established deadline; (2) the information can be verified; (3) the information is not so incomplete that it cannot serve as a reliable basis for reaching the applicable determination; (4) the interested party has demonstrated that it acted to the best of its ability; and (5) the information can be used without undue difficulties.

In selecting from among the facts otherwise available, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use an adverse inference, if the

Department finds that an interested party failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with the request for information. *See, e.g., Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 53808, 53819–20 (October 16, 1997). Finally, section 776(b) of the Act states that an adverse inference may include reliance on information derived from the petition. *See also* Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 103–316 at 870 (1994).

In accordance with section 776(a)(2)(A) of the Act, for the reasons explained below, because Siderar failed to respond to our questionnaire, we preliminarily determine that the use of total adverse facts available is warranted with respect to Siderar. *See* the April 23, 2001 memorandum Application of Facts Available for Siderar Saic on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the main Commerce Department Building.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that the Department may use an inference adverse to the interests of a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with the Department's requests for information. *See also* Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 103–316 at 870 (1994) (SAA). Failure by Siderar to respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire constitutes a failure to act to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information, within the meaning of section 776 of the Act. Because Siderar failed to act to the best of its ability, the Department has determined that, in selecting among the facts otherwise available, an adverse inference is warranted in selecting the facts available for this company. Consistent with Department practice, we assigned Siderar the highest margin alleged in the amendment to the petition, *i.e.*, 44.59 percent. *See Initiation Notice*.

2. Selection and Corroboration of Facts Available

Section 776(b) of the Act states that an adverse inference may include reliance on information derived from the petition. *See also* SAA at 829–831. Section 776(c) of the Act provides that, when the Department relies on secondary information (such as the petition) in using the facts otherwise available, it must, to the extent practicable, corroborate that information from independent sources that are reasonably at its disposal.

The SAA clarifies that "corroborate" means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value (*see* SAA at 870). The SAA also states that independent sources used to corroborate such evidence may include, for example, published price lists, official import statistics and Customs data, and information obtained from interested parties during the particular investigation (*see* SAA at 870).

We reviewed the adequacy and accuracy of the information in the petition during our pre-initiation analysis of the petition, to the extent appropriate information was available for this purpose. *See Import Administration AD Investigation Initiation Checklist*, dated December 4, 2000, for a discussion of the margin calculation in the petition. In addition, in order to determine the probative value of the margin in the petition for use as adverse facts available for purposes of this determination, we examined evidence supporting the calculation in the petition. In accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we examined the key elements of the export price (EP) and normal value (NV) calculations on which the margin in the petition was based. Our review of the EP and NV calculation indicated that the information in the petition has probative value, as certain information (*e.g.*, international freight and customs duties) included in the margin calculation in the petition is from public sources concurrent, for the most part, with the POI.

We compared the export prices contained in the petition with U.S. Census values for the same HTS category and found the export prices suggested in the petition to be reasonable and, therefore, corroborated for purposes of calculating a facts available margin. With respect to the NV data included in the margin calculations of the petition, we were able to corroborate the reasonableness of these data through the use of multiple sources. *See* the April 23 memorandum titled *Application of Facts Available for Siderar Saic*.

All-Others Rate

Section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act provides that, where the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for all exporters and producers individually investigated are zero or de minimis margins, or are determined entirely under section 776 of the Act, the Department may use any reasonable method to establish the estimated "all-others" rate for exporters

and producers not individually investigated. Our recent practice under these circumstances has been to assign, as the "all-others" rate, the simple average of the margins in the petition. We have done so in this case.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing Customs to suspend liquidation of all entries of HRS from Argentina that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct Customs to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the amount by which the NV exceeds the EP, as indicated in the chart below. We will adjust the deposit requirements to account for any export subsidies found in the companion countervailing duty investigation. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Siderar Saic (Siderar)	44.59
All Others	40.60

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final antidumping determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry. The deadline for that ITC determination would be the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after the date of our final determination.

Public Comment

Case briefs must be submitted no later than 35 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Rebuttal briefs must be filed within five business days after the deadline for submission of case briefs. A list of authorities used, a table of contents, and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Executive summaries should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. Public versions of all comments and rebuttals should be provided to the Department and made available on diskette.

Section 774 of the Act provides that the Department will hold a hearing to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs, provided that such a

hearing is requested by any interested party. If a request for a hearing is made in an investigation, the hearing will tentatively be held two days after the deadline for submission of the rebuttal briefs, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. In the event that the Department receives requests for hearings from parties to more than one HRS case, the Department may schedule a single hearing to encompass all cases. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should specify the number of participants and provide a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs.

If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination in this investigation no later than 75 days after the date of this preliminary determination.

This determination is published pursuant to sections 733(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Act. Effective January 20, 2001, Bernard T. Carreau is fulfilling the duties of the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Dated: April 23, 2001.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-10852 Filed 5-2-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-865]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 3, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine Bertrand, Carrie Blozy, or Doreen Chen, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3207, (202) 482-0165, and (202) 482-0193, respectively.