

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 doubled antidumping duties.

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation. We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections section 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: August 6, 2001.

**Faryar Shirzad,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

*General Comment:*

Comment 1: General and Administrative and Interest Expenses Used in Constructed Value

*Company-Specific Comments:*

Agro Dutch

Comment 2: Date of Sale for Certain U.S. Sales

Comment 3: Facts Available for Movement Expenses on Certain Sales

Comment 4: Adjustments to Cost of Manufacturing for Period of Review

Comment 5: Equivalent Units Work-In-Process Adjustment

Weikfield

Comment 6: New Factual Information

Comment 7: Capitalization of Pre-Production Expenses

Comment 8: Claim for Start-up Adjustment

Comment 9: Treatment of Work-In-Process

Comment 10: Capitalized Interest Expense

Comment 11: Affiliated Party Interest

Himalya International

Comment 12: Omission of Certain U.S. Sales from Margin Calculation

Comment 13: Facts Available for U.S. Brokerage and Handling Expenses

Comment 14: Treatment of Certain Movement Expenses

Comment 15: Calculation of Indirect Selling Expenses for Constructed Value

Comment 16: Offsetting Positive Margins with Negative Margins in Antidumping Duty Margin Calculation

Comment 17: General and Administrative Expense Ratio

Comment 18: Financial Expense Ratio

[FR Doc. 01-20269 Filed 8-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**[A-428-825]**

**Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Germany; Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 13, 2001.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from Allegheny Ludlum, AK Steel Corporation, Butler Armco Independent Union, J&L Specialty Steel, Inc., North American Stainless, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC, and Zanesville Armco Independent Organization (collectively, petitioners) and respondent Krupp Thyssen Nirosta GmbH (KTN) and Krupp Hoesch Steel Products, Inc. (Krupp) (collectively, KTN), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils (S4) from Germany. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000.

We preliminarily determine that there are sales at less than normal value by KTN during the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the United States Price (USP) and normal value (NV).

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the arguments: (1) A statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the

arguments (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Patricia Tran, Michael Heaney, or Robert James at (202) 482-1121, (202) 482-4475, or (202) 482-0649, respectively, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**Applicable Statute and Regulations**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Background*

The Department published an antidumping duty order on S4 from Germany on July 27, 1999. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order; Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Germany (Antidumping Duty Order)*, 64 FR 40557 (July 27, 1999). On July 20, 2000, the Department published the *Notice of Opportunity to Request Administrative Review of stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Germany for the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000* (65 FR 45035).

On July 28, 2000, petitioners requested an administrative review of KTN's sales for the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000. On July 31, 2000, KTN also requested a review of its sales for the same time period. On September 6, 2000, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000. *See Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 65 FR 53980 (September 6, 2000).

Because it was not practicable to complete this review within the normal time frame, on February 28, 2001, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice of the extension of time limits for this review. *See Stainless Steel Sheet and Strips in Coils from Germany; Antidumping Duty Administrative*

*Review; Time Limits; Notice of Extension of Time Limits*, 66 FR 12759 (February 28, 2001). This extension established the deadline for these preliminary results as July 31, 2001.

#### *Scope of the Review*

For purposes of this order, the products covered are certain stainless steel sheet and strip in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject sheet and strip is a flat-rolled product in coils that is greater than 9.5 mm in width and less than 4.75 mm in thickness, and that is annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject sheet and strip may also be further processed (e.g., cold-rolled, polished, aluminized, coated, etc.) provided that it maintains the specific dimensions of sheet and strip following such processing.

The merchandise subject to this order is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) at subheadings: 7219.13.00.31, 7219.13.00.51, 7219.13.00.71, 7219.13.00.81, 7219.14.00.30, 7219.14.00.65, 7219.14.00.90, 7219.32.00.05, 7219.32.00.20, 7219.32.00.25, 7219.32.00.35, 7219.32.00.36, 7219.32.00.38, 7219.32.00.42, 7219.32.00.44, 7219.33.00.05, 7219.33.00.20, 7219.33.00.25, 7219.33.00.35, 7219.33.00.36, 7219.33.00.38, 7219.33.00.42, 7219.33.00.44, 7219.34.00.05, 7219.34.00.20, 7219.34.00.25, 7219.34.00.30, 7219.34.00.35, 7219.35.00.05, 7219.35.00.15, 7219.35.00.30, 7219.35.00.35, 7219.90.00.10, 7219.90.00.20, 7219.90.00.25, 7219.90.00.60, 7219.90.00.80, 7220.12.10.00, 7220.12.50.00, 7220.20.10.10, 7220.20.10.15, 7220.20.10.60, 7220.20.10.80, 7220.20.60.05, 7220.20.60.10, 7220.20.60.15, 7220.20.60.60, 7220.20.60.80, 7220.20.70.05, 7220.20.70.10, 7220.20.70.15, 7220.20.70.60, 7220.20.70.80, 7220.20.80.00, 7220.20.90.30, 7220.20.90.60, 7220.90.00.10, 7220.90.00.15, 7220.90.00.60, and 7220.90.00.80. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the Department's written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

Excluded from the scope of this order are the following: (1) Sheet and strip that is not annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled; (2) sheet and strip that is cut

to length; (3) plate (i.e., flat-rolled stainless steel products of a thickness of 4.75 mm or more); (4) flat wire (i.e., cold-rolled sections, with a prepared edge, rectangular in shape, of a width of not more than 9.5 mm); and (5) razor blade steel. Razor blade steel is a flat-rolled product of stainless steel, not further worked than cold-rolled (cold-reduced), in coils, of a width of not more than 23 mm and a thickness of 0.266 mm or less, containing, by weight, 12.5 to 14.5 percent chromium, and certified at the time of entry to be used in the manufacture of razor blades. See Chapter 72 of the HTSUS, "Additional U.S. Note" 1(d).

In response to comments by interested parties, the Department has determined that certain specialty stainless steel products are also excluded from the scope of this order. These excluded products are described below.

Flapper valve steel is defined as stainless steel strip in coils containing, by weight, between 0.37 and 0.43 percent carbon, between 1.15 and 1.35 percent molybdenum, and between 0.20 and 0.80 percent manganese. This steel also contains, by weight, phosphorus of 0.025 percent or less, silicon of between 0.20 and 0.50 percent, and sulfur of 0.020 percent or less. The product is manufactured by means of vacuum arc remelting, with inclusion controls for sulphide of no more than 0.04 percent and for oxide of no more than 0.05 percent. Flapper valve steel has a tensile strength of between 210 and 300 ksi, yield strength of between 170 and 270 ksi, plus or minus 8 ksi, and a hardness (Hv) of between 460 and 590. Flapper valve steel is most commonly used to produce specialty flapper valves for compressors.

Also excluded is a product referred to as suspension foil, a specialty steel product used in the manufacture of suspension assemblies for computer disk drives. Suspension foil is described as 302/304 grade or 202 grade stainless steel of a thickness between 14 and 127 microns, with a thickness tolerance of plus-or-minus 2.01 microns, and surface glossiness of 200 to 700 percent Gs. Suspension foil must be supplied in coil widths of not more than 407 mm, and with a mass of 225 kg or less. Roll marks may only be visible on one side, with no scratches of measurable depth. The material must exhibit residual stresses of 2 mm maximum deflection, and flatness of 1.6 mm over 685 mm length.

Certain stainless steel foil for automotive catalytic converters is also excluded from the scope of this order. This stainless steel strip in coils is a specialty foil with a thickness of between 20 and 110 microns used to

produce a metallic substrate with a honeycomb structure for use in automotive catalytic converters. The steel contains, by weight, carbon of no more than 0.030 percent, silicon of no more than 1.0 percent, manganese of no more than 1.0 percent, chromium of between 19 and 22 percent, aluminum of no less than 5.0 percent, phosphorus of no more than 0.045 percent, sulfur of no more than 0.03 percent, lanthanum of between 0.002 and 0.05 percent, and total rare earth elements of more than 0.06 percent, with the balance iron.

Permanent magnet iron-chromium-cobalt alloy stainless strip is also excluded from the scope of this order. This ductile stainless steel strip contains, by weight, 26 to 30 percent chromium, and 7 to 10 percent cobalt, with the remainder of iron, in widths 228.6 mm or less, and a thickness between 0.127 and 1.270 mm. It exhibits magnetic remanence between 9,000 and 12,000 gauss, and a coercivity of between 50 and 300 oersteds. This product is most commonly used in electronic sensors and is currently available under proprietary trade names such as "Arnokrome III."<sup>1</sup>

Certain electrical resistance alloy steel is also excluded from the scope of this order. This product is defined as a non-magnetic stainless steel manufactured to American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) specification B344 and containing, by weight, 36 percent nickel, 18 percent chromium, and 46 percent iron, and is most notable for its resistance to high temperature corrosion. It has a melting point of 1390 degrees Celsius and displays a creep rupture limit of 4 kilograms per square millimeter at 1000 degrees Celsius. This steel is most commonly used in the production of heating ribbons for circuit breakers and industrial furnaces, and in rheostats for railway locomotives. The product is currently available under proprietary trade names such as "Gilphy 36."<sup>2</sup>

Certain martensitic precipitation-hardenable stainless steel is also excluded from the scope of this order. This high-strength, ductile stainless steel product is designated under the Unified Numbering System (UNS) as S45500-grade steel, and contains, by weight, 11 to 13 percent chromium, and 7 to 10 percent nickel. Carbon, manganese, silicon and molybdenum each comprise, by weight, 0.05 percent or less, with phosphorus and sulfur each comprising, by weight, 0.03 percent or less. This steel has copper,

<sup>1</sup> "Arnokrome III" is a trademark of the Arnold Engineering Company.

<sup>2</sup> "Gilphy 36" is a trademark of Imphy, S.A.

niobium, and titanium added to achieve aging, and will exhibit yield strengths as high as 1700 Mpa and ultimate tensile strengths as high as 1750 Mpa after aging, with elongation percentages of 3 percent or less in 50 mm. It is generally provided in thicknesses between 0.635 and 0.787 mm, and in widths of 25.4 mm. This product is most commonly used in the manufacture of television tubes and is currently available under proprietary trade names such as "Durphynox 17."<sup>3</sup>

Finally, three specialty stainless steels typically used in certain industrial blades and surgical and medical instruments are also excluded from the scope of this order. These include stainless steel strip in coils used in the production of textile cutting tools (e.g., carpet knives).<sup>4</sup> This steel is similar to ASTM grade 440F, but containing, by weight, 0.5 to 0.7 percent of molybdenum. The steel also contains, by weight, carbon of between 1.0 and 1.1 percent, sulfur of 0.020 percent or less, and includes between 0.20 and 0.30 percent copper and between 0.20 and 0.50 percent cobalt. This steel is sold under proprietary names such as "GIN4 Mo." The second excluded stainless steel strip in coils is similar to AISI 420-J2 and contains, by weight, carbon of between 0.62 and 0.70 percent, silicon of between 0.20 and 0.50 percent, manganese of between 0.45 and 0.80 percent, phosphorus of no more than 0.025 percent and sulfur of no more than 0.020 percent. This steel has a carbide density on average of 100 carbide particles per square micron. An example of this product is "GIN5" steel. The third specialty steel has a chemical composition similar to AISI 420 F, with carbon of between 0.37 and 0.43 percent, molybdenum of between 1.15 and 1.35 percent, but lower manganese of between 0.20 and 0.80 percent, phosphorus of no more than 0.025 percent, silicon of between 0.20 and 0.50 percent, and sulfur of no more than 0.020 percent. This product is supplied with a hardness of more than Hv 500 guaranteed after customer processing, and is supplied as, for example, "GIN6."<sup>5</sup>

#### Verification

As provided for in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified the information submitted by KTN. We used standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's

facilities and examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification findings are outlined in the sales and cost verification reports which are on file in Room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building. See Home Market Verification of Information Submitted by KTN, July 16, 2001; Verification Report on the Further Manufacturing Cost Data Submitted by Ken-Mac Metals, Inc., June 18, 2001; and Verification Report on the Cost of Production and Constructed Value Data Submitted by KTN, June 22, 2001.

#### Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of S4 in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared United States Price (USP) to normal value (NV), as described in the "United States Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Tariff Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

#### United States Price (USP)

We calculated CEP, in accordance with subsection 772(b) of the Tariff Act, because sales to the first unaffiliated purchaser that took place after importation into the United States. We based CEP on the packed, delivered, duty paid or delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments for price or billing errors, where applicable. We also made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act; these included, where appropriate, foreign inland freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duties, U.S. inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, international freight, foreign inland insurance, and U.S. warehousing expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Tariff Act, we deducted those selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (credit costs, warranty expenses, commissions and other direct selling expenses), inventory carrying costs, and indirect selling expenses. We offset credit expenses by the amount of interest revenue on sales. For CEP sales, we also made an adjustment for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Tariff Act.

For those sales in which material was sent to an unaffiliated U.S. processor to be further processed, we made an adjustment based on the transaction-specific further-processing amounts reported by KTN. In addition, Ken-Mac performed some further processing of

some of KTN's U.S. sales. For these sales, we deducted the cost of further processing in accordance with 772(d)(2) of the Tariff Act. In calculating the cost of further manufacturing for Ken-Mac, we relied upon the further manufacturing information provided by KTN.

#### Normal Value

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (i.e., the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the respondent's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Tariff Act. As KTN's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

Sales to affiliated customers in the home market not made at arm's-length prices (if any) were excluded from our analysis because we considered them to be outside the ordinary course of trade. If sales were not made at arm's-length then the Department used the sale from the affiliated party to the first unaffiliated party. See 19 CFR 351.102. To test whether these sales were made at arm's-length prices, we compared on a model-specific basis the starting prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, and packing. Where, for the tested models of subject merchandise, prices to the affiliated party were on average 99.5 percent or more of the price to the unaffiliated parties, we determined that sales made to the affiliated party were at arm's length. See 19 CFR 351.403(c). In instances where no price ratio could be calculated for an affiliated customer because identical merchandise was not sold to unaffiliated customers, we were unable to determine that these sales were made at arm's-length prices and, therefore, excluded them from our analysis. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina*, 58 FR 37062, 37077 (July 9, 1993) and *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination; Emulsion Styrene-*

<sup>3</sup> "Durphynox 17" is a trademark of Imphy, S.A.

<sup>4</sup> This list of uses is illustrative and provided for descriptive purposes only.

<sup>5</sup> "GIN4 Mo," "GIN5" and "GIN6" are the proprietary grades of Hitachi Metals America, Ltd.

*Butadiene Rubber from Brazil*, 63 FR 59509, 59512 (November 4, 1998). Where the exclusion of such sales eliminated all sales of the most appropriate comparison product, we made a comparison to the next most similar model.

#### *Cost of Production (COP) Analysis*

The Department disregarded certain sales made by KTN in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation because these sales were at prices below KTN's cost of production (see *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Germany*, 64 FR 30710, 30716 (June 8, 1999)). Thus, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of S4 in the home market were made at prices below their cost of production (COP) in the current review period. Accordingly, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, we initiated a cost investigation to determine whether sales made during the POR were at prices below their respective COP.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Tariff Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus an amount for general and administrative expenses (G&A), interest expenses, and home market packing costs. We relied on the COP data submitted by KTN, except where noted below:

Where KTN's reported transfer prices for purchases of nickel from an affiliated party were not at arm's length, we increased these prices to reflect the prevailing market prices. Further, we revised the slitting costs reported by KTN's home market resellers by calculating one average cost for the service provided. See Memorandum from Tajia Slaughter to Neal Halper, Director Office of Accounting, dated July 31, 2001.

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act, where less than 20 percent of KTN's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. Where 20 percent or more of KTN's

home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made: (1) In substantial quantities within the POR (*i.e.*, within an extended period of time) in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act, and (2) at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Tariff Act (*i.e.*, the sales were made at prices below the weighted-average per-unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, if such sales existed, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act.

#### *Constructed Value*

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Tariff Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A, including interest expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by KTN in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. We used the CV data KTN supplied in its section D supplemental questionnaire response, except for the adjustments that we made for COP above.

#### *Price-Based Normal Value*

We calculated NV based on prices to unaffiliated customers or prices to affiliated customers that we determined to be at arm's length. We made adjustments for interest revenue, discounts, and rebates where appropriate. We made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, handling, and warehousing, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Tariff Act. In addition, when comparing sales of similar merchandise, we made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We also made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.410. We made COS adjustments for imputed credit expenses and warranty expenses. We also made an adjustment, where appropriate, for the CEP offset in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act. See *Level of Trade and CEP Offset* section below. Finally, we deducted home market packing costs

and added U.S. packing costs in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Tariff Act.

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act, we based NV on CV if we were unable to find a contemporaneous home market match of such or similar merchandise. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Tariff Act. Where we compared CV to CEP, we deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses. We also made an adjustment, where appropriate, for the CEP offset in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act.

#### *Level of Trade and CEP Offset*

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Tariff Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than CEP sales, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the differences in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act (the CEP offset provision). (See *e.g.*, *Certain Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997)).

In implementing these principles in this review, we asked KTN to identify the specific differences and similarities in selling functions and support services between all phases of marketing in the home market and the United States. KTN identified four channels of distribution in the home market: (1) Mill direct sales (2) mill inventory sales (3)

service center inventory sales, and (4) service center processed sales. For all channels KTN performs similar selling functions such as negotiating prices with customers, setting similar credit terms, arranging freight to the customer, and conducting market research and sales calls. The remaining selling activities did not differ significantly by channel of distribution. Because channels of distribution do not qualify as separate levels of trade when the selling functions performed for each customer class or channel are sufficiently similar, we determined that one level of trade exists for KTN's home market sales.

For the U.S. market KTN reported four channels of distribution: (1) Back-to-back CEP sales made through KHSP and Thyssen Marathon Canada (TMC); (2) consignment CEP sales made through KHSP and TMC; (3) inventory sales from TMC; and (4) services center sales thru Ken-Mac. All U.S. sales were CEP transactions. The Department examines the selling functions at the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer (*i.e.*, the sale from Krupp Thyssen Nirosta Export (KTN's home market affiliate) in Germany to affiliated U.S. importers). These selling functions included negotiating prices with customers, offering technical advice, arranging delivery services, providing after-sale warranties, and conducting market research and sales calls. However, KTN performed fewer of these selling functions in the U.S. market than it did in the home market. Additionally, the differences in selling functions performed for home market and CEP transactions indicates that home market sales involved a more advanced stage of distribution than CEP sales. *See* KTN Preliminary Analysis Memorandum, July 31, 2001, a public version of which is on file in Room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building. Because we compared CEP sales to HM sales at a different level of trade, we examined whether a LOT adjustment may be appropriate. In this case KTN sold at one LOT in the home market; therefore, there is no basis upon which to determine whether there is a pattern of consistent price differences between levels of trade. Further, we do not have the information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns of KTN's sales of other similar products, and there is no other record evidence upon which such an analysis could be based.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making a LOT adjustment but the LOT in Germany for KTN is at a more advanced stage than the LOT of the CEP sales, a

CEP offset is appropriate in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act, as claimed by KTN. Where there were commissions in U.S. market but not the home market, we calculated the CEP offset as the lesser of either the U.S. commissions or the home market indirect selling expenses. Where there were commissions in both the U.S. and home markets, we calculated the CEP offset as the lesser of either the home market indirect selling expenses or the difference between the U.S. and home market commissions. Where there were commissions in the home market but not the U.S. market, we set the CEP offset equal to zero. We performed these calculations in accordance with 772(d)(1)(D) of the Tariff Act. We applied the CEP offset to NV, whether based on home market prices or CV.

#### *Facts Available*

In accordance with section 776(a)(1) of the Tariff Act, in these preliminary results we find it necessary to use partial facts available in those instances where the respondent did not provide us with certain information necessary to conduct our analysis. In a small number of cases, KTN's affiliated U.S. reseller, Ken-Mac, was unable to confirm the origin of the subject merchandise it sold during the POR. Therefore, KTN provided data about these particular resales through Ken-Mac in a separate database. KTN reported that it allocated these sales of "unattributable" merchandise amongst the potential suppliers of the material based on relative percentage, by volume, of stainless steel and strip purchased during the POR by Ken-Mac from each supplier. In addition to KTN, potential suppliers of this merchandise include, among others, Mexinox S.A. de C.V. (Mexinox) and Acciai Speciali Terni (AST), producers which are subject to the companion antidumping duty administrative reviews covering S4 in coils from Mexico and Italy, respectively. At our sales verification of Ken-Mac, we thoroughly reviewed this issue and determined that Ken-Mac had acted to the best of its ability in attempting to trace the origin of the subject merchandise that it sold during the POR.

Because of the unknown origin of certain of Ken-Mac's resales of subject merchandise, KTN has, in effect, not provided all the information necessary to complete our analysis. Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that, pursuant to section 776(a) of the Tariff Act, it is appropriate to use the facts otherwise available in calculating a margin on these sales. Section 776(a) of the Tariff Act provides that the

Department will, subject to section 782(d), use the facts otherwise available in reaching a determination if "necessary information is not available on the record." Therefore, for these preliminary results, we have calculated a margin on Ken-Mac's "unattributable" resales by applying the overall margin calculated on all other Ken-Mac sales/resales of subject merchandise to the weighted-average price of these "unattributable" sales. We then weighted the result by allocating a portion of the "unattributable" database representing the ratio of Ken-Mac's purchases of stainless steel from Germany to stainless steel purchases from all vendors.

The Department incorporated KTN's May 21, 2001 submission of Krupp VDM GmbH (Krupp VDM) sales into KTN's home market and U.S. market sales data to calculate a weighted-average margin. However, a section D response was not included along with Krupp VDM's sales information. KTN did report in Krupp VDM's sales listing TOTCOM and VCOM; additional information on the record allowed the Department to calculate Krupp VDM's COP without resorting to facts available. The Department calculated Krupp VDM's total cost of production (TOTCOP) by first constructing Krupp VDM's general and administrative expenses (GNA) and interest expense (INTEX) from its audited 1999 and 2000 financial statements. *See* KTN's May 21, 2001 submission at exhibit C-4. The TOTCOP was calculated by adding GNA, INTEX and Krupp VDM's reported TOTCOM. *See* KTN's Preliminary Analysis Memorandum, July 31, 2001.

#### *Preliminary Results of Review*

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period January 4, 1999 through June 30, 2000:

*Manufacturer/Exporter:* KTN  
*Weighted Average Margin (percentage):*  
2.81

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within thirty days of publication. *See* CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs or written comments no later than 30 days after the

date of publication of these preliminary results of review. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) A statement of the issue, (2) a brief summary of the argument and (3) a table of authorities. Further, we would appreciate it if parties submitting written comments would provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate *ad valorem* assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appropriate appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of the review.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of S4 in coils from Germany entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for KTN will be the rate established in the final results of review;

(2) If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and

(3) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 25.37 percent (*see Antidumping Duty Order* 64 FR 40557, 40559).

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of

their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: July 31, 2001.

**Faryar Shirzad,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-20272 Filed 8-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-535-001]

#### **Cotton Shop Towels From Pakistan: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On April 9, 2001, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on cotton shop towel from Pakistan for the period January 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999. *See Cotton Shop Towels From Pakistan: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 66 FR 18444 (April 9, 2001) (*Preliminary Results*).

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not made changes to the net subsidy rates. Therefore, the final results do not differ from the preliminary results. The final net subsidy rates for the reviewed companies are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 13, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gayle Longest at (202) 482-3338 or Mark Young at (202) 482-6397, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department

of Commerce, Room 4012, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **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 the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

#### **Background**

On April 9, 2001, the Department published its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on cotton shop towels from Pakistan. *See Preliminary Results*. This review covers 11 manufacturers/exporters, Mehtabi Towel Mills Ltd. (Mehtabi), Shahi Textiles (Shahi), Silver Textile Factory (Silver), Universal Linen (Universal), United Towel Exporters (United), R.I. Weaving (R.I.), Fine Fabrico (Fabrico), Ejaz Linen (Ejaz), Quality Linen Supply Corp. (Quality), Jawwad Industries (Jawwad), and Ahmed & Co. (Ahmed). The review covers the period January 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999, and seven programs.

#### **Scope of the Review**

The merchandise subject to this review is cotton shop towels. The product covered in this review is provided for under item number 6307.10.20 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### **Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memorandum) dated concurrent with this notice which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of issues which parties have raised and to which we have responded, all of which are in the Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice as Appendix I. 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 room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision