

b. Constructed Export Price

For constructed export-price (CEP) sales (sampled and non-sampled), we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer. When an affiliated party acts as an importer for EP sales we have included the applicable EP sales in the assessment-rate calculation. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries under the relevant order during the review period (see 19 CFR 351.212(a)).

Cash-Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each respondent (*i.e.*, each exporter and/or manufacturer included in these reviews), we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value of that company's sales of merchandise during the review period subject to each order.

To derive a single deposit rate for each respondent, we weight-averaged the EP and CEP deposit rates (using the EP and CEP, respectively, as the weighting factors). To accomplish this when we sampled CEP sales, we first calculated the total dumping margins for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP margins by the ratio of total days in the review period to days in the sample weeks. We then calculated a total net value for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP total net value by the same ratio. Finally, we divided the combined total dumping margins for both EP and CEP sales by the combined total value for both EP and CEP sales to obtain the deposit rate.

We will direct the Customs Service to collect the resulting percentage deposit rate against the entered customs value of each of the exporter's entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice. Entries of parts incorporated into finished bearings before sales to an unaffiliated customer in the United States will receive the respondent's deposit rate applicable to the order.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative reviews for all shipments of ball bearings entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash-

deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates shown above except that, for firms whose weighted-average margins are less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the Department will not require a deposit of estimated antidumping duties; (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, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash-deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the "All Others" rate for the relevant order made effective by the final results of review published on July 26, 1993 (see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order*, 58 FR 39729 (July 26, 1993), and, for BBs from Italy, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 61 FR 66472 (December 17, 1996)). These "All Others" rates are the "All Others" rates from the relevant LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

This notice serves as a 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 these review periods. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a 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. 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 the terms of an APO are sanctionable violations.

We are issuing and publishing these determinations and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(c).

Dated: August 23, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

Comments and Responses

1. Facts Available
2. Margin Calculation (Zeroing of Positive Margins)
3. Export Price/Constructed Export Price
4. Price Adjustments
 - A. Commissions
 - B. Billing Adjustments
 - C. Credit Expenses
 - D. Direct and Indirect Selling Expenses
 - E. Others
5. Arm's-Length Test and Sales to Affiliated Parties
6. Sample Sales, Prototype Sales, and Sales Outside the Ordinary Course of Trade
7. Cost of Production and Constructed Value
 - A. Profit for CV
 - B. Affiliated-Party Inputs
 - C. Depreciation of Idle Assets
 - D. Loss on Marketable Securities
 - E. Others
8. Packing and Movement Expenses
9. Discounts and Rebates
10. Miscellaneous
 - A. Improper Service
 - B. Consignment Sales
 - C. Model Matching
 - D. Clerical Errors
 - E. Others

[FR Doc. 02-22254 Filed 8-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-122-840]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Canada

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 30, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Constance Handley or Daniel O'Brien, at (202) 482-0631 or (202) 482-1376, respectively; Import Administration, 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 (Department) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Final Determination

We determine that carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod (steel wire rod) from Canada is being sold, or is likely to be sold, in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 735 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the "Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

The preliminary determination in this investigation was issued on April 2, 2002. See *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada*, 67 FR 17389 (April 10, 2002). Since the publication of the preliminary determination, the following events have occurred:

In April and May 2002, the Department verified the responses submitted by the three respondents in the investigation: Ispat Sidbec Inc. (ISI), Ivaco, Inc. (Ivaco) and Stelco, Inc. (Stelco). Verification reports were issued in May and June 2002. On July 8, 2002, we received case briefs from the petitioners¹ and the three respondents. On July 17, 2002, we received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners and the respondents. A public hearing was not held.

Scope Issues

Since the *Preliminary Determination* a number of parties have filed requests asking the Department to exclude various products from the scope of the concurrent antidumping duty (Brazil, Canada, Germany, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago and Ukraine) and countervailing duty (Brazil, Canada, Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkey) investigations. On May 6, 2002, Ispat Hamburger Stahlwerke GmbH and Ispat Walzdraht Hochfeld GmbH (collectively, Ispat Germany) requested an exclusion for "super clean valve spring wire." Two parties filed additional exclusion requests on June 14, 2002: Bluff City Steel asked that the Department exclude

"clean-steel precision bar," and Lincoln Electric Company sought the exclusion of its EW 2512 grade of metal inert gas welding wire. On June 28, 2002, petitioners filed objections to a range of scope exclusion requests including: (i) Bluff City Steel's request for clean precision bar; (ii) Lincoln Electric Company's request for EW 2512 grade wire rod; (iii) Ispat Germany's request for "super clean valve spring wire;" (iv) Tokusen USA's January 22, 2002 request for 1070 grade tire cord and tire bead quality wire rod (tire cord wire rod); and (v) various parties' request for 1090 grade tire cord wire rod.

In addition, Moldova Steel Works requested the exclusion of various grades of tire cord wire rod on July 17, 2002. The Rubber Manufacturers Association (the RMA), Ispat Germany, Lincoln Electric and Bluff City filed rebuttals to the petitioners' June 28, 2002 submission on July 8, 11, 17, and 29, 2002, respectively. The RMA filed additional comments on July 30, 2002.²

The Department has analyzed these requests and the petitioners' objections and we find no modifications to the scope are warranted. See Memorandum from Richard Weible to Faryar Shirzad, "Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod; Antidumping Duty (Brazil, Canada, Germany, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine) and Countervailing Duty (Brazil, Canada, Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkey) Investigations: Requests for Scope Exclusion" dated August 23, 2002, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Commerce building.

Scope of Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of

bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

The designation of the products as "tire cord quality" or "tire bead quality" indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other

¹ The petitioners in this investigation are Co-Steel Raritand, Inc., and North Start Steel Texas, Inc.

² On August 9, 2002, Bekaert Corporation requested an exclusion for certain high chrome/high silicon steel wire rod, from the scope of these investigations. This request was filed too late to be considered for the final determinations in these investigations.

rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products under investigation are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, and 7227.90.6059 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001. This period corresponds to the four most recent fiscal quarters prior to the month of the filing of the petition (i.e., August 2001).

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we conducted verification of the cost and sales information submitted by the three respondents. We used standard verification procedures including examination of relevant accounting and production records, and original source documents provided by the respondent.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this antidumping proceeding are listed in the appendix to this notice and addressed in the *Decision Memorandum* dated August 23, 2002, and are hereby adopted by this notice. The *Decision Memorandum* is on file in room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce

building. In addition, a complete version of the *Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the World Wide Web at http://www.ita.doc.gov/import_admin/records/frn. The paper and electronic versions of the *Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Determinations

Based on our findings at verification, and analysis of comments received, we have made adjustments to the preliminary determination calculation methodologies in calculating the final dumping margins in these proceedings. These adjustments are discussed in the *Decision Memorandum* for this investigation.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of steel wire rod exported from Canada, with the exception of merchandise produced by Stelco, Inc., that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the preliminary determination. The Customs Service shall continue to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond based on the estimated weighted-average dumping margins shown below. Because we have determined that steel wire rod produced by Stelco, Inc. is not being sold at LTFV, we are not directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of this merchandise. The suspension of liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice.

We determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for Canada:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
ISI	2.54
Ivaco	13.35
Stelco	* 1.18
All Others	9.91

* *De minimis*—excluded from the calculation of the “All Others” rate.

International Trade Commission Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the International Trade Commission (ITC) of our determination. The ITC will determine, within 45 days, whether imports of subject merchandise from Canada are causing material injury, or threaten material injury, to an industry in the United States. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat

of injury does not exist, this proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or canceled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping order directing Customs Service officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation.

This notice also serves as a 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. Timely 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.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 735(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 23, 2002.

Faryar Shizad,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

Issues Covered in Decision Memorandum

- Comment 1: Treatment of Negative Margins
Sales Issues Specific to Ivaco
- Comment 2: Reported U.S. Inventory Carrying Costs
- Comment 3: Indirect Selling Expenses Incurred in Canada
- Comment 4: Facts Available Rate for Further Manufactured Sales
- Comment 5: Sivaco Georgia’s (SGA) Freight Revenue for Certain Sales
- Comment 6: The Department Should Exclude All of Ivaco’s Intra-Company Sales
- Comment 7: Three Sales Identified by Ivaco as U.S. Sales
- Comment 8: The Department Should Convert Ivaco’s Home Market Gross Unit Price and Associated Expenses to a Uniform Currency
Cost Issues Specific to Ivaco
- Comment 9: Deferred Production Costs
- Comment 10: Ivaco’s Reported Billet Costs and Cost of Manufacture
- Comment 11: Financial Expense Ratio
- Comment 12: General and Administrative Expense Ratio
Sales Issues Specific to ISI
- Comment 13: Date of Payment for Unpaid Sales to a U.S. Customer
- Comment 14: Matching of Prime Material to Non-Prime Material
- Comment 15: Walker Wire’s Sales of Wire Products

Comment 16: Segregation of Further-Manufactured Sales from Other Constructed Export Price Sales

Cost Issues Specific to ISI

Comment 17: Affiliated Party Inputs
 Comment 18: General and Administrative Depreciation Expense
 Comment 19: General and Administrative Expense—Further Manufacturing
 Comment 20: Adjustment to Walker Wire's Cost of Manufacturing

Sales Issues Specific to Stelco

Comment 21: Sale Amount
 Comment 22: Stelco's Sales to Stelfil Ltee. (Stelfil)

Cost Issues Specific to Stelco

Comment 23: "Collapsed Entities" Rule
 Comment 24: Purchase of Pulverized Coal, Bloom Reheating Services and Billets
 Comment 25: Purchases of Iron Ore
 Comment 26: General and Administrative Expense Rates
 Comment 27: Foreign Exchange Gains and Losses
 Comment 28: Short-Term Interest Income
 Comment 29: Further Manufacturing Costs
 Comment 30: Minor Errors

[FR Doc. 02-22246 Filed 8-29-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-823-812]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Ukraine

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 30, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Blozy, Stephen Bailey, or Lisa Shishido, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0165, (202) 482-1102, and (202) 482-1382, respectively.

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 of Commerce ("the Department") regulations refer to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (2001).

Final Determination

We determine that carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Ukraine is being sold, or is likely to be sold, in the United States at less than fair value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 735 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

This investigation was initiated on September 24, 2001. See *Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Germany, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, and Venezuela*, 66 FR 50164 (October 2, 2001) ("Notice of Initiation"). The sole participating respondent in this investigation is Krivorozhstal State Mine-Metallurgical Works ("Krivorozhstal"). The petitioners in this investigation are Co-Steel Raritan, Inc., Georgetown Steel Company, Keystone Consolidated Industries, Inc., and North Star Steel Texas, Inc. ("Petitioners"). On October 17, 2001, the Government of Ukraine ("GOU") submitted a request for, and information in support of, graduation to market economy status for Ukraine. On April 10, 2002, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published its *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Ukraine*, 67 FR 17367 (April 10, 2002) ("Preliminary Determination"). Since the *Preliminary Determination* of the investigation, the following events have occurred.

On April 17, 2002, the Department issued to Krivorozhstal a letter regarding its March 19, 2002 submission. On April 24, 2002, Krivorozhstal responded to this letter.

On April 17, and April 18, 2002, respectively, the GOU submitted a request and proposal for a suspension agreement in accordance with the Department's regulations at 19 CFR 351.208. On April 24, 2002, the GOU submitted a request to discuss its proposed suspension agreement.

On April 24, 2002, Krivorozhstal submitted a request that the Department issue to it a market economy questionnaire. On April 30, 2002, Petitioners submitted a letter in opposition to this request.

On May 20 and May 21, 2002, Krivorozhstal submitted public pricing information regarding its factors of production. On May 21, 2002,

Krivorozhstal requested that the Department allow the late submission of its public pricing information concerning water. On May 24, 2002, Petitioners submitted a letter in opposition to this request. On June 6, 2002, the Department issued a questionnaire to Krivorozhstal regarding public pricing information, including the information concerning water. On June 20, 2002, Krivorozhstal responded to this questionnaire.

On June 24, 2002, Krivorozhstal submitted production and sales documentation for byproducts that it claimed it generated and sold during the POI. On June 26, 2002, the Department requested information from Krivorozhstal regarding its June 24, 2002, submission. See *Memorandum to the File from Lori Ellison to James C. Doyle*, June 26, 2002. On June 27, 2002, Krivorozhstal provided a response to this request.

On June 6, 2002, the Department issued a verification agenda to Krivorozhstal. On June 27, 2002, Petitioners submitted comments regarding the Department's verification. The Department conducted a verification of Krivorozhstal's sales and factors of production data at Krivorozhstal's headquarters in Krivoi Rog, Ukraine from July 1, 2002, through July 5, 2002. See *Memorandum to the File from Lori Ellison and Stephen Bailey: Verification of Sales and Factors of Production for Krivorozhstal in the Antidumping Duty Investigation of Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Ukraine*, July 19, 2002 ("Verification Report").

On July 26, 2002, Petitioners and Krivorozhstal submitted case briefs with respect to the sales and factors of production verification and the Department's *Preliminary Determination*. Petitioners and Krivorozhstal submitted rebuttal briefs on July 31, 2002.

The Department has conducted and completed the investigation in accordance with section 735 of the Act.

Scope of Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and