

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 68, No. 33

Wednesday, February 19, 2003

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Materials Processing Equipment Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Open Meeting

The Materials Processing Equipment Technical Advisory Committee will meet on March 6, 2003 at 9 a.m. in Room 3884 of the Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to materials processing equipment and related technology.

Agenda

1. Introductions and opening remarks.
2. Approval of minutes from previous meeting.
3. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
4. Review of proposals submitted by the MPETAC.
5. Discussion on 5-axis issues.

The meeting will be open to the public and a limited number of seats will be available. Reservations are not accepted. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. Written statements may be submitted at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate distribution of public presentation materials to Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials two weeks prior to the meeting date to the following address: Ms. Lee Ann Carpenter, Advisory Committees MS: 3876, Bureau of Industry and Security, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230.

For more information contact Lee Ann Carpenter at 202-482-2583.

Dated: February 13, 2003.

Lee Ann Carpenter,
Committee Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 03-3988 Filed 2-18-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-JT-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-817]

Notice of Determination Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act: Antidumping Measure on Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From India

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

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, which governs administrative actions following World Trade Organization Panel reports, the Department of Commerce is issuing a second determination with respect to the antidumping duty investigation on cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate from India. This determination is in conformity with the findings of a World Trade Organization Panel report, as adopted by the World Trade Organization Dispute Settlement Body.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard Smith, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5193.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to Department of Commerce's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2001). Citation to "section 129" refers to section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, codified at 19 U.S.C. 3538.

Background

On December 29, 1999, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) published a final determination of sales

at less than fair value in the antidumping duty investigation on cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate (subject merchandise) from India.¹ During this proceeding, the sole Indian respondent, the Steel Authority of India, Ltd. (SAIL), acknowledged serious deficiencies with respect to its home market sales, cost of production, and constructed value information. However, SAIL argued that Commerce should use its submitted U.S. sales price information in the margin calculation, by comparing the prices of these sales to information concerning normal value from the petition.² Commerce rejected this request and based the dumping margin on total facts available.³ In determining to reject the partial information submitted by SAIL and rely entirely on the facts available, Commerce found that the information submitted did not meet any of the criteria established by section 782(e) of the Act. This included a finding, pursuant to section 782(e)(5), that the information could not be used without undue difficulties.⁴ Commerce's explanation for this finding was that "the U.S. sales database contained errors that, while in isolation were susceptible to correction, however when combined with the other pervasive flaws in SAIL's data lead us to conclude that SAIL's data on the whole is unreliable."⁵

Subsequently, the Government of India requested the establishment of a World Trade Organization (WTO)

¹ *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products from India*, 64 FR 73126 (December 29, 1999) (*Final Determination*). Following an affirmative injury determination issued by the United States International Trade Commission, Commerce issued an antidumping duty order on this product. See *Notice of Amendment of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Quality Steel Plate Products from France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan and the Republic of Korea*, 65 FR 6585 (February 10, 2000).

² *Final Determination* at 73128.

³ Commerce selected, as facts available, the highest of the margins alleged in the petition, 72.49 percent.

⁴ *Final Determination* at 73127. Section 782(e)(5) lists, as a factor to consider in determining whether to accept information that does not meet all applicable requirements, whether "the information can be used without undue difficulties." The corresponding provision in the AD Agreement, which was the focus of the Panel ruling in this case, is at Annex II, paragraph 3.

⁵ *Id.*