DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration


Stainless Steel Bar from France, Italy, South Korea and the United Kingdom; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: On February 1, 2007, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar from France, Italy, South Korea and the United Kingdom pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). The Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews for these orders. As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The dumping margins are identified in the Final Results of Reviews section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 4, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Audrey Twyman or Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3534 and (202) 482–0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 1, 2007, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar (“SSB”) from France, Italy, South Korea and the United Kingdom pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Reviews, 72 FR 4689 (February 1, 2007). The Department received the Notice of Intent to Participate from Carpenter Technology Corp.; North American Stainless; Crucible Specialty Metals Division of Crucible Materials Corp.; Electralloy; Outokumpu Stainless Bar, Inc.; Universal Stainless &Alloy Products, Inc.; and Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc. (collectively “the domestic interested parties”), within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department’s Regulations (“Sunset Regulations”). (Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc. will remain neutral regarding the continuation of the antidumping duty order against Italy.) The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under sections 771(9)(C) of the Act, as manufacturers of a domestic–like product in the United States.

We received complete substantive responses from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no responses from respondent interested parties with respect to any of the orders covered by these sunset reviews. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(4)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of these orders. The domestic interested parties submitted letters on April 12, 2007, agreeing with the Department’s decision to conduct expedited sunset reviews for these orders because we did not receive responses from any respondent interested parties.

Scope of the Orders

For the purposes of these orders, the term “stainless steel bar” includes articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot–rolled, forged, turned, cold–drawn, cold–rolled or otherwise cold–finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. Stainless steel bar includes cold–finished stainless steel bars that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot–rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semi–finished products, cut length flat–rolled products (i.e., cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), products that have been cut from stainless steel sheet, strip or plate, wire (i.e., cold–formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat–rolled products), and angles, shapes and sections.

The stainless steel bar subject to these reviews is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.30.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in these reviews are addressed in the “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Stainless Steel Bar from France, Italy, South Korea, and the United Kingdom: Final Results” (“Decision Memo”) from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 25, 2007, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the orders were to be revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in room B–099 of the main Department building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn, under the heading “May 2007.” The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on SSB from France, Italy, South Korea, and the United Kingdom would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted–average percentage margins:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers</th>
<th>Weighted Average Margin (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France, Aubert &amp; Duval, S.A.</td>
<td>71.83, as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, Cogne Acciai Speciali Srl.</td>
<td>6.60, as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea, Changwon Specialty</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Co. Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongbang Industrial Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective orders is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.


David M. Spooner,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7–10702 Filed 6–1–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–449–804]

Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Latvia. We preliminarily determine that sales of subject merchandise by Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs (LM) have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries based on the difference between the export price (EP) and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 4, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 7, 2001, the Department published an antidumping duty order on rebar from Latvia. See Antidumping Duty Orders: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, People’s Republic of China, Poland, Republic of Korea and Ukraine, 66 FR 46777 (September 7, 2001). On September 1, 2006, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order of rebar from Latvia for the fifth period of review which covers September 1, 2005, through August 31, 2006 (POR). See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 71 FR 52061 (September 1, 2006). On September 29, 2006, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), the petitioner1 requested an administrative review of LM.

On October 31, 2006, the Department published the initiation of the fifth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on rebar from Latvia. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 71 FR 63752 (October 31, 2006). On November 9, 2006, LM submitted a letter to the Department in which it certified that it made no sales of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR but acknowledged subject merchandise may have entered the United States during the POR. On November 21, 2006, the petitioner submitted comments regarding LM’s claim of no sales. On April 9, 2007, and May 9, 2007, we placed memoranda on the file that provided the results of the Department’s query of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data regarding sales of subject merchandise during the POR. See Memorandum to File from Saliha Loucif: Query of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Database for Sales During the Fifth Administrative Review (April 9, 2007) (Data Query Memo) and Memorandum to File from David Layton: Placement of Additional

1 The petitioner is the Rebar Trade Action Coalition (RTAC) which comprises Nucor Corporation, Gerdau Ameristeel Corporation, and Commercial Metals Company.

Documents on the Record (May 9, 2007) (Record Memo). On April 9, 2007, and May 9, 2007, we also placed certain documents from the final results of the fourth administrative review of the antidumping order on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Latvia (covering the period September 1, 2004 through August 31, 2005) on the record of the current administrative review. See Memorandum to File from Saliha Loucif: Copying of documents from the record of the fourth administrative review in the record of the fifth administrative review (Fourth Review Documents Memo) and Record Memo. After placing the fourth review documents on the record on April 9, 2007, we gave parties until April 21, 2007, to submit comments. LM submitted comments on April 20, 2007. After placing additional documents on the record on May 9, 2007, we gave parties until May 21, 2007, to comment.

Scope of The Order

The product covered by this order is all steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths, currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7214.20.00, 7223.30.8050, 7222.11.0050, 7222.30.0000, 7228.60.6000, 7228.20.1000, or any other tariff item number. Specifically excluded are plain rounds (i.e., non-deformed or smooth bars) and rebar that has been further processed through bending or coating. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Responses

On November 9, 2006, the Department received a letter from LM certifying that LM made no sales of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. In the same submission, LM also stated that “[a]lthough it may be possible that LM’s U.S. customers may have entered subject merchandise into the United States during the fifth period of review, any such entries would consist entirely of sales of LM merchandise that were subject to the review by the Department in the context of the ongoing fourth review of this antidumping order.”

On November 15, 2006, the petitioner responded to LM’s comments, providing public available trade data which confirmed the existence of entries of subject merchandise from Latvia during the POR. In its submission, the petitioner stated that the issue of whether LM made no sales of subject merchandise must be decided by the