

Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash-deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this review for all shipments of CMC from Sweden entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for subject merchandise produced by CP Kelco, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; 2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the 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 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 the all-others rate of 25.29 percent from the LTFV investigation. See *Order*, 70 FR at 39735.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Public Comment

Pursuant to section 351.224(b) of the Department's regulations, the Department will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results within five days after the date of publication of this notice. Pursuant to section 351.309 of the Department's regulations, interested parties may submit written comments in response to these preliminary results. Unless extended by the Department, case briefs are to be submitted within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, and rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, are to be submitted no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii) and (d)(1). Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issues; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. See 19 CFR 351.309. Case and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with section 351.303(f) of the Department's regulations. Further, we request that parties submitting briefs and rebuttal briefs provide the Department with a

copy of the public version of such briefs on diskette.

Also, pursuant to section 351.310(c) of the Department's regulations, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, interested parties may request a public hearing on arguments raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Unless the Secretary specifies otherwise, the hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the date for submission of rebuttal briefs. See 19 CFR 351.310(d)(1). Parties will be notified of the time and location.

The Department will publish the final results of the administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief, no later than 120 days after publication of the preliminary results, unless extended. See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act; 19 CFR 351.213(h).

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 351.402(f) of the Department's regulations 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.

This administrative review and notice are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 30, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-18029 Filed 8-5-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-822]

Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Mexico; 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.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from respondent ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. (Mexinox S.A.) and Mexinox USA, Inc. (Mexinox USA) (collectively, Mexinox) and petitioners,¹ 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 in coils) from Mexico. This administrative review covers imports of subject merchandise from Mexinox S.A. during the period July 1, 2006, to June 30, 2007.

We preliminarily determine that sales of S4 in coils from Mexico have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the constructed export price (CEP) and NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issues, (2) a brief summary of the argument, and (3) a table of authorities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Maryanne Burke or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5604 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 27, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order; Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico*, 64 FR 40560 (July 27, 1999). On July 3, 2007, the Department published a notice entitled *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 72 FR 36420 (July 3, 2007), covering, *inter alia*, S4 in coils from Mexico for the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), Mexinox and petitioners requested that the Department conduct

¹ Petitioners are Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, AK Steel Corporation, North American Stainless, United Auto Workers Local 3303, Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America.

an administrative review. On August 24, 2007, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 48613 (August 24, 2007).

On September 11, 2007, the Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to Mexinox. Mexinox submitted its response to section A of the questionnaire on October 3, 2007, and its response to sections B through E of the questionnaire on October 29, 2007. On January 9, 2008, the Department issued its supplemental questionnaire for section A. Mexinox responded to this supplemental questionnaire on February 1, 2008. On March 5, 2008, the Department issued another supplemental questionnaire which covered sections A through C. Mexinox filed its response to this questionnaire on April 7, 2008. The Department also issued a supplemental questionnaire for section D on April 11, 2008, to which Mexinox responded on May 19, 2008. On May 2, 2008, the Department issued another supplemental questionnaire for sections A through C, as well as for section E, the latter of which pertains to an affiliated U.S. reseller, Ken-Mac Metals (Ken-Mac). Mexinox filed its response to this supplemental questionnaire also on May 19, 2008. Finally, the Department issued separate supplemental questionnaires covering section D and sections A through C on May 19, 2008 and May 30, 2008, respectively. Mexinox submitted its responses to both of these supplemental questionnaires on June 11, 2008.

Because it was not practicable to complete this review within the normal time frame, on February 22, 2008, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice of the extension of time limits for this review. See *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 9772 (February 22, 2008). This extension established the deadline for these preliminary results as July 30, 2008.

Cost Reporting Period

On December 19, 2007, Mexinox submitted information regarding its material input costs for the period of review (POR) and claimed the use of a single weighted-average cost for austenitic products for the entire POR would distort the dumping margin calculation due to sharply rising nickel

costs throughout the period. Rather than using a single POR-average cost for purposes of the sales-below-cost test, Mexinox urged the Department to consider employing monthly or quarterly costs for austenitic products (i.e. those products that contain nickel) in this segment of the proceeding. On June 27, 2008, petitioners submitted comments claiming the Department's standard practice of using POR-average costs is appropriate in the instant case. In rebuttal comments submitted July 2, 2008, Mexinox maintains record evidence shows a direct link between cost increases for austenitic hot-rolled stainless steel band (hot band), the principle material input for S4 in coils, and price increases for finished S4 in coils during the POR through alloy surcharges which Mexinox claims act as a pass-through pricing mechanism. In addition, on July 10, 2008, the Department met with representatives for Mexinox on this issue. See *Ex Parte Memorandum to the File*, from Maryanne Burke dated July 14, 2008, on file in CRU in room 1117 of the main Commerce building.

The Department has considered the sales and cost information reported by Mexinox, in addition to the comments submitted by petitioners and Mexinox. Based on our analysis, we preliminarily find it appropriate to use Mexinox's reported quarterly costs of austenitic products for this review. With the exception of cases where high inflation exists in which the Department restates an annual weighted-average cost to an equivalent basis, the Department's normal practice is to calculate a weighted-average cost for the entire POR unless this methodology results in inappropriate comparisons or skewed data. See, e.g., *Certain Pasta from Italy; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 77852 (December 13, 2000) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at comment 18; see also *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination not to Revoke the Antidumping Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from the Netherlands*, 65 FR 742, 746 (January 5, 2000). In determining whether distortions result from significant cost fluctuations in the context of our antidumping duty calculations, the Department has historically evaluated the case specific record evidence using two primary factors: (1) Whether the cost changes throughout the POI/POR were significant; and (2) whether sales during the shorter averaging periods could be accurately linked with the COP/CV during the same shorter averaging

periods. See *Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Final Results, Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part, and Determination To Revoke in Part (Rebar from Turkey)*, 70 FR 67665 (November 8, 2005) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1. See also *Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S., Plaintiff, v. United States*, Court No. 05-00613, Slip Op. 07-167 (CIT November 15, 2007).

With regard to the first factor, record evidence provided by Mexinox demonstrates significant changes in the total cost of manufacture (COM) throughout the POR for austenitic stainless steel sheet and strip products produced during the POR. Based upon the record of this review, the significant change throughout the POR in the total COM is due to the price volatility of nickel which is used in the production of the austenitic hot band purchased by Mexinox. Austenitic hot band is Mexinox's raw material input for certain merchandise under consideration. Thus, unlike *Rebar from Turkey*, we preliminarily conclude that the differences in COM are significant enough to warrant a departure from our standard annual costing approach based upon record evidence indicating our annual cost approach would lead to distortions in our sales-below-cost test and inconsistencies in our overall margin calculation.

To address the second factor, Mexinox demonstrated that, through its alloy surcharge levied on all sales during the POR, there is a linkage between the increasing direct material costs and final sale prices. Specifically, Mexinox illustrated that nickel acquisition and consumption costs are related to the market prices promulgated by the London Metal Exchange. We note the alloy surcharge regime is a common business practice in the stainless steel industry, whereby the changes in material costs realized by producers during the months preceding the date of sale are measured and ultimately transferred to its final customers. While we acknowledge that the alloy surcharge figure does not directly correspond to changes in the price of the applicable raw material used in the production to which the surcharge applies, as found in *Brass from the Netherlands*, the surcharge amount is, by design, a pass-through mechanism developed to account for raw material price changes. The objective of this pass-through mechanism satisfies the basic theory behind our second criterion—it demonstrates a direct link between production costs and sales prices. We have examined the data submitted by

Mexinox and have concluded that a quarterly costing approach would lead to more appropriate comparisons in our antidumping duty calculations for austenitic products. For those products reported that do not contain nickel, we have continued to use a single weighted-average cost for the POR.

Additionally, we note the Department solicited comments from outside parties on shorter cost averaging periods in a **Federal Register** notice. See *Antidumping Methodologies for Proceedings that Involve Significant Cost Changes Throughout the Period of Investigation (POI)/Period of Review (POR) that May Require Using Shorter Cost Averaging Periods; Request for Comment*, 73 FR 26364 (May 9, 2008) (*Antidumping Methodologies; Request for Comment*). On June 9, 2008, the Department extended the time limit for parties to submit written comments concerning this issue to June 23, 2008. See *Antidumping Methodologies for Proceedings that Involve Significant Cost Changes Throughout the Period of Investigation (POI)/Period of Review (POR) that May Require Using Shorter Cost Averaging Periods; Request for Comment and Proposed Methodology for Identifying and Analyzing Targeted Dumping in Antidumping Investigations; Request for Comment*, 73 FR 32557 (June 9, 2008). We are currently analyzing the comments received which could lead the Department to formulate a different methodological framework on this matter. Thus, we will further examine the facts of this case for the final results of this review in light of both the comments received from the interested parties in this administrative review and the general comments received with respect to *Antidumping Methodologies; Request for Comment*.

Period of Review

The POR is July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

Scope of the Order

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 currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) 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 HTSUS 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."²

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."³

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, 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."⁴

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).⁵ 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."⁶

Sales Made Through Affiliated Resellers

A. U.S. Market

Mexinox USA, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Mexinox S.A., which in turn is a subsidiary of ThyssenKrupp AG, sold subject merchandise in the United States during the POR to unaffiliated customers. Mexinox USA also made sales of subject merchandise to U.S. affiliate Ken-Mac which is an operating division of ThyssenKrupp Materials Inc., which is a subsidiary of ThyssenKrupp USA, Inc., the primary holding company for ThyssenKrupp AG in the U.S. market. Ken-Mac purchased subject merchandise from Mexinox USA and further manufactured and/or resold the subject merchandise to unaffiliated customers in the United States during the POR. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 13, 22 and 29. For purposes of this review, we have included both Mexinox USA's and Ken-Mac's sales of subject merchandise to unaffiliated customers

in the United States in our margin calculation.

B. Home Market

Mexinox Trading, S.A. de C.V. (Mexinox Trading), a wholly owned subsidiary of Mexinox S.A., resold the foreign like product as well as other merchandise in the home market. Mexinox S.A.'s sales to Mexinox Trading represented a small portion of Mexinox S.A.'s total sales of the foreign like product in the home market and constituted less than five percent of all home market sales. See, e.g., Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 3, and its April 7, 2008, supplemental questionnaire response covering sections A through C at Attachment A-26 (quantity and value chart). Because sales to Mexinox Trading of the foreign like product were below the five percent threshold established under 19 CFR 351.403(d), we did not require Mexinox S.A. to report Mexinox Trading's downstream sales to its first unaffiliated customer. This is consistent with our practice to date and the methodology we have employed in past administrative reviews of S4 in coils from Mexico. See, e.g., *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 7710 (February 11, 2008) (2005-2006 Final Results), as amended, *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 14215 (March 17, 2008) (2005-2006 Amended Final Results. See also *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 73444 (December 12, 2005) and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Comment 2.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of S4 in coils from Mexico to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared CEP sales made in the United States by both Mexinox USA and Ken-Mac to unaffiliated purchasers to NV as described in the "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice, below. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), we compared individual CEPs to monthly weighted-average NVs.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act we considered all products produced by Mexinox S.A. covered by the description in the "Scope of the Order" section above, and

² "Arnokrome III" is a trademark of the Arnold Engineering Company.

³ "Gilphy 36" is a trademark of Imphy, S.A.

⁴ "Durphynox 17" is a trademark of Imphy, S.A.

⁵ This list of uses is illustrative and provided for descriptive purposes only.

⁶ "GIN4 Mo," "GIN5" and "GIN6" are the proprietary grades of Hitachi Metals America, Ltd.

sold in the home market during the POR, to be foreign like product for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We relied on nine characteristics to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to comparison sales of the foreign like product (listed in order of priority): (1) Grade; (2) cold/hot rolled; (3) gauge; (4) surface finish; (5) metallic coating; (6) non-metallic coating; (7) width; (8) temper; and (9) edge trim. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics and reporting instructions listed in the Department's original September 11, 2007, questionnaire.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act, to the extent practicable, we base NV on sales made in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the export transaction. The NV LOT is based on the starting price of sales in the home market or, when NV is based on constructed value (CV), that of the sales from which selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit are derived. With respect to CEP transactions in the U.S. market, the CEP LOT is defined as the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer. See section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act.

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 customer. See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2). 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. 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 difference 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., *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Greenhouse Tomatoes From Canada*, 67 FR 8781 (February 26, 2002) and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Comment 8; see also *Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from Brazil*;

Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 70 FR 17406, 17410 (April 6, 2005), unchanged in *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from Brazil*, 70 FR 58683 (October 7, 2005). For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and CEP profit under section 772(d) of the Tariff Act. See *Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States*, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314–1315 (Fed. Cir. 2001). We expect that if the claimed LOTs are the same, the functions and activities of the seller should be similar. Conversely, if a party claims the LOTs are different for different groups of sales, the functions and activities of the seller should be dissimilar. See *Porcelain-on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Administrative Review*, 65 FR 30068 (May 10, 2000) and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Comment 6.

We obtained information from Mexinox regarding the marketing stages involved in making its reported home market and U.S. sales to both affiliated and unaffiliated customers. Mexinox provided a description of all selling activities performed, along with a flowchart and tables comparing the levels of trade among each channel of distribution and customer category for both markets. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 33 through 39 and Attachments A–4–A through A–4–C; see also Mexinox's February 1, 2008, supplemental section A questionnaire response at 21 through 24 and Attachments A–20–A and A–20–B.

Mexinox sold S4 in coils to end-users and retailers/distributors in the home market and to end-users and distributors/service centers in the United States. For the home market, Mexinox identified two channels of distribution described as follows: (1) direct shipments (*i.e.*, products produced to order) and (2) sales from inventory. Within each of these two channels of distribution, Mexinox S.A. made sales to affiliated and unaffiliated distributors/retailers and end-users. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 3 and 26 through 27. We reviewed the intensity of all selling functions Mexinox claimed to perform for each channel of distribution and customer category. For certain functions, such as pre-sale technical assistance, processing of customer orders, sample analysis, prototypes and trial lots, freight and delivery, price negotiation/customer

communications, sales calls and visits, and warranty services, the level of performance for both direct shipments and sales through inventory was identical across all types of customers. Only a few functions exhibited differences, including inventory maintenance/just-in-time performance, further processing, credit and collection, low volume orders and shipment of small packages. See Mexinox's February 1, 2008, supplemental section A questionnaire response at Attachment A–20. While we find differences in the levels of intensity performed for some of these functions, such differences are minor and do not establish distinct levels of trade in Mexico. Based on our analysis of all of Mexinox S.A.'s home market selling functions, we find all home market sales were made at the same LOT, the NV LOT.

We then compared the NV LOT, based on the selling functions associated with the transactions between Mexinox S.A. and its customers in the home market, to the CEP LOT, which is based on the selling functions associated with the transaction between Mexinox S.A. and its affiliated importer, Mexinox USA. Our analysis indicates the selling functions performed for home market customers are either performed at a higher degree of intensity or are greater in number than the selling functions performed for Mexinox USA. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007 section A questionnaire response at 33 through 39 and Attachments A–4–A through A–4–C; see also Mexinox's February 1, 2008, supplemental section A questionnaire response at 21 through 24 and Attachment A–20. For example, in comparing Mexinox's selling functions, we find there are more functions performed in the home market which are not a part of CEP transactions (*e.g.*, pre-sale technical assistance, sample analysis, prototypes and trial lots, price negotiation/customer communications, sales calls and visits, credit and collection, and warranty services). For selling functions performed for both home market sales and CEP sales (*e.g.*, processing customer orders, freight and delivery arrangements), we find Mexinox S.A. actually performed each activity at a higher level of intensity in the home market. Based on Mexinox's responses, we note that CEP sales from Mexinox S.A. to Mexinox USA generally occur at the beginning of the distribution chain, representing essentially a logistical transfer of inventory that resembles ex-factory sales. In contrast, all sales in the home market occur closer to the end of the distribution chain and involve smaller

volumes and more customer interaction which, in turn, require the performance of more selling functions. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 33 through 39 and Attachments A-4-A through A-4-C; see also Mexinox's February 1, 2008, supplemental section A questionnaire response at Attachment A-20. Based on the foregoing, we conclude the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage than the CEP LOT.

Because we found the home market and U.S. sales were made at different LOTs, we examined whether a LOT adjustment or a CEP offset may be appropriate in this review. As we found only one LOT in the home market, it was not possible to make a LOT adjustment to home market sales, because such an adjustment is dependent on our ability to identify a pattern of consistent price differences between the home market sales on which NV is based and home market sales at the LOT of the export transaction. See 19 CFR 351.412(d)(1)(ii). Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a LOT adjustment. Because the data available do not form an appropriate basis for making a LOT adjustment, and because the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the CEP LOT, we have made a CEP offset to NV in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act.

Constructed Export Price

Mexinox indicated it made CEP sales through its U.S. affiliate, Mexinox USA, in the following four channels of distribution: (1) Direct shipments to unaffiliated customers; (2) stock sales from the San Luis Potosi (SLP) factory; (3) sales to unaffiliated customers through Mexinox USA's warehouse inventory; and (4) sales through Ken-Mac. See Mexinox's October 3, 2007, section A questionnaire response at 27 through 31. Ken-Mac is an affiliated service center located in the United States which purchases S4 in coils produced by Mexinox S.A. and then resells the merchandise (after, in some instances, further manufacturing) to unaffiliated U.S. customers.

In accordance with section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, CEP is the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise, or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter. We find Mexinox properly classified all of its

U.S. sales of subject merchandise as CEP transactions because such sales were made in the United States through Mexinox USA or Ken-Mac to unaffiliated purchasers. We based CEP on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States sold by Mexinox USA or its affiliated reseller, Ken-Mac. We made adjustments for billing adjustments, discounts and rebates where applicable. We also made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act. These expenses included, where appropriate: foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling, inland insurance, U.S. customs duties, U.S. inland freight, U.S. brokerage, and U.S. warehousing expenses. As directed by 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 (*i.e.*, credit costs, warranty expenses, and a certain expense of proprietary nature), commissions, inventory carrying costs, and other indirect selling expenses. We also made an adjustment for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Tariff Act. We used the expenses as reported by Mexinox made in connection with its U.S. sales, with the exception of the U.S. indirect selling expense ratio which we recalculated. See "Analysis of Data Submitted by ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of S4 in Coils from Mexico" (Preliminary Analysis Memorandum) from Maryanne Burke, Trade Analyst, to the File, dated July 30, 2008.

For sales in which the material was sent to an unaffiliated U.S. processor, we made an adjustment based on the transaction-specific further-processing expenses incurred by Mexinox USA. In addition, the U.S. affiliated reseller Ken-Mac performed some further manufacturing for its sales to unaffiliated U.S. customers. For these sales, we deducted the cost of further processing in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Tariff Act. In calculating the cost of further manufacturing for Ken-Mac, we relied upon Ken-Mac's reported cost of further manufacturing materials, labor and overhead. We also included amounts for further manufacturing general and administrative expenses (G&A), as reported in Mexinox's May 19, 2008, supplemental section D questionnaire response.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Market

To determine whether there is 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 is greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared Mexinox's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act. Because Mexinox'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 for subject merchandise, we determined the home market was viable. See, *e.g.*, Mexinox's April 7, 2008, supplemental questionnaire response covering sections A through C and E at Attachment A-26.

B. Affiliated-Party Transactions and Arm's-Length Test

Sales to affiliated customers in the home market not made at arm's-length prices are excluded from our analysis because we consider them to be outside the ordinary course of trade. See section 773(f)(2) of the Tariff Act; see also 19 CFR 351.102(b). Consistent with 19 CFR 351.403(c) and (d) and agency practice, "the Department may calculate NV based on sales to affiliates if satisfied that the transactions were made at arm's length." See *China Steel Corp. v. United States*, 264 F. Supp. 2d 1339, 1365 (CIT 2003). To test whether the sales to affiliates 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 direct selling expenses, billing adjustments, discounts and rebates, movement charges and packing. Where prices to the affiliated party were, on average, within a range of 98 to 102 percent of the price of identical or comparable merchandise to the unaffiliated parties, we determined that the sales made to the affiliated party were at arm's length. See *Antidumping Proceedings: Affiliated Party Sales in the Ordinary Course of Trade*, 67 FR 69186, 69194 (November 15, 2002). We found both affiliated home market customers failed the arm's length test and, in accordance with the Department's practice, we excluded sales to these affiliates from our analysis.

C. Cost of Production Analysis

Because we disregarded sales of certain products made at prices below

the cost of production (COP) in the most recently completed review of S4 in coils from Mexico (*see Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 35618, 35623 (June 21, 2006), unchanged in *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 76978 (December 22, 2006) (2004–2005 Final Results) we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review for Mexinox may have been made at prices below the COP, as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act. Pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, we initiated a COP investigation of sales by Mexinox. We relied on home market sales and COP information provided by Mexinox in its questionnaire responses, except where noted below:

ThyssenKrupp Nirosta GmbH (TKN) and ThyssenKrupp AST, S.p.A. (TKAST), hot band producers affiliated with Mexinox, sold hot band to Mexinox USA, which in turn sold hot band to Mexinox S.A. Hot band is considered a major input to the production of S4 in coils. Section 773(f)(3) of the Tariff Act, (the major input rule) states:

“in the case of a transaction between affiliated persons involving the production by one of such persons of a major input to the merchandise, the administering authority has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that an amount represented as the value of such input is less than the cost of production of such input, then the administering authority may determine the value of the major input on the basis of the information available regarding such cost of production, if such cost is greater than the amount that would be determined for such input under paragraph (2).”

Paragraph 2 of section 773(f) (transactions disregarded) states:

“a transaction directly or indirectly between affiliated persons may be disregarded if, in the case of any element of value required to be considered, the amount representing that element does not fairly reflect the amount usually reflected in sales of merchandise under consideration in the market under consideration. If a transaction is disregarded under the preceding sentence and no other transactions are available for consideration, the determination of the amount shall be based on the information available as to what the amount would have been if the transaction had occurred between persons who are not affiliated.”

In accordance with the major input rule, and as stated in *2005–2006 Final Results*, it is the Department’s normal

practice to use all three elements of the major input rule (*i.e.*, transfer price, COP and market price) where available.

For these preliminary results, we evaluated the transfer prices between Mexinox and its affiliated hot band suppliers on a grade-specific basis. For certain grades of hot band, all three elements of the major input analysis were available. These grades of hot band account for the majority of volume of hot band that Mexinox purchased from TKN and TCAST during the POR. As such, we find these purchases provide a reasonable basis for the Department to measure the preferential treatment, if any, given to Mexinox for purchases of hot band from TKN and TCAST during the POR. Therefore, we adjusted the reported costs to reflect the higher of transfer prices, COP, or market prices of hot band, where available. Additionally, we relied on these results to adjust the reported cost for grades where all three elements of the major input were not available. See the Department’s Cost of Production and Constructed Value Calculation Adjustments for the Preliminary Results—ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. from LaVonne Clark, Senior Accountant, to Neal M. Halper, Director, Office of Accounting, dated July 30, 2008 (Cost Calculation Memorandum).

In certain cases, where market prices have not been available, the Department has constructed market prices in order to perform the major input analysis. See *Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from Korea: Final Results of the 2005–2006 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 69663 (December 10, 2007) (*PSF from Korea*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 5 and *Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Product from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 27802 (May 17, 2007) (*Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand*) and accompany Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 3. In the instant case we have applied the results of our analysis of those grades where market prices were available to those grades where market prices were not available. We find this approach to be reasonable because the grades where market prices are available constitute the majority of hot band purchased by Mexinox from the affiliated parties. As such, these purchases provide reasonable grounds to determine the arm’s length nature of purchases between Mexinox and its affiliates during the POR. For further details, see Cost Calculation Memorandum.

Because we have determined that shorter cost periods are appropriate for the COP analysis of austenitic grades, we have performed the cost-based part of the major input analysis by quarter for all grades of austenitic hot band. For all other grades of hot band, we have performed the cost-based part of the major input analysis on a POR basis.

We also revised Mexinox’s reported COP to include depreciation expenses related to a newly installed production line. We recalculated Mexinox’s G&A expense rate to include employee profit sharing in the numerator, and adjusted for a certain provision accounted for during a prior period. We revised Mexinox’s financial expense ratio to exclude certain interest income from accounts receivable and adjusted ThyssenKrupp AG’s cost of goods sold to exclude packing expenses. See Cost Calculation Memorandum.

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined, in accordance with sections 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Tariff Act, whether, within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. As noted in section 773(b)(1)(D) of the Tariff Act, prices are considered to provide for recovery of costs if such prices are above the weighted average per-unit COP for the period of investigation or review. In the instant case, we have relied on Mexinox’s reported quarterly costs of austenitic grades of merchandise. Mexinox calculated the reported quarterly costs using a methodology that is similar to that used by the Department in cases of high-inflation (*see e.g. Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products from Indonesia*, 64 FR 73164 (December 29, 1999) at Comment 1). Because this methodology restates the quarterly costs on an equivalent basis, by calculating an annual weighted-average COP for the POR and then restating it to each respective quarter, we find Mexinox’s reported quarterly costs meet the requirements of section 773(b)(1)(D) of the Tariff Act.

Where less than 20 percent of the respondent’s home market sales of a given model were at prices below the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made within an extended period of time and in “substantial quantities.” Where 20 percent or more

of the respondent's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because: (1) they were made within an extended period of time in "substantial quantities," in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Tariff Act; and (2) based on our comparison of prices to the weighted-average COPs for the POR, they were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Tariff Act.

Our cost test for Mexinox revealed that, for home market sales of certain models, less than 20 percent of the sales of those models were at prices below the COP. We therefore retained all such sales in our analysis and used them as the basis for determining NV. Our cost test also indicated that for home market sales of other models, more than 20 percent were sold at prices below the COP within an extended period of time and were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. Thus, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act, we excluded these below-cost sales from our analysis and used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis for determining NV.

D. Constructed Value

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Tariff Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Mexinox's material and fabrication costs, SG&A expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. We calculated the COP component of CV as described above in the "Cost of Production Analysis" section of this notice. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country.

E. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We calculated NV based on prices to unaffiliated customers or prices to affiliated customers we determined to be at arm's length. Mexinox S.A. reported home market sales in Mexican pesos, but noted certain home market sales were invoiced in U.S. dollars during the POR. *See* Mexinox's October 29, 2007, section B questionnaire response at B-26 and B-27. In our margin calculation we used the currency of the sale invoice at issue and applied the relevant adjustments in the actual currency invoiced or incurred by Mexinox. We accounted for billing adjustments, discounts, and rebates,

where appropriate. We also made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, insurance, handling, and warehousing, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Tariff Act. In addition, we made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise compared 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. As noted above in the "Level of Trade" section of this notice, we also made an adjustment for the CEP offset in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act. 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.

We used Mexinox's home market adjustments and deductions as reported, except for certain handling expenses and imputed credit expenses. We have recalculated the handling expenses incurred by Mexinox's home market affiliate, Mexinox Trading, and applied the revised ratio to those home market sales for which Mexinox reported a handling expense. We calculated imputed credit expenses based on the short-term borrowing rate associated with the currency of each home market sale transaction. *See* Preliminary Analysis Memorandum. Our methodology for calculating handling charges and imputed credit expenses is consistent with past administrative reviews of this case. *See, e.g., 2005-2006 Final Results, as amended, and 2004-2005 Final Results.*

F. Price-to-CV Comparisons

Where we were unable to find a home market match of such or similar merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act, we based NV on CV. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Tariff Act.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Tariff Act.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review we preliminarily determine the following weighted-average dumping margin

exists for the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007:

Manufacturer exporter	Weighted average margin (percentage)
ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V.	2.87

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 of these preliminary results. *See* 19 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 per 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c). Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for submitting the case briefs. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). 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, parties submitting case briefs and/or rebuttal briefs are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such argument on diskette. The Department will issue final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such argument or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Duty Assessment

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate importer-specific *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. The total customs value is based on the entered value reported by Mexinox for all U.S. entries of subject merchandise initially purchased for consumption to the United States made during the POR. *See* Preliminary Analysis Memorandum. In

accordance with 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP on or after 41 days following the publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the company included in these preliminary results for which the reviewed company did not know their merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company or companies involved in the transaction.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of S4 in coils from Mexico 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)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent (*de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1)), the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously 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, 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 of 30.85 percent, which is the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. 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 Mexico*, 64 FR 40560 (July 27, 1999). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR

351.402(f)(2) 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) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: July 30, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-17987 Filed 8-5-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-475-818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Notice of Preliminary Results of Eleventh Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by interested parties, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta ("pasta") from Italy for the period of review ("POR") July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007. This review covers four producers/exporters of subject merchandise. We preliminarily determine that during the POR, respondents sold subject merchandise at less than normal value ("NV"). If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 6, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christopher Hargett (Divella) or Stephanie Moore (Zara), AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4161 or (202) 482-3692, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 24, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on pasta from Italy. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta From Italy*, 61 FR 38547 (July 24, 1996).

On July 3, 2007, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 72 FR 36420 (July 3, 2007). We received requests for review from petitioners¹ and from individual Italian exporters/producers of pasta, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1) and (2). On August 24, 2007, the Department published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, listing the following companies as respondents: Atar S.r.L. ("Atar"), Domenico Paone fu Erasmo S.p.A., F. Divella SpA ("Divella"), Industria Alimentare Colavita S.p.A., and Pasta Zara SpA 1 ("Zara 1") and Pasta Zara SpA 2 ("Zara 2") (collectively, "Zara"), Pastificio Carmine Russo, Pastificio Di Martino Gaetano & F. Ili SrL., Pastificio Felicetti SrL., Pastificio Fratelli Pagani S.p.A., Pastificio Russo di Cicciano, Rummo S.p.A. Molino e Pastificio, and Valdigrano Di Flavio Pagani SrL. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 48613 (August 24, 2007) ("Initiation Notice").

On October 15, 2007, due to the significant number of requests received and then current resource constraints, the Department selected the three exporters/producers accounting for the largest volume of exports—Atar, Divella, and Zara, as mandatory respondents.²

The following companies self-requested that the Department conduct an administrative review: Atar, Domenico Paone fu Erasmo S.p.A., Industria Alimentare Colavita S.p.A., Pastificio Carmine Russo, Pastificio Fratelli Pagani S.p.A. [sic], Pastificio Russo di Cicciano, Rummo S.p.A. Molino e Pastificio, and Valdigrano Di Flavio Pagani SrL. The companies

¹ New World Pasta Company; Dakota Growers Pasta Company; and American Italian Pasta Company.

² See Memorandum to Melissa Skinner, Director, Office 3, from Team regarding Selection of Respondents for Individual Review, October 15, 2007.