

71 FR 30875, May 31, 2006

C-427-810
Sunset Review
Public Document
IA/III: SM

May 22, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: David M. Spooner
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

FROM: Stephen J. Claeys
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Full
Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order on Certain
Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France

Summary

We have analyzed the substantive responses of interested parties in the full sunset review of the countervailing duty (“CVD”) order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (“CORE”) from France. We recommend that you approve the positions we have developed in the “Discussion of the Issues” section of this memorandum. Below is the complete list of the issues in this full sunset review for which we received substantive responses by parties.

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of a Countervailable Subsidy
2. Net Countervailable Subsidy Likely to Prevail
3. Nature of the Subsidy

History of the Order

In the original investigation, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) investigated one producer, Usinor Sacilor (“Usinor”) and concluded that the Government of France (“GOF”) was providing countervailable subsidies to French producers and exporters of subject merchandise.¹ See Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from France, 58 FR 37304 (July 9, 1993)(“Final”). On August 17, 1993, the Department published an amended final determination and CVD order on CORE from France. See Countervailing Duty Order and Amendment to Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From France, 58 FR 43759 (August 17, 1993)(“Amended Final”). Following proceedings before the Court of International Trade and the Court of Appeals

¹ During the investigation the Department reviewed only one company, Usinor, and noted that in 1986, Usinor and Sacilor merged into a single entity called Usinor.

for the Federal Circuit, the Department again amended its final determination. See Certain Steel Products from France; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Determination of Countervailing Duty Investigation, 64 FR 67561 (December 2, 1999) (“Final Amended Determination”). The Department calculated a country-wide rate on CORE from France of 15.13 percent in the Final Amended Determination.

The following programs were found countervailable in the final affirmative determination:

1. Equity Infusions - PACS/FIS and infusion of capital to Usinor Sacilor in 1978.
2. Grants in the Form of Shareholders’ Advances
3. Investment Subsidies
4. Long-term Loans from CFDI
5. Loan Guarantees 1978 through 1982
6. Outstanding Loans Discovered at Verification
7. ECSC Article 54 Loans and Loan Guarantees
8. ECSC Redeployment Aid (Article 56(2)(b))
9. Grants in the Form of Cancellation of Debt by Denain Nord-Est Longwy (“DNEL”) and Marine-Wendel

In the April 2000 final results of the first five-year sunset review of the order, the Department determined that revocation would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy. See Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order, 65 FR 18063 (April 6, 2000) (“Sunset Final”). On December 15, 2000, after an affirmative finding of likelihood by the International Trade Commission (“ITC”), the Department ordered continuation of the order. See Notice of Continuation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Carbon Steel Products from Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom, 65 FR 78469 (December 15, 2000).

On October 23, 2003, the Department reaffirmed its final likelihood finding from the Sunset Final.² This reaffirmation was a result of the Department’s analysis of Usinor’s privatization in 1995-1997. The analysis resulted from the January 8, 2003, World Trade Organization (“WTO”) Dispute Settlement Body’s (“DSB”) adoption of the report of the WTO Appellate Body in United States - Countervailing Duty Measures Concerning Certain Products from the European Communities, WT/DS212/AB/R (December 9, 2002) (“Certain Products”).

² See Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Section 129 Determination: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Countervailing Duty Order from Jeffrey May, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to James J. Jochum, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, signed October 24, 2003.

Pursuant to the findings in Certain Products, the Department changed its methodology for analyzing privatizations in the context of the CVD law. Further, in accordance with Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (“Section 129”), on October 23, 2003, the Department issued a memorandum regarding its analysis of the privatization of Usinor. The Department used its modified methodology for analyzing privatizations to examine (a) whether pre-privatization, allocable, non-recurring subsidies to Usinor found countervailable in the Final were, for the purposes of a sunset review, eliminated as a result of the company’s privatization in 1995-1997, and (b) whether the findings in the Sunset Final should be amended accordingly. The Department determined that, with the exception of the employee offering, which constituted 5.16 percent of the sale, the privatization of Usinor was at arm’s length and for fair market value. The Department also determined that the sale of shares to Usinor’s employees were not at arm’s length or at fair market value. Based on these findings, the Department reaffirmed its likelihood finding from the Sunset Final.

Since the issuance of the order, the Department has not completed an administrative review of the order. The Department declined a request from Duferco Coating SA and Sorral SA (“Duferco Sorral”) to Duferco Coating SA and Sorral SA (“Duferco Sorral”) to conduct a new shipper review.³ However, on September 28, 2005, in response to a request from United States Steel Corporation (“U.S. Steel”) and Duferco Sorral to conduct an administrative review, the Department initiated a review of Duferco Sorral for the period of review covering 2004.⁴

Background

On November 1, 2005, the Department initiated a sunset review of the CVD order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from France pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the “Act”). See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Reviews, 70 FR 65884 (November 1, 2005). On November 9, 2005, the Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of Nucor Corporation (“Nucor”), and on November 16, 2005, on behalf of Mittal Steel USA ISG Inc. (“Mittal Steel USA”), Ispat-Inland (“Ispat”); United States Steel Corporation (“U.S. Steel”)(collectively, “domestic interested parties”); and United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO-CLC (“USW”). The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as domestic producers of a like product and the USW claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(D) if the Act as a union engaged in the production of subject merchandise in the United States. The Department received substantive responses from the domestic interested parties. In addition, the Department received substantive responses from Arcelor S.A. (“Arcelor”) and from Duferco Sorral, both claiming to

³ See Memorandum from Brandon Farlander, Office 7 and Kristen Johnson, Office 3 to the File and letter to Duferco Sorral from Richard O. Weible, Director, Office 7, both dated March 31, 2005, declining to initiate antidumping and CVD new shipper reviews.

⁴ See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part, 70 R 56631 (September 28, 2005).

be a foreign producer and exporter of subject merchandise. Arcelor claimed to be the successor-in-interest to Usinor. Duferco Sorral claimed that in 2002, the privatized Usinor merged with Aceralia and Arbed to form Arcelor and that in 2004, Duferco Belgium acquired Duferco Sorral (i.e., Beautor SA and Sorral SA) from Arcelor. We also received substantive responses from the European Union (“EU”) and the Government of France (“GOF”)(hereafter, these four respondent parties are collectively referred to as “respondent parties”). All of the substantive responses were received within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). Given the level of participation and the nature and extent of the issues raised, pursuant to section 751(c)(5)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2)(i), the Department determined to conduct a full sunset review of this CVD order.

The Department determined that the sunset review of the CVD order on CORE from France is extraordinarily complicated. In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (i.e., an order in effect on January 1, 1995). (See section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act.) Therefore, on February 28, 2006, the Department extended the time limit for the completion of the final results of this review until on or about May 23, 2005, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act. See Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from France: Extension of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders, 71 FR 10011 (February 28, 2006).

Discussion of the Issues

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this review to determine whether revocation of the CVD order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy. Section 752(b) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the net countervailable subsidy determined in the investigation and any subsequent reviews, and whether any change in the programs which gave rise to the net countervailable subsidy has occurred that is likely to affect that net countervailable subsidy. Pursuant to section 752(b)(3) of the Act, the Department shall provide to the International Trade Commission (“ITC”) the net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail if the order were revoked. In addition, consistent with section 752(a)(6) of the Act, the Department shall provide to the ITC information concerning the nature of the subsidy and whether the subsidy is a subsidy described in Article 3 or Article 6.1 of the 1994 WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (“SCM”).

Below we address the substantive responses of the interested parties.

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of a Countervailable Subsidy

Interested Parties' Comments

In their substantive response, domestic interested parties note that there have been no administrative reviews of the order and that the Department has found no changes to the subsidy programs determined in the investigation. Therefore, they assert that the Department should find that revocation of the order would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy.

Respondent parties state that, with respect to the programs found countervailable in the original investigation, the programs have either been formally terminated with no remaining benefits, or have been fully amortized based on the Department's allocation methodology. Specifically, the respondent parties assert that any benefit from the equity infusions and grants in the form of shareholders' advances have been fully amortized and otherwise eliminated as a result of the privatization at arm's length and for fair market value. With respect to CFDI loans granted from 1983 through 1988 and outstanding at the time of the investigation, the respondent parties argue that in a subsequent investigation involving Usinor, the Department found that this program was not used - demonstrating that all outstanding loans were repaid by 1998 - the timing of the initiation of the investigation on stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from France. As for the remaining programs: investment subsidies, other loan guarantees, loans discovered during verification, ECSC Article 54 loans, and ECSC Article 56; which according to respondents accounted for 0.20 percent of the investigation subsidy rate, the respondent parties assert that the programs no longer exist and are not likely to be reinstated. In sum, the respondent parties argue that no benefits will be conferred from these programs in the future.

We did not receive rebuttal comments from any parties.

Department's Position

In accordance with section 752(b)(1) of the Act, in determining whether revocation of a CVD order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy, the Department will consider the net countervailable subsidy determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and whether any change in the programs which gave rise to the net countervailable subsidy determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews has occurred that is likely to affect that net countervailable subsidy.

In the instant case, there have not been any completed administrative reviews of the order. As discussed above in the "History of the Order" section of this memorandum, the Department found nine programs countervailable in the investigation. While the respondent parties claim that each of these programs has been terminated or that the benefits have been fully allocated and, therefore, none of these programs are likely to provide countervailable subsidies in the future, we disagree.

In the investigation, the Department determined that equity infusions provided pursuant to a plan agreed upon in 1978 helped the principal steel companies and their subsidiaries restructure their massive debt. This plan involved the creation of a steel amortization fund for the purpose of ensuring repayment of funds borrowed by the principal steel companies, Usinor, Sacilor, Chatillon-Neuves-Maisons, and their subsidiaries. In accordance with the restructuring plan, bonds previously issued and certain pre-1978 loans were converted into loans with special characteristics, or PACS. The Department also found that the 1981 Corrected Finance Law granted Usinor and Sacilor the authority to issue convertible bonds and that the Fonds d'Intervention Siderurgique (FIS), was created by decree of May 18, 1983, in order to implement that authority. In the investigation the Department found that Usinor Sacilor's 1986 and 1988 conversion of FIS bonds to common stock constituted equity infusions on terms inconsistent with commercial consideration, the benefits of which would be fully allocated by 2005.

In addition to the debt-to-equity conversions, the GOF provided an infusion of capital to Usinor Sacilor in 1978. Because the Department determined that Usinor Sacilor was unequityworthy at the time of the equity infusion, the Department determined that the equity infusion was provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

The Department also found that the GOF provided grants to Usinor Sacilor through shareholders' advances beginning in 1982 and that the GOF paid out the last of the advances it had agreed to make under this program in 1986. These advances were converted to common stock in 1986. The Department determined that the advances constituted countervailable grants, as no shares were given for them.

In the investigation, the Department determined that the investment subsidies (funds received from various agencies) received by Usinor were de facto specific absent documentation as to the actual distribution of funds from these agencies.

The Department also found that long term loans issued by the Caisse Francaise de Developpement Industriel ("CFDI") provided countervailable subsidies. Specifically, the Department determined that the Law of July 13, 1978, created "participative" loans, which were issued by the CFDI, on which the borrower paid a lower than market interest rate. In the investigation, the Department determined that these loans were countervailable to the extent that they were inconsistent with commercial considerations.

The Department determined also that the GOF provided countervailable guarantees from 1978 through 1982 on certain loans that were obtained by Usinor Sacilor.

The Department also determined that certain loans discovered at verification provided countervailable subsidies. Although no information on these loans, other than that Usinor Sacilor had received "other participative" loans, was available, the Department determined to treat the outstanding principals as a zero rate short-term loan.

The Department also found that countervailable subsidies were being provided through ECSC Article 54 industrial investment loans were provided for the purpose of purchasing new equipment or financing modernization. In the investigation, the Department determined that these loans were only available to companies in the steel and coal industries. Therefore, these loans were specific, and countervailable.

The Department found that countervailable subsidies were also being provided through grants provided under Article 56(2)(b) of the ECSC treaty, known as ECSC Redeployment Aid. Such grants were provided to assist workers affected by the restructuring of the coal and steel industries. In the investigation, the Department determined that the GOF provided extra contributions which relieved Usinor Sacilor of an obligation that it had incurred under the collective bargaining agreement.

The Department also found countervailable grants in the form of cancellation of debt by Denain Nord-Est Longwy (“DNEL”) and Marine-Wendel. As part of the GOF’s 1978 Rescue Plan for the steel industry, DNEL and Marine-Wendel, the former private majority shareholders of Usinor and Sacilor, respectively, cancelled a portion of the debt owed by Usinor and Sacilor.

Although the respondent parties assert that all of these programs have either been terminated or the benefit stream has been fully allocated, the Department has not been provided with substantial evidence to support a finding that each of these programs has been terminated, without replacement. Therefore, we preliminarily find that there is likelihood of continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy were the order to be revoked.

2. Net Countervailable Subsidy Likely to Prevail

Interested Parties’ Comments

The domestic interested parties assert that the Department normally will select the rate from the investigation because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters and foreign governments without the discipline of an order in place. Therefore, the domestic interested parties argue that the Department should report to the ITC as the net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail were the order revoked the only rates that have been determined by the Department which are 15.13 percent for Usinor and 15.13 percent for the country-wide rate.

Respondent parties argue that since all of the programs found to be countervailable at the time of the original investigation have been terminated or fully allocated and are not likely to be reinstated in the future, the net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail if the order is revoked is zero.

Department's Position

We agree with the domestic interested parties that the Department normally will provide to the ITC the net countervailable subsidy that was determined in the original investigation because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters and foreign governments without the discipline of an order in place. This rate, however, may not be the most appropriate rate if, for example, the rate was derived from subsidy programs which were found in subsequent reviews to be terminated, there has been a program-wide change, or the rate ignores a program found to be countervailable in a subsequent administrative review.

In the instant case, the benefits from the government equity infusions and certain other non-recurring grants have been fully allocated prior to the initiation of this sunset review. The allocation period for these non-recurring subsidies, which was determined in the investigation, is 14 years.⁵ Using that period, the last year to which any benefits were allocated was 2002.⁶ In addition, there is no evidence that additional disbursements have been made since the investigation under these programs. Thus, we are adjusting the rate from the investigation by removing the countervailable subsidy rates associated with programs for which the benefits have been fully allocated.⁷

As noted above, since the issuance of the order, the Department has not conducted any administrative reviews. As a result, we do not have any verified, updated information with respect to whether any of the nine programs found in the investigation to provide countervailable subsidies has been terminated, whether any program-wide changes thereof have been effectuated, or whether additional programs have been established which provide countervailable subsidies to the manufacturers and/or exporter of the subject merchandise. Therefore, the only net countervailable subsidies available to us in this review are those from the original investigation. Thus, we determine that the country-wide net countervailable subsidy likely to prevail if the order were revoked is 0.16 percent.

3. Nature of the Subsidy

Consistent with section 752(a)(6) of the Act, the Department will provide information to the ITC concerning the nature of the subsidy and whether the subsidy is a subsidy as described in Article 3 or Article 6.1 of the SCM. None of the parties addressed this issue.

The following programs are not a subsidy described in Article 3 of the SCM. However, during the period of investigation, they could have been a subsidy described in Article 6.1 of the

⁵ See Final Amended Determination.

⁶ Conversion of FIS bonds to common stock in 1988 constituted an equity infusion on terms inconsistent with commercial consideration.

⁷ See Memorandum to the File re: Calculation of Subsidy Rate Likely to Prevail, dated May 22, 2006.

SCM if the amount of the subsidy exceeds five percent, as measured in accordance with Annex IV of the SCM. Such programs could have fallen within the meaning of Article 6.1 if it constitutes debt forgiveness or is a subsidy to cover operating losses sustained by an industry or enterprise. However, there is insufficient information on the record of this sunset review in order for the Department to make such a determination. We, however, are providing the ITC with the following program description.

1. Equity Infusions

PACS/FIS: With respect to the equity infusions found be countervailable, during the investigation, the Department determined that Loans with Special Characteristics (PACS), was a plan agreed upon in 1978 to help the principal steel companies and their subsidiaries restructure their massive debt. The Department determined that the PACS were debt rather than equity when issued, and found that Usinor and Sacilor converted debt into PACS. The Department also found that the 1981 Corrected Finance Law granted Usinor and Sacilor the authority to issue convertible bonds and that the Fonds d'Intervention Siderurgique (FIS), was created by decree of May 18, 1983, in order to implement that authority. Pursuant to that authority, Usinor and Sacilor issued convertible bonds that were then converted into equity. Because the Department found Usinor Sacilor was unequityworthy in 1986 and 1988, the Department considered the conversion of FIS bonds to common stock during those years to constitute equity infusions on terms inconsistent with commercial consideration. However, because Usinor Sacilor was equityworthy in 1991, the PACS-to-equity conversion was found to be consistent with commercial considerations.

Infusion of Capital: In addition to the debt-to-equity conversions, the GOF provided an infusion of capital to Usinor Sacilor in 1978. Because the Department determined that Usinor Sacilor was unequityworthy at the time of the equity infusion, the Department determined that the equity infusion was provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations. As a result, the combined benefit from these equity infusions was found to be 10.91 percent ad valorem during the investigation.

2. Grants in the Form of Shareholders' Advances

The Department also found that the GOF provided grants to Usinor Sacilor through shareholders' advances beginning in 1982 and that the GOF paid out the last of the advances it had agreed to make under this program in 1986. These advances were converted to common stock in 1986. The Department determined that the advances constituted countervailable grants, as no shares were given for them.

Based on the information from the original investigation, we can conclude that the benefits from the non-recurring government equity infusions and other financial assistance provided to Usinor have been fully allocated prior to the initiation of this sunset review, and no longer provide a countervailable benefit. Specifically, the benefits from the 1986 and 1988

equity infusions (PACS/FIS) and infusion of capital to Usinor Sacilor in 1978 as well as the grants in the form of shareholders' advances provided through 1986 have been fully allocated prior to 2005.

3. Investment Subsidies

In the investigation, the Department determined that the investment subsidies (funds received from various agencies) received by Usinor were de facto specific absent documentation as to the actual distribution of funds from these agencies. Because the Department did not have any information concerning receipt of investment subsidies in any year other than 1991 (the period of investigation ("POI")), the Department expensed the amount received in 1991 thereby creating a proxy for the benefit that would have existed if past subsidies had been allocated over time. On this basis, the Department found that there was no benefit from this program during the POI.

4. Long-term Loans from CFDI

In the investigation, the Department also found that long-term loans issued by the Caisse Francaise de Developpement Industriel ("CFDI") provided countervailable subsidies. Specifically, the Department determined that the Law of July 13, 1978, created "participative" loans, which were issued by the CFDI, on which the borrower paid a lower than market interest rate. In the investigation, the Department determined that these loans were countervailable to the extent that they were inconsistent with commercial considerations. The benefit from this program was 0.35 percent ad valorem. However, once the Department corrected the final determination for ministerial errors, the Department determined the subsidy rate to be 0.00 percent for this program.

5. Loan Guarantees from 1978 through 1982

Absent information regarding specificity, the Department determined that the GOF provided countervailable guarantees from 1978 through 1982 on certain loans that were obtained by Usinor Sacilor. However, the Department found no benefit from this program during the POI.

6. Outstanding Loans Discovered at Verification

The Department also determined that certain loans discovered at verification provided countervailable subsidies. Although no information on these loans, other than that Usinor Sacilor had received "other participative" loans, was available, the Department determined to treat the outstanding principals as a zero rate short-term loan. The calculated benefit from this program was 0.01 percent ad valorem. When the Department amended the final determination after remand, the rate for this program remained 0.01 percent.

7. ECSC Article 54 Loans and Loan Guarantees

The Department also found that countervailable subsidies were being provided through ECSC Article 54 industrial investment loans were provided for the purpose of purchasing new equipment or financing modernization. In the investigation, the Department determined that these loans were only available to companies in the steel and coal industries. Therefore, these loans were specific, and countervailable. The benefit from this program was 0.16 percent ad valorem.

8. ECSC Redeployment Aid (Article 56(2)(b))

The Department found that countervailable subsidies were also being provided through grants provided under Article 56(2)(b) of the ECSC treaty, known as ECSC Redeployment Aid. Such grants were provided to assist workers affected by the restructuring of the coal and steel industries. In the investigation, the Department determined that the GOF provided extra contributions which relieved Usinor Sacilor of an obligation that it had incurred under the collective bargaining agreement. The Department treated the extra contributions as a countervailable grant. The benefit from this program was 0.01 percent ad valorem.

9. Grants in the Form of Cancellation of Debt by Denain Nord-Est Longwy (“DNEL”) and Marine-Wendel

The Department also found countervailable, grants in the form of cancellation of debt by DNEL and Marine-Wendel. As part of the GOF’s 1978 Rescue Plan for the steel industry, DNEL and Marine-Wendel, the former private majority shareholders of Usinor and Sacilor, respectively, cancelled a portion of the debt owed by Usinor and Sacilor. Part of the loans made by DNEL and Marine-Wendel were written off and another portion was converted to PACS. In the investigation, the Department determined that the debt forgiveness represented by the loan write-off was specific to Usinor and Sacilor, and hence countervailable, and calculated the benefit using the grant methodology. Marine-Wendel redeemed its PACS in 1989, and because no interest was paid, the Department treated this portion as a zero interest rate loan for which the benefits expired before the POI. DNEL essentially wrote-off its PACS in 1981 at a minimal redemption value. The Department treated the difference between the full value of the loan and the redemption value as a grant and, because the benefit did not exceed 0.50 percent of Usinor’s sales, the Department expensed the benefit in the year of receipt. Therefore, the 0.05 percent benefit from this program was attributable to the loans written off in 1978, which was treated as a grant and originally allocated over a 15-year AUL.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this sunset review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the CVD order would likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy for the reasons set forth in these preliminary results of review. Further, we preliminarily find the net

countervailable subsidy likely to prevail if the order were revoked is 0.16 percent.

Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we recommend adopting all of the above positions. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the preliminary results of review in the Federal Register.

AGREE: _____

DISAGREE: _____

David M. Spooner
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

(Date)