

A-449-804
A-455-803
A-560-811
A-570-860
A-822-804
A-823-809
A-841-804

Sunset Reviews

Public Document

M. Khan/Office 1/Ext.0914

DATE: November 1, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

FROM: Christian Marsh 
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the People's Republic of China, and Ukraine

Summary

We have analyzed the responses of the interested parties in the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders covering steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), and Ukraine. We recommend that you approve the positions described in the Discussion of the Issues section of this memorandum. Below is the complete list of the issues in the sunset reviews for which we received substantive responses:

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping
2. Magnitude of the margin likely to prevail

History of the Orders

On April 11, 2001, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published its final determinations in the investigations of steel concrete reinforcing bars from Indonesia, Poland, and Ukraine. *See Notice of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Indonesia, Poland and Ukraine*, 66 FR 18752 (April 11, 2001). For Poland, the Department found a weighted-average antidumping duty ("AD") margin of 52.07 percent for Stalexport and an All Others Rate of 47.13 percent. *See id.* For Indonesia, the

Department found a weighted-average AD margin of 71.01 percent for PT Gunung Gahapi Sakti; PT Bhirma Steel; Krakatau Wajatama; PT Jakarta Steel Perdana Industri; PT Hanil Jaya Metal Works; PT Pulogadung Steel; PT Jakarta Cakra Tunggal; and PT The Master Steel Manufacturing Co.; and an All Others Rate of 60.46 percent. *See id.* For Ukraine, the Department found a weighted-average AD margin of 41.69 percent for the Ukraine-wide rate. *See id.*

On June 22, 2001, the Department published its final determinations in the investigations of steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Latvia, Moldova, and the PRC. For Belarus, the Department determined a weighted-average AD margin of 114.53 percent for the Belarus-wide rate. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Belarus*, 66 FR 33528 (June 22, 2001). For Latvia, the Department determined a weighted-average AD margin of 17.21 percent for both Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs and the All Others Rate. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Latvia*, 66 FR 33530 (June 22, 2001). For Moldova, the Department found a weighted-average AD margin of 232.86 percent for the Moldova-wide rate. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova*, 66 FR 33525 (June 22, 2001). For the PRC, the Department found an AD margin of 133.00 percent for both Laiwu Steel Group and the PRC-wide rate. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 33522 (June 22, 2001).

On September 7, 2001, the Department published AD orders on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, Poland, and Ukraine. *See Antidumping Duty Orders: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, People's Republic of China, Poland, Republic of Korea and Ukraine*, 66 FR 46777 (September 7, 2001).¹

The Department has conducted no administrative reviews with respect to imports of steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine. The Department has conducted four administrative reviews with respect to imports of subject merchandise from Latvia. *See Attachment I*. There have been no changed circumstances determinations, no duty absorption findings, and no scope clarifications or rulings concerning the steel concrete reinforcing bars antidumping duty orders. Several Harmonized Tariff Schedule categories have been added to the scope, but the scope description itself has not changed. The orders remain in effect for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise.

The Department conducted the first sunset reviews on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), and found that revocation of the AD orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations. The U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”) determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the AD orders would be likely to lead to

¹ On August 9, 2007, the Department revoked the AD order on steel concrete reinforcing bars with respect to the Republic of Korea. *See Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from South Korea: Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 44830 (August 9, 2007).

continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. *See Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Belarus, China, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, and Ukraine*, Investigations Nos. 731–TA–873–875, 877–880, and 882 (Reviews), 72 FR 42110 (August 1, 2007). Thus, the Department published the notice of continuation of the AD orders. *See Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, the People’s Republic of China, Poland and Ukraine: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 72 FR 44830 (August 9, 2007).

On July 2, 2012, the Department published the notice of initiation of the second sunset reviews of the AD orders on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Reviews*, 77 FR 39218 (July 2, 2012) (“notice of initiation”). The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the following domestic parties: the Rebar Trade Action Coalition (“RTAC”) and its individual members, Nucor Corporation, Gerdau Long Steel North America, Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc., and Commercial Metals Company (collectively “domestic interested parties”), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). Each individual member of the RTAC is a manufacturer of a domestic like product in the United States and, accordingly, is a domestic interested party pursuant to section 771(9)(C) of the Act.

The Department received complete substantive responses to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no responses from respondent interested parties with respect to any of the orders covered by these sunset reviews. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department is conducting expedited (120-day) sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders for Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine.²

Discussion of the Issues

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted these sunset reviews to determine whether revocation of the AD orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making these determinations, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping duty order. In addition, section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the Department shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Below we address the comments of the interested parties.

² As explained in the memorandum from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll deadlines for the duration of the closure of the Federal Government from October 29, through October 30, 2012. Thus, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by two days. The revised deadline for the final results of this sunset review is now November 1, 2012. *See* Memorandum to the Record from Paul Piquado, AS for Import Administration, regarding “Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Hurricane,” dated October 31, 2012.

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Interested Party Comments

Domestic interested parties believe that revocation of these AD orders would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by the manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise. *See generally* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Responses for Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine (July 30, 2012). According to the domestic interested parties, the records of these proceedings demonstrate that respondents have persisted in dumping in the U.S. market, while also dramatically reducing their sales of subject merchandise. *See id.*

Domestic interested parties claim the following:

- *Belarus*: Subject merchandise from Belarus disappeared from the market following the imposition of the AD order, with the exception of just 2,820 net tons in 2002. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response from Belarus, at 8-9 (July 30, 2012). Imports of subject merchandise from Belarus have remained absent since the continuation of the AD order in 2007 for five consecutive years, which indicates a strong likelihood of recurrence of dumping if the AD order were revoked. *See id.* The AD margin has remained at 114.53 percent since the original investigation. *See id.* at 7.
- *Indonesia*: Imports of subject merchandise from Indonesia ceased after the imposition of the AD order, and have remained absent since the continuation of the AD order in 2007. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Indonesia, at 8-9 (July 30, 2012). The absence of imports of subject merchandise from Indonesia into the United States is indicative of a strong likelihood of a recurrence of dumping should the AD order be revoked. *See id.* AD margins remain at 71.01 percent for PT Gunung Gahapi Sakti; PT Bhirma Steel; Krakatau Wajatama; PT Jakarta Steel Perdana Industri; PT Hanil Jaya Metal Works; PT Pulogadung Steel; PT Jakarta Cakra Tunggal; and, PT The Master Steel Manufacturing Co. *See id.* at 5. The weighted-average dumping margins remained at 60.46 percent for all others. *See id.*
- *Latvia*: Imports of subject merchandise from Latvia fell drastically after the imposition of the AD order from 303,997 net tons in 2000 to only 33,662 net tons in 2001. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Latvia, at 9 (July 30, 2012). The drop in imports of subject merchandise from Latvia is indicative of a strong likelihood of a recurrence of dumping. *See id.* For the first sunset review, the Department reported to the ITC the rate from the investigation, *i.e.* 17.21 percent rate, for both Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs and for all others. *See id.* at 7.
- *Moldova*: Imports of subject merchandise from Moldova have disappeared from the U.S. market since the imposition of the AD order, and have remained absent since the second sunset review. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Moldova, at 8 (July 30, 2012). AD margins have remained at 232.86 percent since the original investigation. *See id.* at 6. The cessation of all imports following the issuance of the AD

order demonstrates that revocation of the order will certainly lead to a continuation of dumping. *See id.* at 8.

- *Poland*: Subject merchandise from Poland effectively disappeared from the market following the imposition of the order, which is an indication that Polish producers could not maintain pre-investigation import levels without selling merchandise at dumped prices. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Poland, at 8-9 (July 30, 2012). There were no imports from Poland for five consecutive years between 2007 through 2011. *See id.* The cessation of subject merchandise imports from Poland is indicative of a strong likelihood of a recurrence of dumping if the order were revoked. *See id.* AD margins remain at 52.07 percent for Stalexport and at 47.13 percent for all others. *See id.* at 7.
- *PRC*: Imports of subject merchandise from the PRC fell to zero in 2003 from a high of approximately 160,000 metric tons in 2000. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for the PRC, at 8 (July 30, 2012). Imports of subject merchandise into the United States from the PRC have remained at similarly diminished levels in the U.S. market since the continuation of the AD order in 2007, with a high of only 2,164 metric tons in 2007. *See id.* AD margins have remained at 133 percent for Laiwu Steel Group and for the PRC-wide rate since the original investigation. *See id.* at 5-6. A drastic reduction of imports of subject merchandise from the PRC into the United States demonstrates a strong likelihood of a recurrence of dumping if the AD order were to be revoked. *See id.* at 9.
- *Ukraine*: Subject merchandise from Ukraine disappeared from the U.S. market following the imposition of the AD order, and remained absent following the continuation of the AD order after the first sunset review. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response from Ukraine, at 8 (July 30, 2012). The Ukraine-wide AD margin remains at 41.69 percent. *See id.* at 5. The evidence supports a finding that there is a strong likelihood of recurrence of dumping if the AD order were revoked. *See id.* at 8.

Department's Position

Consistent with the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically the Statement of Administrative Action ("SAA"), H. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the Department normally determines that revocation of an AD order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly. In addition, pursuant to section 752(c)(1)(B) of the Act, the Department considers the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the AD order.

Belarus: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Belarus virtually ceased following the issuance of the AD order. *See* Domestic Interested

Parties' Substantive Response from Belarus, at 8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Indonesia: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Indonesia disappeared from the U.S. market after the imposition of the AD order. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Indonesia, at 8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Latvia: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Latvia fell drastically after the imposition of the AD order, and have ceased completely since the first sunset review. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Latvia, at 9. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Moldova: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Moldova disappeared from the U.S. market since the imposition of the order. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Moldova, at 8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Poland: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Poland disappeared from the U.S. market since the imposition of the order. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Poland, at 8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

PRC: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from the PRC fell to zero in 2003 from a high of approximately 160,000 metric tons in 2000, and have remained significantly diminished since the first sunset review in 2007. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for the PRC, at 5-8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Ukraine: Statistics from the ITC's Dataweb show that imports of subject merchandise from Ukraine disappeared from the U.S. market following the imposition of the AD order. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response from Ukraine, at 8. Therefore, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail

Interested Party Comments

Domestic interested parties request that the Department report to the ITC the margins that were determined in the final determinations in the original investigations, in accordance with the SAA. *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response from Belarus, at 11; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Indonesia, at 11-12; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Latvia, at 16; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Moldova, at 10; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Poland, at 11; Domestic Interested

Parties' Substantive Response for the PRC, at 11; and, Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response for Ukraine, at 11.

Department's Position

Normally, the Department will provide to the ITC the company-specific margin from the investigation for each company. For companies not investigated specifically, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation. The Department's preference for selecting a margin from the investigation is based on the fact that it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place. Under certain circumstances, however, the Department may select a more recent margin to report to the ITC. *See, e.g., Potassium Permanganate from The People's Republic of China; Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of Antidumping Duty Order; Final Results*, 70 FR 24520 (May 10, 2005).

The Department has recently announced that in sunset reviews, it will comply with WTO dispute findings against "zeroing" by "not rely{ing} on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology determined by the Appellate Body to be WTO-inconsistent." *See Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) ("*Final Modification for Reviews*"). In the original investigations involving Indonesia, Poland and Ukraine, the final dumping margins were based upon the use of adverse facts available and, therefore, were not affected by the WTO-inconsistent methodology. In the investigations involving Belarus, Moldova, and the PRC, all final dumping margins were margins where no offsets were denied because all comparison results were positive. As a result, the Department's final weighted-average dumping margins calculated in the investigations were not affected by "zeroing." After considering the arguments put forth, and the dumping margins determined in the investigations, the Department agrees with domestic interested parties that it is appropriate to report to the ITC the investigation rates for Belarus, Indonesia, Moldova, Poland, the PRC, and Ukraine³ because these are the only rates that reflect the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order in place. For Latvia, the Department finds that it is appropriate to provide to the ITC the Department's revised final margin for Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs, the only respondent in the investigation, which was recalculated based on information contained in the output from the SAS program from the investigation. *See Memorandum from Mahnaz Khan, International Trade Compliance Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1 to the Susan Kuhbach, Office Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1 regarding "Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia: Margin Likely to Prevail," dated October 30, 2012.* Thus, the Department will report to the ITC the rates listed in the Final Results of Review section, below.

³ As of February 1, 2006, Ukraine graduated to market economy status. *See Final Results of Inquiry Into Ukraine's Status as a Non-Market Economy Country*, 71 FR 9520 (February 24, 2006). As a result, the Ukraine-wide rate is the All Others rate.

FINAL RESULTS OF REVIEW

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on steel concrete reinforcing bars from Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, the People's Republic of China, and Ukraine would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	Weighted-Average Margin (percent)
<u>Belarus</u>	
Belarus-Wide Rate	114.53
<u>Indonesia</u>	
PT Gunung Gahapi Sakti	71.01
PT Bhirma Steel	71.01
Krakatau Wajatama	71.01
PT Jakarta Steel Perdana Industri	71.01
PT Hanil Jaya Metal Works	71.01
PT Pulogadung Steel	71.01
PT Jakarta Cakra Tunggal	71.01
PT The Master Steel Manufacturing Co.	71.01
All Others Rate	60.46
<u>Latvia</u>	
Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs	16.99
All Others Rate	16.99
<u>Moldova</u>	
Moldova-Wide Rate	232.86
<u>Poland</u>	
Stalexport	52.07
All Others Rate	47.13
<u>PRC</u>	
Laiwu Steel Group	133.00
PRC-Wide Rate	133.00
<u>Ukraine</u>	
All Others Rate	41.69

ATTACHMENT 1

History of the Order

Investigation		
<i>Country</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Margins</i>
Belarus	<i>Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Belarus, 66 FR 33528 (June 22, 2001)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belarus-Wide = 114.53%
Indonesia	<i>Notice of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Indonesia, Poland and Ukraine, 66 FR 18752 (April 11, 2001)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pt Gunung Gahapi Sakti = 71.01% •PT Bhirma Steel = 71.01% •Krakatau Wajatama = 71.01% •PT Jakarta Steel Perdana Industri = 71.01% •PT Hanil Jaya Metal Works = 71.01% •PT Pulogadung Steel = 71.01% •PT Jakarta Cakra Tunggal = 71.01% •PT The Master Steel Manufacturing Co. = 71.01% •All Others = 60.46%
Latvia	<i>Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Latvia, 66 FR 33530 (June 22, 2001)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 17.21% •All Others = 17.21%
Moldova	<i>Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, 66 FR 33525 (June 22, 2001)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Moldova-Wide =232.86%
People's Republic Of	<i>Notice of Final Determination of Sales</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Laiwu Steel Group = 133%

China	<i>at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From the People's Republic of China</i> , 66 FR 33522 (June 22, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All Others = 133%
Poland	<i>Notice of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Indonesia, Poland and Ukraine</i> , 66 FR 18752 (April 11, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Stalexport = 52.07% •All Others = 47.13%
Ukraine	<i>Notice of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Indonesia, Poland and Ukraine</i> , 66 FR 18752 (April 11, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ukraine-Wide = 41.69%

Administrative and Sunset Reviews			
<i>Country</i>	<i>Segment</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>Margins</i>
Belarus	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, the People's Republic of China, South Korea, Indonesia, Poland, and Belarus; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> , 71 FR 70509 (December 5, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Belarus-Wide = 114.53%
Indonesia	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, the People's Republic of China, South Korea, Indonesia, Poland, and Belarus; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> ,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pt Gunung Gahapi Sakti = 71.01% •PT Bhirma Steel = 71.01% •Krakatau Wajatama = 71.01% •PT Jakarta Steel Perdana Industri = 71.01%

		71 FR 70509 (December 5, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●PT Hanil Jaya Metal Works = 71.01% ●PT Pulogadung Steel = 71.01% ●PT Jakarta Cakra Tunggal = 71.01% ●PT The Master Steel Manufacturing Co. = 71.01% ●All Others = 60.46%
Latvia	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia; Final Results of the Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order</i> , 72 FR 16767 (April 5, 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 17.21% ●All Others = 17.21%
Latvia	1 st Administrative Review POR: January 30, 2001 – August 31, 2002	<i>Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia</i> , 68 FR 71067 (December 22, 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 0.87%
Latvia	2 nd Administrative Review POR: September 1, 2002 – August 31, 2003	<i>Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia</i> , 69 FR 74498 (December 14, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 3.01%
Latvia	3 rd Administrative Review POR: September 1, 2003 – August 31, 2004	<i>Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia</i> , 71 FR 7016, (February 10, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 5.24%

Latvia	4 th Administrative Review POR: September 1, 2004 – August 31, 2005	<i>Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia, 71 FR 74900 (December 13, 2006); amended at Notice of Implementation of Determination Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act: Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Latvia, Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From Finland, Certain Pasta From Italy, Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From the Netherlands, Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Spain, Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy, Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Japan, 77 FR 36257 (June 18, 2012)</i>	•Joint Stock Company Liepajas Metalurgs = 4.87%
Latvia	5 th Administrative Review POR: September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2007	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 73 FR 11869 (March 5, 2008)</i>	No rate determined (Rescinded)
Moldova	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, the People's Republic of China, South Korea, Indonesia, Poland,</i>	•Moldova-Wide = 232.86%

		<i>and Belarus; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 71 FR 70509 (December 5, 2006)</i>	
People's Republic Of China	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, the People's Republic of China, South Korea, Indonesia, Poland, and Belarus; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 71 FR 70509 (December 5, 2006)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Laiwu Steel Group = 133% ●All Others = 133%
Poland	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Moldova, the People's Republic of China, South Korea, Indonesia, Poland, and Belarus; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 71 FR 70509 (December 5, 2006)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Stalexport = 52.07% ●All Others = 47.13%
Ukraine	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Ukraine; Final Results of the Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order, 72 FR 9732 (March 5, 2007)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All Others Rate = 41.69%