

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 703(f) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination. In addition, we are making available to the ITC all non-privileged and non-proprietary information relating to this investigation. We will allow the ITC access to all privileged and business proprietary information in our files, provided the ITC confirms that it will not disclose such information, either publicly or under an administrative protective order, without the written consent of the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

In accordance with section 705(b)(2) of the Act, if our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will make its final determination within 45 days after the Department makes its final determination.

Disclosure and Public Comment

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b), the Department will disclose to the parties the calculations for this preliminary determination within five days of its announcement. Case briefs for this investigation must be submitted no later than one week after the issuance of the last verification report. See 19 CFR 351.309(c) (for a further discussion of case briefs). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, must be filed within five days after the deadline for submission of case briefs. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). A list of authorities relied upon, a table of contents, and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Executive summaries should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c), we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on this preliminary determination. Individuals who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. Parties will be notified of the schedule for the hearing and parties should confirm the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time. Requests for a public hearing should contain: (1) party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) to the extent practicable, an

identification of the arguments to be raised at the hearing.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: November 2, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-26947 Filed 11-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration (A-274-804)

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Trinidad and Tobago; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On November 24, 2008, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and alloy steel wire rod (wire rod) from Trinidad and Tobago for the period of review (POR) October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008.

We preliminarily determine that during the POR, ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited, and its affiliate ArcelorMittal International America LLC (collectively, AMPL) made sales of 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. The Department will issue the final results within 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis McClure or Jolanta Lawska, 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) 482-5973 or (202) 482-8362, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 29, 2002, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the

antidumping duty order on wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago; see *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 (October 29, 2002) (Wire Rod Orders). On October 1, 2008, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 73 FR 57056 (October 1, 2008).

On October 31, 2008, we received timely request for review from petitioners,¹ and AMPL, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2). On November 24, 2008, the Department published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008, naming AMPL as the respondent. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 73 FR 70964 (November 24, 2008).

On December 3, 2008, we sent the initial questionnaire covering sections A through D to AMPL. On January 30, 2009, AMPL submitted its sections A through C response to the Department's questionnaire. On February 20, 2009, AMPL submitted its section D response to the Department's questionnaire. On March 19, 2009, the Department sent to AMPL a supplemental questionnaire for sections A through C. We received the response to the supplemental questionnaire on April 16, 2009. On April 30, 2009, petitioners submitted comments on the April 16, 2009, supplemental questionnaire response from AMPL. On May 14, 2009, the Department issued a second supplemental section A-C questionnaire, and on June 4, 2009, AMPL submitted its response. The Department issued a supplemental questionnaire for section D on June 15, 2009, and received the response on July 13, 2009. On August 4, 2009, the Department issued a second supplemental section D questionnaire, and received the response on August 14, 2009.

On May 7, 2009, the Department published a notice extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results of the administrative review from July 3, 2009, to November 2, 2009. See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping*

¹ Petitioners are ISG Georgetown Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel Mills.

Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 21330 (May 7, 2009).

Verification

Pursuant to section 782(i) of the Act, the Department conducted verifications of the questionnaire response submitted by AMPL in August and September 2009. See Memorandum to The File, "Verification of the Sales Response of ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited in the Antidumping Review of Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago," (November 2, 2009) and "Verification of the Cost Response of ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited and ArcelorMittal International America LLC in the Antidumping Review of Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago," (November 2, 2009). The verification reports are available on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Room 1117 of the Department's main building.

On October 20, 2009, the Department received a revised home market and U.S. market sales database based on minor corrections submitted at verification as well as verification findings noted in the Memorandum to The File, "Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum for ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited," (November 2, 2009) (Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum), which is also available in the CRU. On October 20, 2009, the Department also received a revised cost database based on minor corrections submitted at the cost verification.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter. Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. Grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) grade 1080 tire cord

quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

Grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis – that is, the direction of rolling – of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size

of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003.

The designation of the products as "tire cord quality" or "tire bead quality" indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The merchandise subject to this order are classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3000, 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3020, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.3091, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.3093, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6000, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.000, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0030, 7227.20.0080, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6010, 7227.90.6020, 7227.90.6085, 7227.90.6050, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, 7227.90.6059, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes,

the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.²

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), all products produced by the respondent covered by the description in the Scope of the Order section, above, and sold in Trinidad and Tobago during the POR are considered to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We have relied on eight criteria to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to comparison market sales of the foreign like product: grade range, carbon content range, surface quality, deoxidation, maximum total residual content, heat treatment, diameter range, and coating. These characteristics have been weighted by the Department where appropriate. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade 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 listed above. Where there were no sales of similar merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to constructed value (CV).

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago were made in the United States at less than NV, we compared the export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) to the NV, as described in the "Export Price and Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions. In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we calculated CV when we were unable to find a weighted-average price at a time contemporaneous with the U.S. sales.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used, as appropriate, EP or CEP, in accordance with sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act. We calculated EP when the merchandise was sold by the producer or exporter outside the United States directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to

importation and when CEP was not otherwise warranted based on the facts on the record. We calculated CEP for those sales where a person in the United States, affiliated with the foreign exporter or acting for the account of the exporter, made the sale to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States of the subject merchandise. We based EP and CEP on the packed prices charged to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States and the applicable terms of sale.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, for movement expenses including inland freight, international freight, demurrage expenses, marine insurance, other transportation expenses, and U.S. customs duties.

For CEP, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, when appropriate, we deducted from the starting price those selling expenses that were incurred in selling the subject merchandise in the United States, including direct selling expenses (cost of credit). In addition, we deducted indirect selling expenses that related to economic activity in the United States. These expenses include inventory carrying costs incurred by affiliated U.S. distributors. We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and (f) of the Act.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Markets

To determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared AMPL's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, because AMPL had an aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product that was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

In the most recently completed segment of the proceeding in which AMPL participated, the Department found that the respondent made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise and excluded such sales from the calculation of NV. See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 65833 (November 5, 2008), unchanged in

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 10722 (March 12, 2009). Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department determined that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that AMPL made sales of wire rod in Trinidad and Tobago at prices below the cost of production (COP) in this administrative review. As a result, we initiated a COP inquiry for AMPL.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated a weighted-average COP based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative expenses, packing expenses, and interest expense.

a) Based on its contention that the total cost of manufacturing for wire rod products increased by more than 25 percent during the POR, AMPL reported its production costs on a quarterly basis. In our June 15, 2009, supplemental D questionnaire, we instructed AMPL to provide weighted-average POR costs for each CONNUM. We also instructed AMPL to recalculate the quarterly costs such that only the main input driving the large cost changes was reported on a quarterly basis, with all remaining cost elements calculated on an annual average basis. Based on our evaluation of AMPL's revised quarterly cost file, we found that the change in the TOTCOM from the lowest quarter for each CONNUM to the highest quarter for the same CONNUM reflected a change that was below the 25 percent threshold. Consequently, for the preliminary results we used the single POR weighted-average annual costs consistent with the Department's standard practice. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Canada*, 71 FR 3822 (January 24, 2006), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 5.

b) We disallowed AMPL's finished goods inventory adjustment to the reported costs because the cost of manufacturing of the merchandise under consideration (*i.e.*, wire rod) must necessarily be derived based on the POR costs incurred and should not take into account the value of wire rod in beginning inventory. See *Notice of Final Results of the Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand*, 74 FR 22885 (May 15, 2009), and accompanying

² Effective July 1, 2008, CBP reclassified certain HTSUS numbers related to the subject merchandise. See <http://www.usitc.gov/publications/docs/tata/hts/bychapter/0810chgs.pdf>.

Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6.

c) We adjusted the reported cost of iron ore to reflect the amount by which the cost of shipping services exceeded the transfer price paid to an affiliated supplier for the service.

d) We adjusted the general and administrative (G&A) expense ratio by disallowing an offset that AMPL took to its G&A expenses for the collection of a previously written off bad debt.

2. Test of Comparison Market Prices

As required under section 773(b)(2) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the per-unit price of the comparison market sales of the foreign like product, to determine whether these sales were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such prices were sufficient to permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We determined the net comparison market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses and packing expenses which were excluded from COP for comparison purposes.

3. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in "substantial quantities." See section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act. Further, the sales were made within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, because we examined below-cost sales occurring during the entire POR. In such cases, because we compared prices to POR-average costs, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, for purposes of this administrative review, we disregarded below-cost sales of a given product and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

C. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

For certain comparisons, we based home market prices on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in Trinidad and Tobago. We adjusted the starting price for inland freight pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, for comparisons made to EP sales, we made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We made COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred for home market sales (credit expense) and adding U.S. direct selling expenses (credit directly linked to sales transactions). No other adjustments to NV were claimed or allowed.

When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs.

D. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Constructed Value

Section 773(a)(4) of the Act provides that where NV cannot be based on comparison-market sales, NV may be based on CV. In this review, AMPL did not have identical or similar comparison market sales at a time contemporaneous with certain U.S. sales. Accordingly, we based NV for these comparisons on the CV. Section 773(e) of the Act provides that the CV shall be based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the imported merchandise, plus amounts for selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. We based SG&A expenses and profit on the actual 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 comparison market, in accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act.

We relied on the CV data submitted by AMPL with the exception of the adjustments as noted in the "Cost of Production Analysis" section, above. See also, Memorandum to The File, "Cost of Production and Constructed Value Calculation Adjustments for the Preliminary Results – ArcelorMittal Point Lisas Limited and ArcelorMittal International America LLC," (November 2, 2009).

In addition, we made adjustments to CV for differences in COS in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to EP, we made COS adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred on comparison market sales from, and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to, CV.

E. Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP or CEP transaction. In identifying LOTs for EP and comparison market sales (*i.e.*, NV based on home market), we consider the starting prices before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and profit under section 772(d) of the Act. See *Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States*, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP transactions, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. 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 an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the 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 Act (the CEP-offset provision).

In the home market, AMPL reported sales made through one LOT corresponding to one channel of distribution. In the U.S. market, AMPL reported two LOTs corresponding to two channels of distribution. AMPL made sales to an unaffiliated trading company and through its U.S. affiliates. We have determined that the sales made by AMPL directly to U.S. customers are EP sales and those made by AMPL's affiliated U.S. resellers constitute CEP sales. Furthermore, we have found that U.S. sales and home market sales were made at the same LOT. Accordingly, we did not find it necessary to make an LOT adjustment or CEP offset. For further explanation of our LOT analysis,

see the Preliminary Sales Calculation Memorandum.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008:

Producer/Manufacturer	Weighted-Average Margin
AMPL	23.95%

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to the parties of this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 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 working day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to 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)(ii). Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Further, parties submitting written comments are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results. *See* section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rate

The Department shall determine and CBP shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), the Department calculates an assessment rate for each importer of the subject merchandise for each respondent. Upon issuance of the final results of this administrative review, if any importer-specific assessment rates calculated in the final results are above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.5 percent), the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to CBP to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries.

To determine whether the duty assessment rates covering the period were *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), for each respondent we calculated importer (or customer)-specific *ad valorem* rates by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to that importer or customer and dividing this amount by the total value of the sales to that importer (or customer). Where an importer (or customer)-specific *ad valorem* rate is greater than *de minimis*, and the respondent has reported reliable entered values, we apply the assessment rate to the entered value of the importer's/customer's entries during the review period. Where an importer (or customer)-specific *ad valorem* rate is greater than *de minimis* and we do not have reliable entered values, we calculate a per-unit assessment rate by aggregating the dumping duties due for all U.S. sales to each importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total quantity sold to that importer (or customer).

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 respondent for which it did not know its 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(ies) involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

On November 2, 2007, consistent with the Court's decision in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990), we published a notice of a Court's decision not in harmony with the final determination of injury by the International Trade Commission. *See Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Trinidad and Tobago: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with Final Determination of The Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 72 FR 62208 (November 2, 2007). This notice states that we will suspend liquidation of subject merchandise entered after July 16, 2007, pending a final and conclusive court decision. *See id.* Therefore, liquidation for entries made during the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008, is suspended pending a final court decision in the

case involving the ITC's final determination of injury.

Cash Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash deposit rate for AMPL, we divided the total dumping margin by the total net value for AMPL's sales during the POR.

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Trinidad and Tobago entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for AMPL will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior 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 final results for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and, (4) 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 11.40 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Wire Rod Orders*. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

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 increase the subsequent assessment of the antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

These preliminary results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 2, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-26943 Filed 11-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-822]

Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers ("HSLWs") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") covering the period of review ("POR") October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008. We preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value ("NV") by Hangzhou Spring Washer Co., Ltd. ("HSW") (also known as Zhejiang Wanxin Group Co., Ltd.). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this 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. The Department invites interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 9, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon Farlander, Austin Redington or David Layton, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0182, (202) 482-1664, and (202) 482-0371, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published the antidumping duty order on certain HSLWs from the PRC on October 19, 1993. The order was amended on November 23, 1993. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China*, 58 FR 53914 (October 19, 1993), and *Amended Final Determination and*

Amended Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China, 58 FR 61859 (November 23, 1993). On October 1, 2008, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 73 FR 57056 (October 1, 2008). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1) and (2), on October 31, 2008, Shakeproof Assembly Components Division of Illinois Tool Works, Inc. ("Shakeproof" or "Petitioner"), a domestic interested party, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of HSW, a producer and exporter of subject merchandise.

On November 24, 2008, the Department published the initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on HSLWs from the PRC covering the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 73 FR 70964 (November 24, 2008).

The Department issued an antidumping duty questionnaire to HSW on December 10, 2008. We received the questionnaire responses from HSW on January 14, 2009, and February 12, 2009. We received supplemental questionnaire responses from HSW on July 10, 2009, September 29, 2009, October 6, 2009 and October 14, 2009.

The Department informed interested parties that surrogate country selection comments submitted by February 25, 2009, would be considered for the preliminary results. See Letter to IPs: Deadlines for Surrogate Country Comments. Neither of the interested parties provided comments on the selection of a surrogate country. On March 30, 2009, Petitioner provided publicly available information to value the factors of production ("FOPs").

On June 23, 2009, the Department published a notice in the **Federal Register** extending the time limit for the preliminary results of this review until November 2, 2009. See *Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the 2007-2008 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 29669 (June 23, 2009).

Non-Market Economy Country Status

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC

has been treated as a non-market economy ("NME") country. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. See, e.g., *Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of the 2004/2005 Administrative Review and Notice of Rescission of 2004/2005 New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 66304 (November 14, 2006); *Honey from the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Final Rescission, In Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 34893 (June 16, 2006); and *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Partial Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances: Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China*, 71 FR 29303 (May 22, 2006) ("Sawblades"). None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment. Accordingly, we calculated NV in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, which applies to NME countries.

Surrogate Country and Surrogate Values

Section 773(c)(1) of the Act directs the Department to base NV on the NME producer's FOPs, valued in a surrogate market economy country or countries considered to be appropriate by the Department if NV cannot be determined pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act, the Department valued the FOPs, to the extent possible, using the costs of the FOPs in one or more market-economy countries that are at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and are significant producers of comparable merchandise. The Department determined that Colombia, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Peru and Thailand are countries comparable to the PRC in terms of economic development. See Memorandum from Carole Showers, Acting Director, Office of Policy, to Brandon Farlander, Program Manager, Office 1, entitled "Request for a List of Surrogate Countries for an Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers" ("HSLW") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), dated December 22, 2008 ("Policy Memo").

On January 16, 2009, the Department solicited comments on its selection of surrogate countries for this administrative review and also invited