

Final Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist:

**CIRCULAR WELDED NON-ALLOY STEEL
PIPES AND TUBES**

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Weighted-average margin
Hylsa	2.99
TUNA	1.77

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of review for all shipments of circular welded carbon steel pipe from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be the rate for that firm as stated above; (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 period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash rate will be 36.00 percent. This is the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under Sec. 353.26 of the Department's regulations to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period.

Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with Sec. 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with Sec. 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and Sec. 353.22.

Dated: June 30, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-18114 Filed 7-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-337-803]

**Initiation of Antidumping Duty
Investigation: Fresh Atlantic Salmon
From Chile**

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Frederick, at (202) 482-0186, or Kris Campbell, at (202) 482-3813; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

INITIATION OF INVESTIGATION:**The Applicable Statute and Regulations**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations refer to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 353, as they existed on April 1, 1997.

The Petition

On June 12, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by the Coalition for Fair Atlantic Salmon Trade (FAST) and the following individual members of FAST: Atlantic Salmon of

Maine; Cooke Aquaculture U.S., Inc.; DE Salmon, Inc.; Global Aqua—USA, LLC; Island Aquaculture Corp.; Maine Coast Nordic, Inc.; ScanAm Fish Farms; and Treats Island Fisheries (collectively referred to hereafter as "the petitioners"). The petitioners submitted information supplementing the petition on June 23, 1997.

The petitioners allege that imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.

The Department finds that the petitioners have standing to file the petition because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and because they have demonstrated sufficient industry support (see discussion below).

Scope of Investigation

The scope of this investigation covers fresh, farmed Atlantic salmon, whether imported "dressed" or cut. Atlantic salmon is the species *Salmo salar*, in the genus *Salmo* of the family salmoninae. "Dressed" Atlantic salmon refers to salmon that has been bled, gutted, and cleaned. Dressed Atlantic salmon may be imported with the head on or off; with the tail on or off; and with the gills in or out. All cuts of fresh Atlantic salmon are included in the scope of the investigation. Examples of cuts include, but are not limited to: crosswise cuts (steaks), lengthwise cuts (fillets), lengthwise cuts attached by skin (butterfly cuts), combinations of crosswise and lengthwise cuts (combination packages), and Atlantic salmon that is minced, shredded, or ground. Cuts may be subjected to various degrees of trimming, and imported with the skin on or off and with the "pin bones" in or out.

Excluded from the scope of this petition are (1) fresh Atlantic salmon that is "not farmed" (i.e., wild Atlantic salmon); (2) live Atlantic salmon and Atlantic salmon that has been subjected to further processing, such as frozen, canned, dried, and smoked Atlantic salmon; and (3) Atlantic salmon that has been further processed into forms such as sausages, hot dogs, and burgers.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classifiable as statistical reporting numbers 0302.12.0003 and 0304.10.4091 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) of the United States. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

During pre-filing consultations and as a result of our review of the petition, we discussed with the petitioners whether the proposed scope was an accurate reflection of the product for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. We noted that the scope in the petition appeared to include both farmed and not farmed Atlantic salmon. The petitioners subsequently notified the Department on June 26, 1997, that Atlantic salmon that is not farmed should be excluded from the scope of the investigation. Accordingly, we have done so.

We are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all interested parties to submit such comments before August 4, 1997. This period of scope consultation is intended to provide the Department ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act requires that the Department determine, prior to the initiation of an investigation, that a minimum percentage of the domestic industry supports an antidumping petition. A petition meets these minimum requirements if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Under section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act, if the petitioners account for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department is not required to poll the industry to determine the extent of industry support.

Based on U.S. salmon production information published by the State of Maine Department of Marine Resources and the Washington Farmed Salmon Commission, the petitioners claimed that they account for over 70 percent of total production of fresh Atlantic salmon in the United States. The petitioners further claimed that, when the U.S. producers related to foreign producers are excluded from the analysis, the petitioners represent approximately 97 percent of domestic production of fresh Atlantic salmon.

On June 27, 1997, the Association of Chilean Salmon and Trout Producers (the Association) contested the

petitioners' standing claim. The Association stated that the petitioners' standing calculations focused exclusively on dressed salmon producers while ignoring U.S. fillet producers and claimed that fillet salmon represents a separate domestic like product from dressed salmon under the five-part domestic like product test used by the International Trade Commission (ITC). The Association argued that these facts suggest: (1) The petitioners do not have standing with respect to fillets, and; (2) even if the Department accepts the petitioners' single domestic like product definition, the petitioners have failed to provide adequate industry support data since fillet producers represent a significant portion of the industry producing the domestic like product. This submission included certain letters in opposition to the petition submitted by U.S. fillet processors, some of whom identified themselves as importers of dressed salmon from Chile.

On June 30, 1997, the petitioners submitted a rebuttal, stating that the Association failed to refute the "total domestic production" and "percent of production" industry support figures contained in the petition and failed to provide any information that would indicate that the petitioners do not have standing even under a two-like-product analysis. The petitioners argued that the facts in this case do not support a finding that fillet salmon is a separate domestic like product because there are no clear dividing lines, in terms of characteristics or uses, between dressed salmon and salmon fillets. Specifically, petitioners contended that, *inter alia*: (1) Salmon fillets are derived from dressed Atlantic salmon and, in fact, all forms of fresh Atlantic salmon include the salmon meat that is ultimately consumed; (2) respondents focused solely on one cut of fresh Atlantic salmon (fillet) while ignoring other cuts (e.g., steak); (3) the one cutting step that does play a significant role in the physical characteristic of the product (the initial cutting of the fish in order to bleed it) has been performed on both dressed and fillet salmon;¹ and (4) fillet cutting is not a "value added" operation, but instead results in a higher-priced end product primarily because much waste has been eliminated. With respect to the last point, the petitioners argued that the price trends of fillets compared with dressed salmon suggest that there is no

value added, but in fact negative value added, because the price of Chilean fillets, when adjusted for the cost of processing dressed salmon into fillets, is less than the price of dressed salmon.

On July 1, 1997, the Association submitted further comments in response to the petitioners' arguments.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether the petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who account for production of the domestic like product. The ITC, which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. However, while both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory provision regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the domestic like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.² Therefore, we have examined the Association's arguments regarding the definition of the domestic like product in the petition in the context of the statutory provisions governing initiation and the facts of the record.

The Association's contention is based on an examination of like product determinations made in prior ITC cases, and follows an analysis of factors traditionally examined by the ITC. However, as noted above, the Department's analysis of like product is not bound by ITC practice. The Department's analysis begins with section 771(10) of the Act, which defines domestic like product as "a product that is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." After considering the information presented by the petitioner and the Association, we do not find that the petitioner's domestic like product definition is inconsistent with this statutory definition. While both parties have cited to various cases involving agricultural

¹ In this respect, the petitioners distinguish this case from the like product decisions in *Live Swine and Pork from Canada*, Inv. No. 701-TA-22 (Final), USITC pub. 2218 (September 1989).

² See *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 642-44 (CIT 1988); *High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 Fed. Reg. 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

and other products, in light of the information presented in the petition, we have concluded that there is no basis on which to reject as clearly inaccurate the petitioners' representations that there are no clear dividing lines, in terms of characteristics or uses, between dressed and cut salmon. Therefore, we have adopted the single domestic like product definition set forth in the petition.

Having found that dressed and cut salmon constitute a single like product, we considered the Association's arguments that U.S. production of salmon cuts had not been accounted for in the petition's demonstration of industry support. The calculation of the standing ratio in the petition was based on a comparison of the volume of the petitioners' total 1996 production of dressed salmon to the volume of the industry's total 1996 production of dressed salmon. We have revised the petitioner's industry support calculations to add to the total U.S. domestic industry figure an amount representing the estimated economic value of U.S. fillet processing, in order to be as conservative as possible in our evaluation of industry support.

In order to factor fillet processing into our analysis, we used a value-based analysis. We determined that the calculation of industry support on the basis of weight is inappropriate because the further processing of dressed salmon into cuts involves significant weight yield loss. In this regard, we note that the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) for the URAA explicitly provides that the Department may determine the existence of industry support based on the value of production. SAA at 862. For a further explanation of our inclusion of salmon processing in the total U.S. domestic industry figure, which served as the denominator in the industry support calculation, see the Initiation Checklist prepared for this case, dated July 1, 1997.

Having accounted for U.S. production of salmon cuts, we find that the production data provided in the petition indicate that the petitioners account for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, thus meeting the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act. Since the petitioners exceed the industry support threshold, we have not taken the letters of opposition that were filed with the Association's June 27, 1997, submission into account in our determination of industry support.

Export Price and Normal Value

The petitioners calculated separate export prices for dressed Atlantic

salmon (dressed salmon), fillets of Atlantic salmon (fillets), and steaks of Atlantic salmon (steaks).

For dressed salmon and fillets, the petitioners based export price on 1996 CIF price quotes to U.S. customers, as reported by the *Urner Barry* guide, an industry standard for seafood price quotes. The petitioners made deductions for foreign inland freight, international freight, and brokerage fees.

For steaks, the petitioners based export price on 1996 FOB Chilean export values derived from Chilean Customs Service statistics, because the *Urner Barry* guide does not track salmon steak. The petitioners made deductions for foreign inland freight.

With respect to normal value, the petitioners could not find specific data regarding the size of the Chilean domestic market for Atlantic salmon. However, they obtained statements from several sources, including the Chilean Salmon and Trout Producers Association and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, indicating that virtually all production of Chilean Atlantic salmon is exported. Given these statements, and the lack of information about the size of the Chilean domestic market, the petitioners turned to third country exports as the basis for normal value. The petitioners determined that Japan and Brazil are the largest third country markets, based on statistics taken from an export statistics bulletin published by the Chilean Government's Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP).

The petitioners obtained prices for exports to Japan and Brazil from the IFOP export statistics bulletin, but did not rely upon these prices for a price-to-price comparison of U.S. sales to third country sales. Instead, the petitioners alleged that sales in the third country markets of Japan and Brazil were made at prices below the fully allocated cost of production (COP), and cannot serve as the basis for normal value.

The petitioners calculated COP using data derived primarily from a consultant's report commissioned by the Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development, as well as from the financial statements of two Chilean fresh Atlantic salmon producers.

The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA), submitted to Congress in connection with the interpretation and application of the Uruguay Round Agreements, states that an allegation of sales below COP need not be specific to individual exporters or producers. SAA, H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2d Sess., at 833 (1994). The SAA, at 833, states that "Commerce will consider allegations of below-cost sales in the

aggregate for a foreign country, just as Commerce currently considers allegations of sales at less than fair value on a country-wide basis for purposes of initiating an antidumping investigation."

Further, the SAA provides that "new section 773(b)(2)(A) retains the current requirement that Commerce have "reasonable grounds to believe or suspect" that below cost sales have occurred before initiating such an investigation. "Reasonable grounds" * * * exist when an interested party provides specific factual information on costs and prices, observed or constructed, indicating that sales in the foreign market in question are at below-cost prices." *Id.*

Based on a comparison of the Japan and Brazil prices for fresh Atlantic salmon to the COP calculated in the petition, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below COP in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating the requested country-wide cost investigation. We note, however, that if we determine that the home market (*i.e.*, Chile) is viable, our initiation of a country-wide cost investigation with respect to sales to Japan and Brazil will be rendered moot.

Since, as described above, we have found reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below COP, for purposes of this initiation we have accepted the use of CV as the basis for normal value.

The petitioners calculated CVs for dressed salmon, fillets, and steaks using the same cost of manufacturing, SG&A, and packing expense figures that were used to compute COP. Consistent with section 773(e)(2), the petitioners included profit in the calculation of CV, based on the financial statements of Chilean producers of fresh Atlantic salmon.

Fair Value Comparison

Based on the data provided by the petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value. The weighted-average dumping margin based on price-to-CV comparisons is 41.78 percent. If it becomes necessary at a later date to consider the petition as a source of facts available under section 776 of the Act, we may further review the margin calculations in the petition.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

We have examined the petition on fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act, including the requirement concerning allegation of material injury or threat of material injury to the domestic producers of a domestic like product by reason of subject imports allegedly sold at less than fair value. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Our preliminary determination will be issued by November 19, 1997, unless the deadline for the determination is extended.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the Government of Chile. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of each petition to each exporter named in the petition, as appropriate.

International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation of this investigation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by July 28, 1997, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of fresh Atlantic salmon from Chile are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in termination of the investigation; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Dated: July 2, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-18112 Filed 7-9-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review: Stainless Steel Bar from India.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Yeske or Zak Smith, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0189 or 482-1279, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to those published in the Code of Federal Regulations, April 1997, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**Background**

On March 7, 1997, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from India (61 FR 54774). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise for the period August 4, 1994 through January 31, 1996. The manufacturer/exporter is Isibars Limited ("Isibars" or "respondent"). The Department gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have found no basis to modify our preliminary results. Therefore, we have adopted the preliminary results of this review as the final results.

On May 1 and May 28, 1997, Isibars submitted untimely arguments and new factual information. We rejected these submissions on May 1, 1997, and June 4, 1997, respectively. On May 20, 1997, and June 9, 1997, respondent filed its objection to the Department's rejection of its submissions.

Scope of the Review

For purposes of this administrative review, the term "stainless steel bar" means articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot-rolled, forged, turned, cold-drawn, cold-rolled or otherwise cold-finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross

section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. Stainless steel bar includes cold-finished stainless steel bars that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

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

The stainless steel bar subject to this administrative review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.11.0005, 7222.11.0050, 7222.19.0005, 7222.19.0050, 7222.20.0005, 7222.20.0045, 7222.20.0075, and 7222.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Interested Party Comments

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment. We received written comments from petitioners (Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division, Crucible Materials Corp., Electralloy Corp., Republic Engineered Steels, Slater Steels Corp., Talley Metals Technology, Inc. and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC)) and the respondent.

Comment 1: Petitioners claim the Department used the wrong date of sale for the reported U.S. sales. They believe the material terms of sale changed significantly enough to warrant using the invoice date, instead of the purchase order date, as the date of sale. Petitioners allege that because the quantity shipped was different than the quantity ordered, the terms of sale changed and thus the invoice date should be viewed as the date of sale. According to petitioners, this change in quantity falls outside the delivery

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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