

Third Quarter, 2000, and adjusted the amount for inflation. As the basis for valuing argon, nitrogen, and oxygen, we have relied on 1999 data from *UN Trade Commodity Statistics (UNTCS)*, United Nations. We also valued bentonite and coal tar using the data from the UNTCS.

Furthermore, we used a website (www.indiaonline.com) providing market prices for natural gas in 2000 to calculate a percentage of Maanshan-produced gas to natural gas and derive a surrogate value for gas. We valued water based on data from the Asian Development Bank's *Second Water Utilities Data Book: Asian and Pacific Region* (published in 1997).

Maanshan purchased iron ore from market-economy suppliers during the POI, one of which was an affiliate. We compared the price paid to the affiliated supplier with the prices paid to the unaffiliated market-economy suppliers and found that the price from the affiliated supplier was within the same range as those from the unaffiliated market-economy suppliers. Therefore, we used the weighted-average price reported by Maanshan.

The only input Maanshan reported for packing was steel strap. We used Indian Import Statistics data for the POI to value this input.

To value truck rates, we used freight costs based on price quotes obtained by the Department in November 1999 from trucking companies in India. For rail transportation, we valued rail rates using information published by the Indian Railway Conference Association in June 1998, as adjusted for inflation.

To value marine insurance and brokerage and handling we used a publicly summarized version of the average value for marine insurance expenses and brokerage and handling expenses reported in *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative and New Shipper Reviews*, 64 FR 856 (January 6, 1999).

To value factory overhead, and selling, general and administrative expenses and profit, we used rates based on financial information from an Indian integrated steel producer, Tata, a producer of subject merchandise whose March 2000 financial statement was provided by the petitioners in an October 9, 2001, submission.

For labor, consistent with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3), we used the PRC regression-based wage rate at the Import Administration's home page, Import Library, Expected Wages of Selected NME Countries, revised in May 2000 ([see http://ia.ita.doc.gov/wages](http://ia.ita.doc.gov/wages)). The source of the wage rate data on the Import Administration's web site is the

1999 Year Book of Labour Statistics, International Labor Organization (Geneva: 1999), Chapter 5B: Wages in Manufacturing.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(1) of the Act, we intend to verify all company information relied upon in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the EP, as indicated below. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacturer	Weighted-average percentage margin
Maanshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.	159.60
China-Wide	117.21

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs for this investigation must be submitted to the Department no later than seven days after the date of the final verification report issued in this proceeding. Rebuttal briefs must be filed five days from the deadline date for case briefs. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. This summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, any hearing will be held two days after the rebuttal brief deadline date at the U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a time and location to be determined. Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs.

We will make our final determination no later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 19, 2001.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-31981 Filed 12-27-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-583-838]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Structural Steel Beams From Taiwan

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that structural steel beams from Taiwan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Interested parties are invited to comment on this preliminary determination. Since we are postponing the final determination, we will make our final determination not later than 135 days after the date of publication of this preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 28, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Rebecca Trainor or Kate Johnson, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4007 or (202) 482-4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**The Applicable Statute**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce ("Department's") regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (April 2001).

Background

Since the initiation of this investigation (*Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Structural Steel Beams From the People's Republic of China, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Russia, South Africa, Spain, and Taiwan*, 66 FR 33048 (June 20, 2001)) (*Initiation Notice*), the following events have occurred.

On July 9, 2001, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that imports of structural steel beams from Taiwan are materially injuring the United States industry (*see* ITC Investigation Nos. 731-TA-935-942 (Publication No. 3438)).

On July 26, 2001, we selected the two largest producers/exporters of structural steel beams from Taiwan as the mandatory respondents in this proceeding. For further discussion, see Memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach, Senior Director Office 1, from The Team Re: Respondent Selection. We subsequently issued the antidumping questionnaire to Kuei Yi Industrial Co., Ltd. ("Kuei Yi") and Tung Ho Steel Enterprise Corp. ("Tung Ho") on July 26, 2001.

During the period August through November 2001, the Department received responses to sections A, B, C and D of the Department's original and supplemental questionnaires from Kuei Yi and Tung Ho.

On September 25, 2001, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e), the petitioners made a timely request to postpone the preliminary determination. We granted this request on October 2, 2001, and postponed the preliminary determination until no later than

November 30, 2001. (*See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Structural Steel Beams from the People's Republic of China, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Russia, South Africa, Spain and Taiwan*, 66 FR 51639 (October 10, 2001)). On October 30, 2001, the petitioners made another timely request to postpone the preliminary determination for an additional 19 days. We granted this request on October 31, 2001, and postponed the preliminary determination until no later than December 19, 2001. (*See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determinations: Structural Steel Beams from the People's Republic of China, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Russia, South Africa, Spain and Taiwan*, 66 FR 56078 (November 6, 2001)).

Postponement of Final Determination and Extension of Provisional Measures

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2) of the Act, on November 30 and December 7, 2001, Tung Ho and Kuei Yi, respectively, requested that, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone its final determination until not later than 135 days after the date of the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**, and extend the provisional measures to not more than six months. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.210(b), because (1) our preliminary determination is affirmative, (2) Kuei Yi and Tung Ho account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, and (3) no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are granting the respondents' request and are postponing the final determination until no later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

Scope of Investigation

The scope of these investigations covers doubly-symmetric shapes, whether hot- or cold-rolled, drawn, extruded, formed or finished, having at least one dimension of at least 80 mm (3.2 inches or more), whether of carbon or alloy (other than stainless) steel, and whether or not drilled, punched, notched, painted, coated, or clad. These structural steel beams include, but are not limited to, wide-flange beams ("W" shapes), bearing piles ("HP" shapes), standard beams ("S" or "I" shapes), and M-shapes. All the products that meet the physical and metallurgical descriptions provided above are within

the scope of these investigations unless otherwise excluded. The following products are outside and/or specifically excluded from the scope of these investigations: (1) Structural steel beams greater than 400 pounds per linear foot, (2) structural steel beams that have a web or section height (also known as depth) over 40 inches, and (3) structural steel beams that have additional weldments, connectors or attachments to I-sections, H-sections, or pilings; however, if the only additional weldment, connector or attachment on the beam is a shipping brace attached to maintain stability during transportation, the beam is not removed from the scope definition by reason of such additional weldment, connector or attachment.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") at subheadings 7216.32.0000, 7216.33.0030, 7216.33.0060, 7216.33.0090, 7216.50.0000, 7216.61.0000, 7216.69.0000, 7216.91.0000, 7216.99.0000, 7228.70.3040, and 7228.70.6000. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

Scope Comments

In accordance with the preamble to our regulations (*see Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we set aside a period of time for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage and encouraged all parties to submit comments within 20 calendar days of publication of the *Initiation Notice* (*see* 66 FR 33048-33049). Interested parties submitted such comments by July 10, 2001. Additional comments were subsequently submitted by interested parties.

Pursuant to the Department's solicitation of scope comments in the *Initiation Notice*, interested parties in this and the concurrent structural steel beams investigations request that the following products be excluded from the scope of the investigations: (1) Beams of grade A913/65 and (2) forklift mast profiles.

With respect to the scope-exclusion requests for the A913/65 beam and forklift mast profiles, the interested parties rely upon 19 CFR 351.225(k)(2) and reason that, in general, these products differ from the structural steel beams covered by the scope of the investigations in terms of physical characteristics, ultimate uses, purchaser expectations, channels of trade, manner

of advertising and display and/or price. They also argue that these products are not produced by the petitioners.

In considering whether these products should be included within the scope of the investigations, we analyzed the arguments submitted by all of the interested parties in the context of the criteria enumerated in the court decision *Diversified Products Corp. v. United States*, 572 F. Supp. 883, 889 (CIT 1983) (“*Diversified*”). For these analyses, we relied upon the petition, the submissions by all interested parties, the International Trade Commission’s (“ITC”) preliminary determination, and other information.

After considering the respondent’s comments and the petitioners’ objections to the exclusion requests regarding the A913/65 beam, we find that the description of this grade of structural steel beam is dispositive such that further consideration of the criteria provided in their submissions is unnecessary. Furthermore, the description of the merchandise contained in the relevant submissions pertaining to this grade of beam does not preclude this product from being within the scope of the investigations. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine that the A913/65 beam does not constitute a separate class or kind of merchandise and, therefore, falls within the scope as defined in the petition.

With respect to forklift mast profiles, having considered the comments we received from the interested parties and the criteria enumerated in *Diversified*, we find that the profiles in question, being doubly-symmetric and having an I-shape, fall within the scope of the investigations. These profiles also meet the other criteria included in the scope language contained in the petition. While the description by the interested party requesting the exclusion indicates some differences, such as in price, between forklift mast profiles and structural steel beams, these differences are not sufficient to recognize forklift mast profiles as a separate class or kind of merchandise. However, given these differences between forklift mast profiles and structural steel beams, we preliminarily determine that forklift mast profiles should be separately identified for model-matching purposes.

We also received a scope-exclusion request by an interested party for fabricated steel beams. This request was subsequently withdrawn pursuant to an agreement with the petitioners to clarify the scope language by adding that “* * * beams that have additional weldments, connectors or attachments to I-sections, H-sections, or pilings are outside the scope definition.” However,

“* * * if the only additional weldment, connector or attachment on the beam is a shipping brace attached to maintain stability during transportation, the beam is not removed from the scope definition by reason of such additional weldment, connector or attachment.” Accordingly, we modified the scope definition to account for this clarification. See the “Scope” section above.

We have addressed these scope-exclusion requests in detail in a Memorandum to Louis Apple and Laurie Parkhill, Directors, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Offices 2 and 3, respectively, from The Structural Steel Beams Teams Re: Scope Exclusion Requests, dated December 19, 2001.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (“POI”) is April 1, 2000, through March 31, 2001.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of structural steel beams from Taiwan to the United States were made at less than fair value (“LTFV”), we compared the export price (“EP”) to the normal value (“NV”), as described in the “Export Price” and “Normal Value” sections of this notice, below. In accordance with section 777A(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, we compared POI weighted-average EPs to weighted-average NVs.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced and sold by the respondents in the home market during the POI that fit the description in the “Scope of Investigation” section of this notice to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We compared U.S. sales to sales made in the home market, 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 sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade. In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by the respondents in the following order of importance: form; shape/size (section depth); strength/grade; and coating. We also excluded from our comparisons home market sales of structural steel beams manufactured by other producers in accordance with 771(16) of the Act.

With respect to home market sales of non-prime merchandise made by Tung Ho during the POI, in accordance with

our past practice, we excluded these sales from our preliminary analysis based on the limited quantity of such sales in the home market and the fact that no such sales were made to the United States during the POI. (See, e.g., *Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Korea*, 58 FR 37176, 37180 (July 9, 1993).)

Export Price

In accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, we calculated EP for those sales where the merchandise was sold to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation by the exporter or producer outside the United States, or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States, based on the facts of record. In this case, all sales to the U.S. were EP sales.

For both respondents, we based EP on the packed FOB price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act; these included, where appropriate, foreign inland freight expenses (freight from the plant to the port of exportation) and foreign brokerage and handling.

Normal Value

A. Home Market Viability

In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (i.e., the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared Kuei Yi’s and Tung Ho’s volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Because both respondents’ aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of their aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable for Kuei Yi and Tung Ho.

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

The Department’s standard practice with respect to the use of home market sales to affiliated parties for NV is to determine whether such sales are at arm’s-length prices. Therefore, in accordance with that practice, we

performed an arm's-length test on Kuei Yi's and Tung Ho's sales to affiliates as follows.

Sales to affiliated customers in the home market not made at arm's-length prices (if any) were excluded from our analysis because we considered them to be outside the ordinary course of trade. See 19 CFR 351.102. To test whether these sales were made at arm's-length prices, we compared, on a model-specific basis, the starting prices of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers net of all movement charges, direct selling expenses, and packing expenses. Where, for the tested models of subject merchandise, prices to the affiliated party were on average 99.5 percent or more of the price to the unaffiliated parties, we determined that sales made to the affiliated party were at arm's length. See 19 CFR 351.403(c). In instances where no price ratio could be constructed for an affiliated customer because identical merchandise was not sold to unaffiliated customers, we were unable to determine that these sales were made at arm's-length prices and, therefore, excluded them from our LTFV analysis. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina*, 58 FR 37062, 37077 (July 9, 1993).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.403(d), where Kuei Yi's sales to its affiliates failed the arm's-length test, we used the sales made by the affiliates to unaffiliated customers in our analysis. For further discussion, see the Preliminary Determination Calculation Memorandum dated December 19, 2001 (*Calculation Memo*).

C. Cost of Production Analysis

Based on our analysis of an allegation contained in the petition, we found that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of structural steel beams in the home market were made at prices below their cost of production ("COP"). Accordingly, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, we initiated a country-wide sales-below-cost investigation to determine whether sales were made at prices below their respective COP (see *Initiation Notice*, 66 FR at 33048, 33051).

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated COP for each respondent based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus an amount for general and administrative expenses ("G&A"), interest expenses, and home market packing costs (see "Test of Home Market Sales Prices" section below for

treatment of home market selling expenses). We relied on the COP data submitted by Kuei Yi and Tung Ho, except as noted below.

We revised Kuei Yi's interest expense ratio to include interest expenses associated with loans covering asset losses incurred during the POI. See *Calculation Memo* for further details of these calculations.

2. Test of Home Market Sales Prices

On a product-specific basis, we compared the adjusted weighted-average COP to the home market sales of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether the sale prices were below the COP. The prices were exclusive of any applicable movement charges, rebates, discounts, and direct and indirect selling expenses. In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices less than their COP, we examined, in accordance with sections 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act, whether such sales were made (1) within an extended period of time, in substantial quantities, and (2) at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

3. Results of the COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C), where less than 20 percent of the respondent's sales of a given product during the POI are at prices less than the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales of that product, because we determine that in such instances 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 POI are at prices less than the COP, we determine that in such instances the below-cost sales represent "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(A) of the Act. In such cases, we also determine whether the below-cost sales were made at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(1)(B) of the Act.

We found that, for certain specific products, more than 20 percent of Kuei Yi's and Tung Ho's home market sales were at prices less than the COP and, in addition, such sales did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. We therefore excluded these sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

E. Level of Trade

Section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act states that, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade ("LOT") as the EP or constructed export price ("CEP"). Sales are made at different LOTs if they are made at different marketing stages (or their equivalent). See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2). Substantial differences in selling activities are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for determining that there is a difference in the stages of marketing. *Id.*; see also *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732 (November 19, 1997). In order to determine whether the comparison sales were at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales, we reviewed the distribution system in each market (*i.e.*, the "chain of distribution"),¹ including selling functions², class of customer ("customer category"), and the level of selling expenses for each type of sale.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, in identifying levels of trade for EP and comparison market sales (*i.e.*, NV based on either home market or third country prices³), 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*, Court Nos. 00-1058, -1060 (Fed. Cir. March 7, 2001).

When the Department is unable to find sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP or CEP, the Department may compare the U.S. sale to sales at a different LOT in the comparison market. In comparing EP or CEP sales at a different LOT in the comparison market, where available data make it

¹ The marketing process in the United States and comparison markets begins with the producer and extends to the sale to the final user or consumer. The chain of distribution between the two may have many or few links, and the respondents' sales occur somewhere along this chain. In performing this evaluation, we considered the narrative responses of each respondent to properly determine where in the chain of distribution the sale appears to occur.

² Selling functions associated with a particular chain of distribution help us to evaluate the level(s) of trade in a particular market. For purposes of this preliminary determination, we have organized the common structural steel beams selling functions into four major categories: sales process and marketing support, freight and delivery, inventory and warehousing, and quality assurance/warranty services.

³ Where NV is based on CV, we determine the NV LOT based on the LOT of the sales from which we derive selling expenses, G&A and profit for CV, where possible.

practicable, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales only, if a NV LOT is more remote from the factory than the CEP LOT and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in LOTs between NV and CEP affected price comparability (*i.e.* no LOT adjustment was practicable), the Department shall grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

We obtained information from Kuei Yi and Tung Ho regarding the marketing stages involved in making the reported home market and U.S. sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by Kuei Yi and Tung Ho for each channel of distribution. Company-specific LOT findings are summarized below.

Kuei Yi

Kuei Yi reported sales in the home market through two channels of distribution: (1) Fabricators and end-users and (2) stockists. We examined the chain of distribution and the selling activities associated with home market sales through these channels of distribution, and determined that there was little difference in the relevant selling functions provided by Kuei Yi. Specifically, Kuei Yi does not provide inventory maintenance, advertising, or sales support for any of its home market customers. Kuei Yi does incur a high degree of sales activity related to transportation and warranty. Kuei Yi did not indicate that there are any differences with respect to freight and delivery between these channels of distribution or customer categories. Similarly, the sales warranty support provided by Kuei Yi does not vary by channel of distribution or customer category. Based on our overall analysis, we found that the channels of distribution did not differ significantly from each other with respect to selling activities and, therefore, constituted one LOT.

In the U.S. market, Kuei Yi made only EP sales through one channel of distribution: sales to traders shipped directly to the United States. Kuei Yi incurs freight costs in delivering the product to the port as well as brokerage and handling charges. Kuei Yi also provides warranty services in the U.S. market. Similar to the home market LOT, Kuei Yi does not provide inventory maintenance, advertising, or sales support in selling to its U.S.

customers. Accordingly, there is only one LOT for U.S. sales.

We compared the EP LOT to the home market LOT and concluded that the selling functions performed for home market customers in this home market LOT are sufficiently similar to those performed for U.S. customers because the same services are offered in both markets. Accordingly, we consider the EP and home market LOTs to be the same. Consequently, we are comparing EP sales to sales at the same LOT in the home market.

Tung Ho

Tung Ho reported sales in the home market through two channels of distribution: (1) Unaffiliated distributors and (2) affiliated and unaffiliated end-users. Tung Ho sold the subject merchandise both out of inventory and on a made-to-order basis to both distributors and end-users. We examined the chain of distribution and the selling activities associated with home market sales through these channels of distribution, and determined that there was little difference in the relevant selling functions provided by Tung Ho. Specifically, Tung Ho provided rebates and warranties to distributors, but not to end-users. Tung Ho did not indicate that there are any differences with respect to freight and delivery or inventory maintenance services between these channels of distribution or customer categories. As we do not consider the existence of rebates and warranties on sales to distributors sufficient to warrant finding a separate channel of distribution for sales to distributors, we find that the home market channels of distribution do not differ significantly from each other with respect to selling activities and, therefore, constitute one LOT.

In the U.S. market, Tung Ho made only EP sales through one channel of distribution: sales to distributors shipped directly to the United States. Tung Ho incurs freight costs in delivering the product to the port as well as brokerage and handling charges. Tung Ho provided no rebates or warranty services in the U.S. market, nor did it provide inventory maintenance, advertising, or sales support in selling to its U.S. customers. Accordingly, there is only one LOT for U.S. sales.

We compared the EP LOT to the home market LOT and concluded that the selling functions performed for home market customers are sufficiently similar to those performed for U.S. customers to warrant considering them the same LOT. Consequently, we are

comparing EP sales to sales at the same LOT in the home market.

F. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

Kuei Yi

We calculated NV based on delivered or ex-works prices to unaffiliated customers or prices to affiliated customers that we determined to be at arm's-length. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for rebates. We also made deductions for movement expenses, including inland freight, under section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, we made adjustments under section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses and warranties.

Tung Ho

We calculated NV based on delivered or ex-factory prices to unaffiliated customers or prices to affiliated customers that we determined to be at arm's-length. We added to the starting price interest revenue, where appropriate. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for billing adjustments and rebates. We also made deductions for inland freight, under section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In addition, we made adjustments under section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for differences in circumstances of sale for imputed credit expenses, bank charges, and warranties. For those sales for which Tung Ho did not report a date of payment, we have used the signature date of the preliminary determination (*i.e.*, December 19, 2001) in the calculation of imputed credit expenses.

Furthermore, for both respondents we made adjustments for differences in costs attributable to differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We also deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act.

Currency Conversion

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

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information relied upon in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(2) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the EP, as indicated in the chart below. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/manufacture	Weighted-average margin percentage
Kuei Yi Industrial Co., Ltd. ...	18.01
Tung Ho Steel Enterprise Corporation	4.70
All Others	13.95

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Disclosure

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties in this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b).

Public Comment

Case briefs for this investigation must be submitted to the Department no later than seven days after the date of the final verification report issued in this proceeding. Rebuttal briefs must be filed five days from the deadline date for case briefs. A list of authorities used, 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. Section 774 of the Act provides that the Department will hold a public hearing to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs, provided that such a hearing is requested by an interested party. If a request for a hearing is made in this investigation, the hearing will tentatively be held two days after the rebuttal brief deadline date at the U.S.

Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs.

We will make our final determination no later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

This determination is published pursuant to sections 733(f) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: December 19, 2001.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-31986 Filed 12-27-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-469-811]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Structural Steel Beams From Spain

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that structural steel beams from Spain are not being, nor are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Interested parties are invited to comment on this preliminary determination. Since we are postponing the final determination, we will make our final determination not later than 135 days after the date of publication of this preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 28, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Gehr or Mike Strollo, Import

Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1779 or (202) 482-0629, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce ("Department's") regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (April 2001).

Background

Since the initiation of this investigation (*Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Structural Steel Beams From the People's Republic of China, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Russia, South Africa, Spain, and Taiwan*, 66 FR 33048 (June 20, 2001)) ("Initiation Notice"), the following events have occurred.

On July 9, 2001, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that imports of structural steel beams from Spain are materially injuring the United States industry (*see* ITC Investigation Nos. 731-TA-935-942 (Publication No. 3438)).

On July 18, 2001, we selected the largest producer/exporter of structural steel beams from Spain as the mandatory respondent in this proceeding. For further discussion, see Memorandum to Lou Apple, Director, Office 2, from The Team Re: Respondent Selection dated July 18, 2001. We subsequently issued the antidumping questionnaire to Aceralia Corporacion Siderurgica, S.A. (Aceralia) on July 18, 2001.

During the period August through November 2001, the Department received responses to sections A, B, C and D of the Department's original and supplemental questionnaires from Aceralia. On December 18, 2001, we issued an additional supplemental questionnaire to the respondent.

On September 25, 2001, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e), the petitioners made a timely request to postpone the preliminary determination. We granted this request on October 2, 2001, and postponed the preliminary determination until no later than November 30, 2001. (*See Notice of Postponement of Preliminary*