

performed in connection with these preliminary results within five days after the date of the public announcement of this notice. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309, interested parties may submit written comments in response to these preliminary results. Unless otherwise indicated by the Department, case briefs must be submitted within 30 days after the publication of these preliminary results. Rebuttal briefs, which are limited to arguments raised in case briefs, must be submitted no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs, unless otherwise specified by the Department. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties submitting case and/or rebuttal briefs are requested to provide the Department copies of the public version on disk. Case and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f). Also, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310, within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, interested parties may request a public hearing on arguments to be raised in the case and rebuttal briefs. Unless the Secretary specifies otherwise, the hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the date for submission of rebuttal briefs.

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii), are due. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

This administrative review is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 U.S.C. 1677f(i)(1)).

Dated: September 2, 2003.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-22943 Filed 9-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-489-807]

Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Final Results, Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part, and Determination Not To Revoke in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On May 6, 2003, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel concrete reinforcing bars from Turkey (68 FR 23972). This review covers five manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review is April 1, 2001, through March 31, 2002. We are rescinding the review with respect to Diler Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S./Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S./Diler Dis Ticaret A.S. and Ekinciler Demir Celik A.S. because these companies had no entries of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. Finally, we have determined not to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi, A.S.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 9, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irina Iltkin or Elizabeth Eastwood, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482-0656 and (202) 482-3874, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This review covers the following five manufacturers/exporters: Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. and Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (collectively "Colakoglu"); Diler Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S., Yazici Demir Celik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S., and

Diler Dis Ticaret A.S. (collectively "Diler"); Ekinciler Demir Celik A.S. (Ekinciler); Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas); and ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi, A.S. (ICDAS).

On May 6, 2003, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel concrete reinforcing bars (rebar) from Turkey. *See Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not to Revoke in Part*, 68 FR 23972 (May 6, 2003) (*Preliminary Results*). Also in May 2003, at our request we received supplemental cost information from Colakoglu.

On May 13, 2002, Diler and Ekinciler informed the Department that they had no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR). We reviewed data from the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (BCBP) and confirmed that there were no entries of subject merchandise from either company. Consequently, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are rescinding our review for Diler and Ekinciler. For further discussion, see the "Partial Rescission of Review" section of this notice, below.

We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. In June 2003, we received case briefs from the petitioners (Gerdau AmeriSteel Corporation, Commercial Metals Company (SMI Steel Group), and Nucor Corporation) and ICDAS, and rebuttal briefs from the petitioners, Colakoglu, and ICDAS.

The Department held a hearing on July 16, 2002, at the request of ICDAS.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar. Deformed rebar is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7213.10.000 and 7214.20.000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written

description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Period of Review

The POR is April 1, 2001, through March 31, 2002.

Partial Rescission of Review

As noted above, Diler and Ekinciler notified the Department that they had no shipments and/or entries of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. We have confirmed this with the BCBP. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with the Department's practice, we are rescinding our review with respect to Diler and Ekinciler. (*See, e.g., Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 67 FR 66110, 66111 (Oct. 30, 2002).)

Cost of Production

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results*, we conducted an investigation to determine whether the respondents participating in the review made home market sales of the foreign like product during the POR at prices below their costs of production (COPs) within the meaning of section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act). We

performed the cost test for these final results following the same methodology as in the *Preliminary Results*, except as discussed in the accompanying "Issues and Decision Memorandum" (Decision Memo) from Jeffrey A. May, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Import Administration, to James J. Jochum, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated September 3, 2003.

We found 20 percent or more of each respondent's sales of a given product during the reporting period were at prices less than the weighted-average COP for this period. Thus, we determined that these below-cost sales were made in "substantial quantities" within an extended period of time and at prices which did not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. *See* sections 773(b)(2)(B), (C), and (D) of the Act.

Therefore, for purposes of these final results, we found that Colakoglu, Habas, and ICDAS made below-cost sales not in the ordinary course of trade. Consequently, we disregarded these sales for each respondent and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review and to which we have responded are listed in the Appendix to this notice and addressed in the Decision Memorandum, which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099, of the main Department building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. These changes are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margin percentages exist for the period April 1, 2001, through March 31, 2002:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percentage
Colakoglu Metalurji A.S	1.62
HABAS Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S	2.42
ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi, A.S.	0.10

The Department will determine, and the BCBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), for Habas and ICDAS, for those sales with a reported entered value, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those sales.

Regarding all of Colakoglu's sales and certain of ICDAS's sales, for assessment purposes, we do not have the information to calculate entered value because these companies were not the importers of record for the subject merchandise. Accordingly, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates for the merchandise in question by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of those sales. To determine whether the duty assessment rates were *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR

351.106(c)(2), we calculated importer-specific ad valorem ratios based on the export prices. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.50 percent). The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the BCBP within 15 days of publication of these final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of rebar from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: 1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates indicated above; 2) for previously 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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 16.06 percent, the all others rate established in 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 also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). 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.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: September 3, 2003.

James J. Jochum,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—Issues in Decision Memo

Comments

1. Interest Rate Used to Calculate Home Market Credit
2. Exchange Rates Used for Currency Conversions
3. Errors Discovered at Verification
4. Habas's U.S. Short-term Interest Rate
5. Revocation for ICDAS
6. Level of Trade (LOT) for ICDAS
7. Short-length Rebar Sales for ICDAS
8. Calculation of ICDAS's Home Market Indirect Selling Expense Ratio
9. Home Market Indirect Selling Expenses of ICDAS's Affiliated Parties
10. Credit Expenses Reported by ICDAS's Affiliated Parties
11. Start-up Adjustment for ICDAS
12. Amortization Rate Applied to the Start-Up Adjustment
13. Cost of Sales
14. General and Administrative (G&A) Expenses
15. Foreign Exchange Gains and Losses

[FR Doc. 03-22945 Filed 9-8-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-841]

Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Structural Steel Beams From the Republic of Korea

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

ACTION: Notice of the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the Committee for Fair Beam Imports, Nucor Corp., Nucor-Yamato Steel Co., TXI-Chaparral Steel Co., ("Petitioners"), INI Steel Company ("INI"), and Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd. ("DSM"), the Department of Commerce ("Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on structural steel beams ("SSB") from the Republic of Korea. This review covers INI and DSM, manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review ("POR") is August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002.

We preliminarily determined that INI has sold subject merchandise at less than normal value ("NV") during the POR. However, we preliminarily determine that DSM has not sold subject merchandise at less than NV. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection ("Customs") to assess antidumping duties on entries of INI's merchandise during the POR for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*, in accordance with the Department's regulations (19 CFR 351.106 and 351.212(b)). The preliminary results are listed below in the section titled "Preliminary Results of Review."

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this segment of the proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 9, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Aishe Allen (DSM) or Michael Holton (INI), Enforcement Group III—Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0172 and (202) 482-1324, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 18, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on structural steel beams from the Republic of Korea. *See Notice Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Structural Steel Beams from South Korea*, 65 FR 50501 (August 18, 2000). On August 6, 2002, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice for antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended

investigation; opportunity to request administrative review on structural steel beams from the Republic of Korea covering the period August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 67 FR 50856 (August 6, 2002).

On August 30, 2002, respondent DSM, a Korean producer of subject merchandise, requested a review of its sales of subject merchandise during the POR in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1). On August 30, 2002, petitioners and INI, in separate requests, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of INI for the period of August 1, 2001 to July 31, 2002. On September 25, 2002, the Department published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review for the period of August 1, 2001 through July 31, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part and Deferral of Administrative Reviews* 67 FR 60210 (September 25, 2002).

DSM

On September 30, 2002, the Department issued a questionnaire to DSM. DSM submitted its Section A questionnaire response on November 4, 2002. On November 13, 2002, DSM submitted its Sections B and C questionnaire responses.

On November 14, 2002, Petitioners submitted comments regarding sales below cost of production for DSM and requested that DSM respond to section D of the Department's September 30, 2002 questionnaire. On November 18, 2002, the Department informed petitioners that it would need to file a sales below cost allegation for the Department to consider whether DSM sold below its cost of production during the POR. On December 6, 2002, petitioners submitted an allegation that the home market sales submitted by DSM in its November 13, 2002, section B response were below its cost of production.

On December 20, 2002, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire covering DSM's November 4, 2002 section A response. On January 13, 2003, DSM submitted its section A supplemental response to the Department's December 20, 2002 supplemental questionnaire.

On January 21, 2003, the Department initiated a sales below cost of production inquiry, and on January 22, 2003, requested DSM to respond to section D of the questionnaire.