

4% per plane  
 Mechanical Properties: Tensile strength:  
 1200–1700 N/mm<sup>2</sup>, (Standard 1280 +/-  
 – 80 N/mm<sup>2</sup>)  
 Surface Finish: Gray hardened condition. Ra/  
 CLA—max. 0.25 m. Cut off 0.25 mm  
 Rmax—max. 2.5 m  
 Edge Condition: Slit edges free from cracks  
 and damages

Dimensions:  
 Thickness: 0.4–1.40 mm<sub>2</sub>, Tolerance: T1  
 Width: 250–1200 mm, Tolerance: B1  
 Flatness: Unflatness Across Strip: max. 0.4%  
 of the nominal strip width  
 Coil Size: Inside Diameter: 600 mm  
 Coil Weight: max. 6.5 kg/mm strip width  
 • *Certain valve steel (type 2)*, with the  
 following specifications: Hardened tempered

high-carbon strip, characterized by high  
 fatigues strength and wear resistance,  
 hardness combined with ductility, surface  
 and end-finishes, and good blanking and  
 forming properties.  
 HTSUS item number: 7211.90.00.00  
 Typical size ranges:  
 Thickness: 0.15–1.0 mm  
 Width: 10.0–140 mm

#### CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

Element .....	C	Si	Mn	P	S	Ni	Cr
Weight % .....	0.7–0.8	0.2–0.35	0.3–0.45	Max. 0.020	Max. 0.016	1.9–2.1	

The merchandise subject to this Agreement is typically classified in the HTSUS at item numbers: 7209.15.0000, 7209.16.0030, 7209.16.0060, 7209.16.0090, 7209.17.0030, 7209.17.0060, 7209.17.0090, 7209.18.1530, 7209.18.1560, 7209.18.2550, 7209.18.6000, 7209.25.0000, 7209.26.0000, 7209.27.0000, 7209.28.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.23.1500, 7211.23.2000, 7211.23.3000, 7211.23.4500, 7211.23.6030, 7211.23.6060, 7211.23.6085, 7211.29.2030, 7211.29.2090, 7211.29.4500, 7211.29.6030, 7211.29.6080, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7225.19.0000, 7225.50.6000, 7225.50.7000, 7225.50.8010, 7225.50.8085, 7225.99.0090, 7226.19.1000, 7226.19.9000, 7226.92.5000, 7226.92.7050, 7226.92.8050, and 7226.99.0000.

Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under Agreement is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 02–24925 Filed 9–30–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–428–836, A–588–861, A–570–879, A–580–850, A–559–807]

### Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Polyvinyl Alcohol From Germany, Japan, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Singapore

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

**ACTION:** Initiation of antidumping duty investigations.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 1, 2002.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Goldberger (Singapore, Republic of Korea) at (202) 482–4136, and Michael Strollo (Germany, Japan, the People's Republic of China) at (202) 482–0629, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

### Initiation of Investigations

#### *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 of Commerce’s (“the Department’s”) regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2002).

#### *The Petitions*

On September 5, 2002, the Department received petitions filed in proper form by Celanese Chemicals Ltd. and E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co. (collectively, “the petitioners”). The Department received supplemental information to the petitions from September 16 through 20, 2002.

In accordance with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the petitioners allege that imports of polyvinyl alcohol (“PVA”) from Germany, Japan, the People's Republic of China (“the PRC”), the Republic of Korea (“Korea”), and Singapore are, 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 imports from Germany, Japan, Korea and the PRC, are materially injuring, or are threatening to materially injure an industry in the United States.<sup>1</sup>

The Department finds that the petitioners filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in sections 771(9)(C) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations that they are requesting the Department to initiate. *See infra*, “Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions.”

<sup>1</sup> We note that the petitioners have only alleged that imports from Singapore are threatening to materially injure an industry in the United States.

### *Scope of Investigations*

The merchandise covered by these investigations is polyvinyl alcohol. This product consists of all polyvinyl alcohol hydrolyzed in excess of 80 percent, whether or not mixed or diluted with commercial levels of defoamer or boric acid. Polyvinyl alcohol in fiber form is not included in the scope of these investigations. The merchandise under investigation is currently classifiable under subheading 3905.30.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments within 20 calendar days of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations.

#### *Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions*

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that the Department's industry support determination, which is to be made before the initiation of the investigation, be based on whether a minimum percentage of the relevant industry supports the petition. A petition meets this requirement 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. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall either poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission ("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. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a 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 like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to the law.<sup>2</sup>

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation," *i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition.

We reviewed the description of the domestic like product presented in the petitions. Based upon our review of the petitioners' claims, we concur that there is a single domestic like product, which is defined in the "Scope of

Investigations" section above. This is consistent with the Department's determinations in past investigations to treat all PVA products as a single class or kind of merchandise. *See, e.g., Notice of Antidumping Orders: Polyvinyl Alcohol From Japan, the People's Republic of China, and Taiwan*, 61 FR 24286 (May 14, 1996).

Finally, the Department has determined that, pursuant to section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, the petitions contain adequate evidence of industry support and, therefore, polling is unnecessary. *See* the Import Administration Antidumping Investigations Initiation Checklist, Industry Support section, September 25, 2002 (the "Initiation Checklist"), on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building.

For all countries, we determined that the petitioners have demonstrated industry support representing over 50 percent of total production of the domestic like product. Therefore, the domestic producers or workers who support the petitions account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act are met. Furthermore, because the Department received no opposition to the petitions, the domestic producers or workers who support the petitions account for 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 petitions. Thus, the requirements of section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) are also met. Accordingly, we determine that these petitions are filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

#### *Initiation Standard for Cost Investigations*

Pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, the petitioners provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales in the home markets of Germany, Japan, Korea, and Singapore were made at prices below the cost of production ("COP") and, accordingly, requested that the Department conduct country-wide sales-below-COP investigations in connection with these investigations. The Statement of Administrative Action ("SAA"), submitted to the Congress in connection with the interpretation and application of the URAA, states that an allegation of sales below COP need not be specific to individual exporters or producers. SAA, H.R. Doc. No. 103-316 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 section 773(b)(2)(A) of the Act retains the requirement that the Department 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.* We have analyzed the country-specific allegations as described below.

#### *Export Price and Normal Value*

The following are descriptions of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate these investigations. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. and home market prices, constructed value ("CV"), and factors of production are discussed in greater detail in the Initiation Checklist. Should the need arise to use any of this information as facts available under section 776 of the Act in our preliminary or final determinations, we may re-examine the information and revise the margin calculations, if appropriate.

Regarding the information involving non-market economies ("NME"), the Department presumes, based on the extent of central government control in an NME, that a single dumping margin, should there be one, is appropriate for all NME exporters in the given country. In the course of these investigations, all parties will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issues of a country's NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters. *See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994).

#### *Germany*

##### *Export Price*

The petitioners based export price ("EP") on price quotes within the POI for the sale of delivered PVA produced by Kuraray Europe from a U.S. distributor to a customer in the United States. The petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by deducting a distributor mark-up, international freight, brokerage and handling, and insurance expenses,

<sup>2</sup> *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 from Japan: Final Determination; Rescission of Investigation and Partial Dismissal of Petition*, 56 FR 32376, 32380-81 (July 16, 1991).

U.S. customs duties, U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer, and U.S. credit expenses. We adjusted the petitioners' EP calculation by not deducting an amount for imputed U.S. credit expenses; instead, we made an adjustment to normal value ("NV"), in accordance with the Department's EP circumstance-of-sale calculation methodology.

#### *Normal Value*

With respect to NV, the petitioners provided home market price quotes within the POI for applications and grades comparable to the products exported to the United States which serve as the basis for EP. The petitioners made an adjustment to home market price for home market credit expenses. As noted above, we made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for U.S. credit expenses. Moreover, we recalculated NV using exchange rates published by the Federal Reserve in accordance with our practice.

The petitioners have provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of PVA in the home market were made at prices below the fully absorbed COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales-below-cost investigation. Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the cost of manufacturing ("COM"); selling, general, and administrative expenses ("SG&A"); financial expenses; and packing expenses. The petitioners calculated COM based on their own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce PVA in the United States and in Germany. To calculate SG&A and financial expenses, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the 2001 consolidated financial statements of Clariant Corporation, the predecessor to Kuraray Europe. Based upon a comparison of the prices of the foreign like product in the home market to the calculated COP of the product, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating a country-wide cost investigation.

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners also based NV for sales in Germany on CV. The petitioners calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A, and financial expense figures used to compute the German home market costs. Consistent with 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioners

included in CV an amount for profit. For profit, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the German PVA producer's 2001 financial statements. The petitioners' calculation of profit was based on operating profit and not on the net income of the German PVA producer. Therefore, for initiation purposes, we have recalculated the CV profit rate to include non-operating items. Because this calculation resulted in a loss, we used a profit rate of zero. Should the need arise to use the profit rate provided by the petitioners as facts available under section 776 of the Act in our preliminary or final determination, we may re-examine the information and, if appropriate, revise the margin calculations. Finally, we adjusted the petitioners' CV to make a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for credit expenses, in accordance with our statutory EP calculation methodology.

The estimated dumping margin for Germany based on a comparison between the adjusted EP and home market price is 2.45 percent. The estimated dumping margin for Germany based on a comparison between the adjusted EP and CV is 19.05 percent.

#### *Japan*

##### *Export Price*

The petitioners based EP on price quotes within the POI for the sale of delivered adhesive-application and textile-application PVA produced by Kuraray Co., Ltd. of Japan (Kuraray) to customers in the United States. The petitioners calculated a net U.S. price for adhesive-application PVA by deducting international freight, brokerage and handling, and insurance expenses, U.S. customs duties, and U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer. For textile-application PVA, the petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by deducting a distributor mark-up, international freight, brokerage and handling, and insurance expenses, U.S. customs duties, U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer, and additional expenses incurred in the United States.

##### *Normal Value*

With respect to NV, the petitioners provided home market price quotes within the POI for applications and grades comparable to the products exported to the United States which serve as the basis for EP. The petitioners made an adjustment to home market price for home market credit expenses.

The petitioners have provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of PVA in the home market were made

at prices below the fully absorbed COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales-below-cost investigation. Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the COM, SG&A, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioners calculated COM based on their own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce PVA in the United States and in Japan. To calculate SG&A and financial expenses, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the 2001 consolidated financial statements of Kuraray. Based upon a comparison of the prices of the foreign like product in the home market to the calculated COP of the product, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating a country-wide cost investigation.

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners also based NV for sales in Japan on CV. The petitioners calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A, and financial expense figures used to compute the Japanese home market costs. Consistent with 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioners included in CV an amount for profit based upon Kuraray's 2001 financial statements. The petitioners made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment to CV for credit expenses.

The estimated dumping margins for Japan based on a comparison between EP and home market price range from 15.46 to 29.04 percent. The estimated dumping margins based on a comparison between EP and CV range from 118.46 to 144.16 percent.

#### *Korea*

##### *Export Price*

The petitioners based EP on price quotes within the POI for the sale of delivered PVA produced and sold by DC Chemical Co., Ltd. ("DC Chemical") to customers in the United States. The petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by deducting a distributor mark-up, international freight, brokerage and handling, and insurance expenses, U.S. customs duties, U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer, and imputed U.S. credit expenses. We adjusted the petitioners' EP calculation by not deducting an amount for imputed U.S. credit expenses; instead, we made an adjustment to NV, in accordance with the Department's EP circumstance-of-sale calculation methodology.

### Normal Value

With respect to NV, the petitioners provided a home market price quote within the POI for an application and grade comparable to the products exported to the United States which serve as the basis for EP. The petitioners made an adjustment to home market price for home market credit expenses. We revised the petitioners' calculation of home market credit expenses to base this expense on the Korean won price, rather than the U.S. dollar equivalent price. As noted above, we made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for U.S. credit expenses. Moreover, we recalculated NV using exchange rates published by the Federal Reserve in accordance with our practice.

The petitioners have provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of PVA in the home market were made at prices below the fully absorbed COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales-below-cost investigation. Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the COM, SG&A, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioners calculated COM based on their own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce PVA in the United States and in Korea. In order to calculate SG&A and financial expenses, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the 2001 financial statements of DC Chemical. Based upon a comparison of the prices of the foreign like product in the home market to the calculated COP of the product, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating a country-wide cost investigation.

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners also based NV for sales in Korea on CV. The petitioners calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A, and financial expense figures used to compute the Korean home market costs. Consistent with 773(e)(2) of the Act, the petitioners included in CV an amount for profit based upon DC Chemical's 2001 financial statements. The petitioners' calculation of profit was based on operating profit and not the net income of the Korean PVA producer. Therefore, for initiation purposes, we have recalculated the CV profit rate to include non-operating items. Because this calculation resulted in a loss, we

used a profit rate of zero. Should the need arise to use the profit rate provided by the petitioners as facts available under section 776 of the Act in our preliminary or final determination, we may re-examine the information and, if appropriate, revise the margin calculations. Finally, we adjusted the petitioners' CV to make a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for credit expenses, in accordance with our statutory EP calculation methodology.

The estimated dumping margin for Korea based on a comparison of the adjusted EP and home market price is 25.41 percent. The estimated dumping margin based on a comparison between the adjusted EP and CV is 31.54 percent.

### The PRC

#### Export Price

The petitioners based EP on price quotes within the POI for the sale of PVA produced in the PRC from a U.S. distributor to a customer in the United States. The petitioners calculated a net U.S. price by deducting a distributor mark-up, international freight, brokerage and handling, and insurance expenses, U.S. customs duties, and U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer. The petitioners also adjusted net U.S. price for inland freight expenses in the PRC using a surrogate value for rail freight in accordance with our NME methodology.

#### Normal Value

The petitioners allege that the PRC is an NME country, and that in all previous investigations the Department has determined that the PRC is an NME. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination in the Less Than Fair Value Investigation of Steel Wire Rope From the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 12759, 12761 (Feb. 28, 2001). In accordance with section 771(18)(c) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country has at one time been considered an NME shall remain in effect until revoked. Therefore, the PRC will continue to be treated as an NME unless and until its NME status is revoked. Pursuant to section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, because the PRC's status as an NME remains in effect, the petitioners determined the dumping margin using an NME analysis.

The petitioners assert that India is the most appropriate surrogate country for the PRC, claiming that India is: (1) A market economy; (2) a significant producer of comparable merchandise; and (3) at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC in terms of per-capita gross national income. Based on the

information provided by the petitioners, we believe that the petitioners' use of India as a surrogate country is appropriate for purposes of initiation of this investigation.

The petitioners valued the factors of production using the quantities of inputs reported by the U.S. surrogate to produce PVA because current reliable information about PRC factor quantities was not reasonably available. The factors of production and usage amounts were derived from the actual production records of the U.S. surrogate generated for fully-hydrolyzed PVA during the period January through June 2002.

Values for vinyl acetate monomer, acetic acid, and steam were based on the 2000–2001 annual report of Vinyl Chemicals (India) Ltd., an Indian chemical producer. The value for methanol and certain other raw material inputs were based on the values reported in the publication *Chemical Weekly*. Electricity was valued using electricity purchases taken from the 2000–2001 annual report of VAM Organic Chemical Ltd. ("VOCL"), an Indian producer of PVA. All surrogate values that fell outside the anticipated period of investigation, which in the PRC case is January 1, 2002, through June 30, 2002, were adjusted for inflation.

The petitioners valued several material, labor, and energy inputs using U.S. producer costs rather than the costs of an Indian surrogate producer. We did not accept the valuation of certain of these inputs for purposes of initiation because non-U.S. surrogate prices were reasonably available to the petitioners. In addition, we did not accept the separate valuation of water and steam because these items appear to be included in the factory overhead rate derived from the surrogate producer's financial statements (see discussion of factory overhead below). Consequently, we recalculated NV to exclude each of the costs identified above because it is the most conservative approach in calculating an alleged dumping margin.

To determine factory overhead, SG&A, and financial expenses, the petitioners relied on rates derived from the financial statements of VOCL. Based on the information provided by the petitioners, we believe that the surrogate values represent information reasonably available to the petitioners and are acceptable for purposes of initiation of this investigation.

Based upon a comparison of EP to adjusted NV, the revised estimated dumping margin is 97.86 percent.

Singapore

*Export Price*

The petitioners based EP on the average customs unit value of PVA imports during the period July 2001 through June 2002, as the petitioners stated they were unable to obtain price data for U.S. imports from Singapore.

*Normal Value*

With respect to NV, the petitioners provided a range of prices for PVA sold in Singapore within the POI. For purposes of the petition, the petitioners used the lowest price in the range as a conservative estimate of the home market sales price for PVA. The petitioners made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment for credit expenses. We revised the petitioners' calculation of home market credit expenses to base this expense on the Singapore dollar price, rather than the U.S. dollar equivalent price.

The petitioners have provided information demonstrating reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of PVA in the home market were made at prices below the fully absorbed COP, within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act, and requested that the Department conduct a country-wide sales-below-cost investigation. Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the COM, SG&A, financial expenses, and packing expenses. The petitioners calculated COM based on their own production experience, adjusted for known differences between costs incurred to produce PVA in the United States and in Singapore. In order to calculate SG&A and financial expenses, the petitioners relied upon amounts reported in the 2001 unconsolidated financial statements of Chemical Industries Ltd., a Singaporean producer of comparable merchandise. We recalculated financial expenses based on the 2001 consolidated financial statements of this company. Based upon a comparison of the prices of the foreign like product in the home market to the calculated COP of the product, we find reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product were made below the COP, within the meaning of section 773(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Act. Accordingly, the Department is initiating a country-wide cost investigation.

Pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b) and 773(e) of the Act, the petitioners also based NV for sales in Singapore on CV. The petitioners calculated CV using the same COM, SG&A, and financial expense figures used to compute the Singapore home market costs. Consistent with 773(e)(2) of the Act, the

petitioners calculated an amount for profit based upon Chemical Industries Ltd.'s 2001 financial statements. Because these statements showed a net loss, petitioners included a zero profit in CV. We recalculated financial expenses as noted above. Furthermore, the petitioners made a circumstance-of-sale adjustment to CV for credit expenses.

The estimated dumping margin for Singapore based on a comparison between the adjusted EP and home market price is 35.11 percent. The estimated dumping margin based on a comparison between the adjusted EP and CV is 61.94 percent.

*Fair Value Comparisons*

Based on the data provided by the petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of PVA from Germany, Japan, Korea, the PRC, and Singapore are being, or are likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

*Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation*

With regard to Germany, Japan, Korea, and the PRC, the petitioners allege that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the individual and cumulated imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV. With respect to Singapore, while the imports from Singapore do not meet the statutory requirement for cumulation, in its analysis for threat, the petitioners allege that imports from Singapore will imminently account for more than three percent of all PVA imports of the subject merchandise and therefore are not negligible. See section 771(24)(A)(ii) of the Act.

The petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is evident in the declining trends in net operating profits, net sales volumes, profit-to-sales ratios, production employment, and capacity utilization. The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. Customs import data, lost sales, and pricing information. We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. See the Initiation Checklist.

*Initiation of Antidumping Investigations*

Based upon our examination of the petitions on PVA, we have found that they meet the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are

initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of PVA from Germany, Japan, Korea, the PRC, and Singapore are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended pursuant to section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

*Distribution of Copies of the Petitions*

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of each petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of Germany, Japan, Korea, the PRC, and Singapore. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of each petition to each exporter named in the petitions, as provided for under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

*ITC Notification*

We have notified the ITC of our initiations as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

*Preliminary Determinations by the ITC*

The ITC will determine no later than October 21, 2002, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of PVA from Germany, Japan, Korea, the PRC, and Singapore are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: September 25, 2002.

**Faryar Shirzad,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 02-24928 Filed 9-30-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**[A-489-807]**

**Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey; Notice of Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results in Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 1, 2002.