

70 FR 39486, July 8, 2005

A-351-602  
A-570-814  
A-588-602  
A-583-605  
A-549-807  
Sunset Reviews  
Public Document  
IA/Office 8/HES/4340

DATE: June 29, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Joseph A. Spetrini  
Acting Assistant Secretary  
for Import Administration

FROM: Barbara E. Tillman  
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Import Administration

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, the People's Republic of China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand; Final Results

### Summary

We have analyzed the substantive responses of the domestic interested parties in the second sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders covering certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings ("pipe fittings") from Brazil, the People's Republic of China ("China"), Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand. We recommend that you approve the positions we developed in the Discussion of the Issues section of this memorandum. Below is the complete list of the issues in these sunset reviews for which we received substantive responses:

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping
2. Magnitude of the margins likely to prevail

### History of the Orders:

The Department of Commerce ("Department") published its final affirmative determinations of sales at less than fair value ("LTFV") in the *Federal Register* with respect to imports of certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and

Thailand at the following rates.<sup>1</sup>

Brazil

All Brazilian Manufacturers, Producers and Exporters 52.25

China

China North Industries Corp. 154.72

Jilin Provincial Machinery & Equipment  
Import & Export Corp. 75.23

Liaoning Machinery & Equipment  
Import & Export Corp. 134.79

Liaoning Metals & Minerals Import &  
Export Corp. 103.70

Shenyang Billiongold Pipe Fittings Co. Ltd. 110.39

Shandong Metals & Minerals Import & Export  
Corp. 35.06

Shenyang Machinery & Equipment Import &  
Export Corp.; Liaoning Metals; Shenzhen  
Machinery Industry Corp. 182.90

All Other Chinese Manufacturers and Exporters 182.90

Japan

Awaji Sangyo , KK 30.83

Nippon Benkan Kogyo Co. Ltd. 65.81

All Other Japanese Manufacturers and Exporters 62.79

Taiwan

Rigid 6.84

C.M. 8.57

Gei Bey 87.30

Chup Hsin 87.30

All Other Taiwanese Manufacturers and Exporters 49.46

Thailand

Thai Benkan Company (“TBC”) 50.84

TTU Industrial Corp. Ltd. (“TTU”) 10.68

All Other Thai Manufacturers and Exporters 39.10

---

<sup>1</sup>See *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 51 FR 37770 (October 24, 1986); *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People’s Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order and Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 57 FR 29702 (July 6, 1992); *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Japan: Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value*, 51FR 46892, (December 29, 1986); *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand: Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value*, 57 FR 21065, (May 18, 1992).

The Department later published in the *Federal Register* antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand.<sup>2</sup> Since the issuance of the antidumping duty orders, the Department conducted: three administrative reviews with respect to pipe fittings from Thailand<sup>3</sup>; two administrative reviews with respect to pipe fittings from Taiwan.<sup>4</sup> However, the Department has conducted no administrative reviews with respect to imports of pipe fittings from Brazil, China, and Japan. There have been no changed circumstance or duty absorption reviews of these orders. Duty absorption inquiries may not be conducted on pre-URAA orders. See *FAG Italia S.p.A. v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed. Cir. 2002). However, the Department conducted a scope ruling on pipe fittings from Taiwan and determined in May 1992 that sprinklers are subject to the order regarding Taiwanese pipe fittings.<sup>5</sup> The Department also determined that Chinese exporters tried to circumvent the antidumping duty order by finishing the subject merchandise in Thailand and then exporting the finished products as products of Thailand.<sup>6</sup> The orders remain in effect for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand.

The Department conducted the first sunset reviews on imports of pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), and found that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations. See *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and the People’s Republic of China* (“First Sunset Review”), 64 FR 67847 (December 3, 1999). The International Trade Commission (“ITC”) determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the U.S. within a reasonably foreseeable time. See *Certain Carbon Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and the People’s Republic of China*, 64 FR 71830 (December 22, 1999) and USITC Pub. 3263, Inv. No. 731-TA-308-310 and 520-521 (Review)

---

<sup>2</sup>See *Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil*, 51 FR 45152 (December 17, 1986); *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Japan*, 52 FR 4167 (February 10, 1987); *Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand*, 57 FR 29702 (July 6, 1992).

<sup>3</sup>See *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 40797 (July 30, 1997); *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 69487 (December 13, 1999); and *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 6409 (February 7, 2003).

<sup>4</sup>See *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 56 FR 20187 (May 2, 1991); *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Taiwan; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 49585 (September 26, 1995).

<sup>5</sup>See *Scope Rulings*, 57 FR 19602 (May 7, 1992).

<sup>6</sup>See *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from the People’s Republic of China; Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order*, 59 FR 15155 (March 31, 1994).

(December 1999). Thus, the Department published the notice of continuation of these antidumping duty orders. *See Continuation of Antidumping Orders: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Brazil, Taiwan, Japan, Thailand, and the People's Republic of China*, 65 FR 753 (January 6, 2000).

On December 1, 2004, the Department published the notice of initiation of the second sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Brazil, the People's Republic of China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 69 FR 69891 (December 1, 2004). The Department received the Notice of Intent to Participate from the Trinity Industries, Inc.<sup>7</sup>; Weldbend Corp.; Tube Forgings of America, Inc.; and Mills Iron Works, Inc. ("TFA/Mills Iron") (collectively "the domestic interested parties"), within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department's Regulations ("Sunset Regulations"). The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler of the subject merchandise in the United States. We received complete substantive responses from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no responses from the respondent interested parties. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews of these orders.

#### Discussion of the Issues:

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted these sunset reviews to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making these determinations, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigations and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the periods before and the periods after the issuance of the antidumping duty orders. In addition, section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the Department shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("ITC") the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Below we address the comments of the interested parties.

#### 1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

##### Interested Party Comments

The domestic interested parties believe that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by the Brazilian, Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese, and Thai manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise due to continued dumping. *See Substantive Response of Trinity Industries ("Trinity Response")* (January 3, 2005) at 4; *Substantive Response of Weldbend ("Weldbend Response")*

---

<sup>7</sup>Trinity Industries acquired the assets of Ladish Co., Ltd. who was a petitioner in the original investigation.

(January 3, 2005) at 4; and Substantive Response of TFA/Mills Iron “TFA/Mills Iron Response”) at 7-9. The domestic interested parties contend that the orders remain in effect at levels above *de minimis* for all manufacturers, producers and exporters of the subject merchandise. See Trinity Response at 4-5; Weldbend Response at 7; and TFA/Mills Response at 12-13.

*Brazil:* TFA/Mills Iron states that Brazilian imports ceased in 1991 and remained virtually non-existent, except in 2003 when the imports were 4,560 kilograms. See TFA/Mills Iron Response at 8. The domestic interested parties also state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order, indicating that the Brazilian manufacturers, producers, and exporters must dump the subject merchandise in order to continue to sell at pre-order volumes. See Trinity Response at 4; see also Weldbend Response at 4-5; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9. Thus, the domestic interested parties conclude that the substantial dumping margins and significant decline of imports demonstrate that revocation of the order will certainly lead to a continuation of dumping. See Trinity Response at 4; see also Weldbend Response at 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9.

*China:* During the period of this review, Weldbend acknowledges that imports increased but not to the level before the antidumping duty order. See Weldbend response at 5. Weldbend asserts that the Chinese exporters reduced significantly their exports to the United States because they were unable to maintain a presence in the U.S. market without dumping. *Id.* at 6. Thus, the domestic interested parties conclude that the substantial dumping margins and significant decline of imports demonstrate that revocation will certainly lead to a continuation of dumping. See Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9.

*Japan:* The domestic interested parties assert that the same trends that existed during the first sunset review still continue during this period of review; therefore, the Department should conclude that revocation of this antidumping duty order is likely to lead to recurrence of dumping. See Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 4; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9. As Weldbend indicates in its chart, Japanese imports dropped sharply once the Department issued the antidumping duty order. See Weldbend Response at 5. The domestic interested parties state that the imports from Japan dropped to even lower levels since the continuation of the order signaling that Japanese exporters must dump pipe fittings in order to continue to sell at pre-order volumes. See Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 5; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9. For example, Japanese manufacturers exported 99,704 kilograms in 2000 but only exported 175 kilograms in 2003. See Weldbend Response at 5. Weldbend asserts that the Japanese exporters reduced significantly their exports to the United States because they were unable to maintain a presence in the U.S. market without dumping. *Id.* at 6. Thus, the domestic interested parties conclude that the substantial dumping margins and significant decline of imports demonstrate that revocation will certainly lead to a continuation of dumping. See Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9.

*Taiwan:* The domestic interested parties state the Department established a new dumping margin during each administrative review which continues to be above *de minimis*. See Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 5; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 7. Weldbend and TFA/Mills Iron also remark that two respondents accepted a best information available rate of 87.3 percent rather than participate in the latest administrative review. TFA/Mills Iron Response

at 7 citing 60 FR *supra* at 49585. In addition, the import volumes declined significantly after the imposition of the order and continues to remain at more reduced levels. *Id* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 4-5. Weldbend points out that import volumes in 2000 were approximately 1.5 million kilograms and fluctuated to 970,556 kilograms by October 2004. Weldbend Response at 5. Weldbend adds that the Taiwanese manufacturers must dump pipe fittings in order to sell at pre-order volumes prior to this order. *See* Weldbend Response at 4 and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9. Consequently, the parties contend that the factors presented in their submission indicate that revocation of this order would lead to continuance or recurrence of dumping. *See* Trinity Response at 5; Weldbend Response at 4, 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 7.

*Thailand:* The domestic interested parties contend that the order remains in effect at levels above *de minimis* for two Thai exporters, (TBC and TTU), and all other Thai producers and exporters of the subject merchandise. *See* Trinity Response at 4-5; Weldbend Response at 7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 12, 13. The domestic interested parties also state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order, indicating that the Thai producers must dump the subject merchandise in order to continue to sell at pre-order volumes. *See* Trinity Response at 4-5; *see also* Weldbend Response at 4; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 11-12. Although the domestic interested parties acknowledge that import volumes increased to pre-order levels during the period of this sunset review, they allege that the import statistics do not accurately reflect the volume of subject merchandise imported into the United States because exports from Awaji Sanjo Thailand are excluded from this order.<sup>8</sup> *See* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 4; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 9-10. Thus, the domestic interested parties conclude that the substantial dumping margins and significant decline of imports demonstrate that revocation will certainly lead to a continuation of dumping. *See* Trinity Response at 5; Weldbend Response at 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 12.

### Department's Position

Consistent with the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (“URAA”), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action (“SAA”), H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) (“House Report”), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (“Senate Report”), the Department’s determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis. In addition, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the

---

<sup>8</sup>In the original investigation the Department found a *de minimis* margin for Awaji Sanjo Thailand, and the company was excluded this order. In 1994, the Department completed a separate investigation and concluded that Awaji Sanjo Thailand dumped at levels above *de minimis*. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand*, 60 FR 10552 (February 27, 1995). However, the ITC’s injury determination was negative; thus, Awaji Sanjo Thailand was excluded from this order.

issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.

In addition, pursuant to 752(c)(1)(B) of the Act, the Department considers the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping order.

*Brazil:* Using statistics provided by the ITC Dataweb (see attached), the Department finds that imports of Brazilian pipe fittings ceased in every year but 2003 where 4,560 kilograms entered into the United States. *See* attached import statistics. Given that dumping continues at above *de minimis* levels, and imports are below pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

*China:* Using statistics provided by the ITC Dataweb (see attached), the Department finds that imports surpassed levels since the first sunset review but not to pre-order levels. Since the completion of our first sunset review in 2000, imports of Chinese pipe fittings have fluctuated from 62,476 kilograms to 80,134 kilograms. *See* attached import statistics. Given that dumping has continued at fluctuated import volumes above *de minimis*, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

*Japan:* Using statistics provided by the ITC Dataweb (see attached), the Department finds that imports of Japanese pipe fittings decreased from 99,704 kilograms to 60 kilograms the completion of our first sunset review in 2000. *See* attached import statistics. Given that dumping continues at above *de minimis* levels, and imports are below pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

*Taiwan:* Using statistics provided by the ITC Dataweb (see attached), the Department finds that imports of Taiwanese pipe fittings have fluctuated from 1.5 million kilograms to 1.1 million kilograms since the completion of our first sunset review in 2000. *See* attached import statistics. Given that dumping continues at above *de minimis* levels, and imports are above pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

*Thailand:* As cited above, the Department has conducted three reviews since issuance of the order in which it found that dumping continued at levels above *de minimis* for Thai exporters. Using statistics provided by the ITC Dataweb (see attached), the Department finds that imports during the period of review approached pre-order levels fluctuating from approximately 5.7 million kilograms to 5.4 million kilograms of Thai pipe fittings. *See* attached import statistics. Given that dumping has continued at levels above *de minimis*, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

## 2. Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail:

### Interested Party Comments

*Brazil:* In their substantive responses, the domestic interested parties request that the Department report to the ITC the margin that was determined in the final sales at less than fair value determination in the original investigation in accordance with the SAA. *See* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 5-6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 10. The domestic

interested parties recommend the Department report to the ITC the following dumping margin for all Brazilian producers, manufacturers, and exporters: 52.25 percent. *See* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 6; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 10.

*China:* In their substantive responses, the domestic interested parties request that the Department report to the ITC the margins that were determined in the final determination in the original investigation in accordance with the SAA. *See* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 10. The domestic interested parties recommend the following dumping margins:

China North Industries Corp.	154.72
Jilin Provincial Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.	75.23
Liaoning Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.	134.79
Liaoning Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	103.70
Shenyang Billiongold Pipe Fittings Co. Ltd.	110.39
Shandong Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	35.06
Shenyang Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.; Liaoning Metals; Shenzhen Machinery Industry Corp.	182.90
All Other Chinese exporters	182.90

*Japan:* The domestic interested parties request the Department report to the ITC the rates found in the original investigation. *See* Trinity Response at 4; Weldbend Response at 6-7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 10.

Awaji Sangyo , KK	30.83
Nippon Benkan Kogyo Co. Ltd.	65.81
All Other Japanese Manufacturers and Exporters	62.79

*Taiwan:* All domestic interested parties recommend that the dumping margins found in the original investigation are likely to prevail if this order were revoked. *See* Trinity Response at 5; Weldbend Response at 6-7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 10.

Rigid	6.84
C.M.	8.57
Gei Bey	87.30
Chup Hsin	87.30
All Other Taiwanese Manufacturers and Exporters	49.46

*Thailand:* In their substantive responses, the domestic interested parties request that the Department report to the ITC the margins that were determined in the most recent administrative reviews. *See* Trinity Response at 5; Weldbend Response at 6-7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 13. The domestic interested parties recommend the following dumping margins for TBC at 52.60 percent; TTU at 52.60 percent; and all other Thai producers and exporters at 39.10 percent. *See* Trinity Response at 5; Weldbend Response at 7; and TFA/Mills Iron Response at 13.

## Department's Position

Normally the Department will provide to the ITC the company-specific margin from the investigation for each company. For companies not investigated specifically or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the “all others” rate from the investigation. The Department’s preference for selecting a margin from the investigation is based on the fact that it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place. Under certain circumstances, however, the Department may select a more recently calculated margin, to report to the ITC.

Since the first sunset review, the Department conducted no administrative reviews for pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, and Taiwan. Therefore, the Department must determine the appropriate rates to report to the ITC regarding pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Japan, and Taiwan. The Department finds that it is appropriate to provide the ITC with the rates from the investigation because these are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order in place. Thus, the Department will report to the ITC these same margins as listed in the Final Results section.

With respect to pipe fittings from Thailand, in the first sunset review, the Department reported to the ITC the following margins from the original investigation: 50.84 percent for TBC, 10.68 percent for TTU, and 39.10 percent for all other Thai manufacturers.<sup>9</sup> *See First Sunset Review*. Since the first sunset review, the Department completed an administrative review of TBC that resulted in a dumping rate of 52.60 percent based on adverse facts available. *See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 6409 (February 7, 2003). Specifically, the rate reported in the first sunset review had been adjusted to exclude export subsidies. As the countervailing duty (“CVD”) order that was the basis for the export subsidies had terminated, the Department found it inappropriate to adjust the margin and, thus, assigned the dumping rate of 52.60. *Id.* In this sunset review, the domestic interested parties request that the Department determine that this more recent dumping margin for TBC is the margin that is likely to prevail if this order were revoked. The Department may, in response to an argument from an interested party, provide to the ITC a more recently assigned margin for a particular company where dumping margins increased for that company, even if the increase was a result of the application of best information or facts available. Having found it inappropriate to continue to adjust the petition data, given the termination of the CVD order, the Department determines that it is appropriate to report to the ITC the rate from the most recently completed review.

Regarding TTU, the domestic interested parties request that the Department should report to the ITC the rate of 52.60 percent, as determined in the 1995-96 administrative review, despite the rate of 10.68 percent reported in the first sunset review. *See Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld*

---

<sup>9</sup>The Department also reported a 38.41 percent margin for Awaji Sangyo Thailand. Awaji Sangyo Thailand was excluded from the original order. Although a dumping margin was found in a later investigation, an antidumping duty order was not imposed against Awaji Sangyo Thailand because of the ITC’s negative injury determination. *See First Sunset Review*.

*Pipe Fittings from Thailand; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 40797 (July 30, 1997). The domestic interested parties argue without providing sufficient cause that the rate for TTU determined in the 1995-96 review more accurately reflects the behavior of this company in the absence of the order. See Trinity Response at 5. Because the domestic interested parties have provided no basis for departing from our practice, the Department finds that it is appropriate to provide the ITC with the rate from the investigation for TBC (and confirmed in the previous sunset review in 1999) because it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order in place.

### Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on pipe fittings from Brazil, China, Taiwan, and Thailand would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	Weighted-Average Margin (percent)
<u>Brazil</u>	
All Brazilian Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	52.25
<u>China</u>	
China North Industries Corp.	154.72
Jilin Provincial Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.	75.23
Liaoning Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.	134.79
Liaoning Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	103.70
Shenyang Billiongold Pipe Fittings Co. Ltd.	110.39
Shandong Metals & Minerals Import & Export Corp.	35.06
Shenyang Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corp.; Liaoning Metals; Shenzhen Machinery Industry Corp.	182.90
All Other Chinese Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	182.90
<u>Japan</u>	
Awaji Sangyo	30.83
Nippon Benkan	65.81
All Other Japanese Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	62.79

<u>Taiwan</u>	
Rigid	6.84
C.M.	8.57
Gei Bey	87.30
Chup Hsin	87.30
All Other Taiwanese Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	49.46

<u>Thailand</u>	
Thai Benkan Company	52.60
TTU Industrial Co., Ltd.	10.68
All Other Thai Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	39.10

---

Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the substantive response received, we recommend adopting all of the above positions. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the final results of review in the *Federal Register*.

AGREE   X  

DISAGREE \_\_\_\_\_

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Joseph A. Spetrini  
 Acting Assistant Secretary  
 for Import Administration

June 29, 2005

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Date)