

## **EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION ON ADEQUACY**

in

*Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products from Brazil, Japan, and Russia*  
Inv. Nos. 701-TA-384 and 731-TA-806-808 (Second Review)

On July 6, 2010, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in each of the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(3)(B).

The Commission received one response to the notice of institution from domestic interested parties, which was jointly filed by United States Steel Corp., ArcelorMittal USA Inc., Nucor Corp., Steel Dynamics, Inc., Gallatin Steel Co., and SSAB Enterprises LLC (collectively “Domestic Producers”). Each of the Domestic Producers is a U.S. producer of hot-rolled flat-rolled carbon-quality steel products (“hot rolled steel”). The Commission determined that the individual responses of each of the Domestic Producers was adequate. Because Domestic Producers collectively account for a substantial proportion of domestic hot rolled steel production, the Commission also determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate.

With respect to the reviews of the antidumping duty and countervailing duty orders on subject merchandise from Brazil, the Commission received two sets of responses to the notice of institution from respondent interested parties. One of these was jointly filed by Companhia Siderurgica Nacional (CSN), a producer and exporter of subject merchandise from Brazil, and Companhia Siderurgica Nacional LLC (CSN LLC), an affiliated importer of subject merchandise. The other was filed by Usinas Siderurgicas de Minas Gerais (Usiminas), a producer and exporter of subject merchandise from Brazil. The Commission found that each individual response was adequate. Because CSN and Usiminas collectively account for a substantial proportion of the production of subject merchandise from Brazil, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was adequate for the reviews of the orders covering subject merchandise from Brazil.

With respect to the review of the antidumping duty order on subject merchandise from Japan, the Commission received individually adequate responses from two respondent interested parties, JFE Steel Corp. and Nippon Steel Corp., each of which is a producer and exporter of subject merchandise from Japan. Because JFE and Nippon collectively account for a substantial proportion of the production of subject merchandise from Japan, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was adequate for the review on the order covering subject merchandise from Japan.

With respect to the review of the suspension agreement on subject merchandise from Russia, the Commission received individually adequate responses from three respondent interested parties, Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works (MMK), Novolipetsk Steel (NLMK), and JSC Severstal, each of which is a producer and exporter of subject merchandise from Russia. Because MMK, NLMK, and Severstal collectively represent a substantial proportion of production of subject merchandise from Russia, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was adequate for the review of the suspension agreement covering subject merchandise from Russia.

Consequently, in each of the subject reviews both the domestic interested party group response and the respondent interested party group response was adequate. The Commission accordingly determined to conduct full reviews in each of the subject reviews.

A record of the Commissioners’ votes is available from the Office of the Secretary and the Commission’s web site (<http://www.usitc.gov>).