

EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATIONS ON ADEQUACY

in

Helical Spring Lock Washers from China and Taiwan Inv. Nos. 731-TA-624-625 (Review)

On February 3, 2000, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews of the outstanding antidumping duty orders on helical spring lock washers (“HSLW”) from China and Taiwan pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.¹ The Commission, in consultation with the Department of Commerce, grouped these reviews because they involve similar domestic like products.²

The Commission received an adequate response from Shakeproof Assembly Components Division of Illinois Tool Works, Inc., a domestic producer of HSLW and the petitioner in the original investigation. The Commission also received an adequate response from the American Association of Fastener Importers, a majority of whose member companies are or have been U.S. importers of subject merchandise from China. Because the Commission received an adequate response from a domestic producer accounting for a substantial percentage of U.S. production, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate. Because the Commission received an adequate response from importers accounting for a substantial percentage of the subject imports, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was adequate.³ Accordingly, the Commission determined to proceed to a full review in *Helical Spring Lock Washers from China*.⁴

No responses were received on behalf of respondent interested parties with respect to the review concerning subject imports from Taiwan. Nonetheless, the Commission determined to conduct a full review in *Helical Lock Spring Washers from Taiwan* because conducting a full review would promote administrative efficiency in light of the Commission’s determination to conduct a full review with respect to *Helical Spring Lock Washers from China*.⁵

A record of the Commissioners’ votes is available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission’s web site.

¹ Chairman Bragg dissenting.

² *See* 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(5)(D).

³ Chairman Bragg found the respondent interested party group response to be inadequate because no foreign producer responded to the Notice of Institution. In her view, importer interest alone, without the participation of foreign producers, does not reflect an adequate “willingness to participate” on the part of respondent interested parties such that the expenditure of Commission resources in the conduct of a full review is justified; indeed, absent the participation of foreign producers, importer interest alone is unlikely to result in the development of a significantly improved or different record, notwithstanding the use of investigative tools available to the Commission including the issuance of questionnaires and a public hearing.

⁴ Chairman Bragg found no circumstances warranting a full review.

⁵ Chairman Bragg found no circumstances warranting a full review.