

EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION ON ADEQUACY

in

Uranium From the Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan,
Invs. Nos. 731-TA-539-C, E, and F (Review)

On November 4, 1999, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(5).

Regarding domestic interested parties, the Commission received a response from the Uranium Coalition (“Coalition”) that contained company-specific information submitted by domestic producers of the domestic like product, Rio Algom Mining Corporation, Uranium Resources, Inc., and the United States Enrichment Corporation (“USEC”), and the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical & Energy Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, a union representing workers at the production facilities of USEC and ConverDyn, a domestic producer that is not a member of the Coalition. Regarding respondent interested parties in the review concerning Russia, the Commission received a joint response containing company-specific information for the Ministry of the Russian Federation for Atomic Energy (the sole producer of uranium in Russia), AO Technabexport (the sole exporter of uranium from Russia), and Globe Nuclear Service and Supply GNSS, Ltd. (one of the U.S. importers of Russian uranium). Regarding respondent interested parties in the review concerning Uzbekistan, the Commission received a joint response containing company-specific information for the Government of Uzbekistan and Navoi Mining and Metallurgical Combinat (the only producer of uranium in Uzbekistan). These parties account for a significant share of production, exports, and/or imports, as the case may be, in the United States, Russia, and Uzbekistan. The Commission found each of the responses to be adequate. The Commission also received a response from the Ad Hoc Utilities Group, a coalition of U.S. industrial users of uranium, which is a party to the proceeding, but not an interested party. The Commission did not receive a response from any respondent interested party in the review concerning Ukraine.

The Commission based its evaluation of the adequacy of the responses on value data because the domestic like product includes both finished and semifinished forms of uranium¹ and, therefore, value data provides the best aggregate measure of production and sales.² On that basis, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate. The Commission determined further that the respondent interested party group responses for the reviews concerning uranium from Russia and Uzbekistan were adequate, and that it should proceed to full reviews with regard to those countries. Because no respondent interested party responded to the notice of institution for the review of uranium from Ukraine, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response for that review was inadequate. However, the Commission will proceed to a full review of the order covering Ukraine to promote administrative efficiency in light of the Commission’s decision to conduct full reviews with respect to Russia and Uzbekistan.

¹ See *Uranium From Kazakhstan*, Inv. No. 731-TA-539-A (Final), USITC Pub. 3213 at 6-8 (July 1999).

² See Notice of Final Rulemaking, 63 Fed. Reg. 30599, 30603 (June 5, 1998).