

immediate reinstatement of the antidumping duty order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that, subsequent to the revocation, ICDAS sold the subject merchandise at less than NV.

In this administrative review, we preliminarily find that ICDAS, in fact, did not sell the subject merchandise in commercial quantities in each of the three consecutive years forming the basis of the request. As such, we preliminarily find that ICDAS does not qualify for revocation. For further discussion see the memorandum to Louis Apple from the Team entitled "Request by ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi, A.S. for Revocation in the 2001–2002 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey," dated April 30, 2003.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(3)(a) of the Act, we verified sales information provided by all the respondents. We used standard verification procedures, including examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification results are outlined in the company-specific verification reports placed in the case file in the Central Records Unit, main Commerce building, room B-099.

Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of rebar from Turkey were made in the United States at less than NV, we compared the export price (EP) to the NV. Because Turkey's economy experienced significant inflation during the POR, as is Department practice, we limited our comparisons to home market sales made during the same month in which the U.S. sale occurred and did not apply our "90/60" contemporaneity rule (*see, e.g., Certain Porcelain on Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 42496, 42503 (Aug. 7, 1997)). This methodology minimizes the extent to which calculated dumping margins are overstated or understated due solely to price inflation that occurred in the intervening time period between the U.S. and home market sales.

When making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the "Scope of the Review" section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise

in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade (i.e., sales within the same month which passed the cost test), we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in sections B and C of our antidumping questionnaire, or CV, as appropriate.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we first attempted to compare products produced by the same company and sold in the U.S. and home markets that were identical with respect to the following characteristics: form, grade, size, and ASTM specification. Where there were no home market sales of foreign like product that were identical in these respects to the merchandise sold in the United States, we compared U.S. products with the most similar merchandise sold in the home market based on the characteristics listed above, in that order of priority. Where we were unable to match U.S. sales to home market sales of foreign like product, we based NV on CV.

Export Price

For all U.S. sales made by Colakoglu, Habas, and ICDAS, we used EP methodology, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and constructed export price methodology was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record. We adjusted the reported data based on our findings at verification. For further discussion, see the April 30, 2003, memoranda to the file entitled "Calculations Performed for Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. for the Preliminary Results in the 2001–2002 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey," (Habas Sales Calculation Memorandum) and "Calculations Performed for ICDAS Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi A.S. (ICDAS) for the Preliminary Results in the 2001–2002 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey," (ICDAS Sales Calculation Memorandum).

A. Colakoglu

We based EP on packed prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. We made deductions for inspection fees, lashing and loading expenses, demurrage expenses, overage premium expenses, crane charges (offset by freight commission revenue,

wharfage revenue, despatch revenue, demurrage commission revenue, agency fee revenue, attendance fee revenue, and other freight-related revenue), and ocean freight expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

B. Habas

We based EP on packed prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. We made deductions for foreign inland freight expenses, surveying expenses, brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight expenses, and marine insurance expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

C. ICDAS

We based EP on packed prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. We made deductions for foreign inland freight expenses, freight commission expenses, surveying expenses, brokerage and handling fees, loading expenses, demurrage expenses (offset by despatch revenue), overage premium expenses, ocean freight expenses, marine insurance expenses, and U.S. customs duties, where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

Normal Value

A. Home Market Viability

In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is five percent or more of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the volume of each respondent's home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that each respondent had a viable home market during the POR. Consequently, we based NV on home market sales.

For each respondent, in accordance with our practice, we excluded home market sales of non-prime merchandise made during the POR from our preliminary analysis based on the limited quantity of such sales in the home market and the fact that no such sales were made to the United States during the POR. (*See, e.g., Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length*