

August 30, 2002, we received a timely request for review from Altos Hornos de Mexico, S.A. (AHMSA), the respondent company in this proceeding. On September 25, 2002, we initiated the review covering the period January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001 (67 FR 60210). See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 67 FR 60210 (September 25, 2002).

On September 27, 2002, we issued initial questionnaires to AHMSA and the Government of Mexico (GOM) covering the programs reviewed in the previous segment of the proceeding. On October 22, 2002, petitioners argued that two GOM programs, asset tax relief provided under the Immediate Deduction Program and the Program for Sectoral Promotion (PROSEC), were either subsumed by or successors to programs previously found to be countervailable in this proceeding and, thus, should be included in any questionnaires issued to AHMSA and the GOM.¹ On December 16, 2002, petitioners submitted new subsidy allegations. These allegations included the Immediate Deduction Program and PROSEC as well as the following programs: Provision of Debt Relief from AHMSA's Creditors by Nacional Financiera (NAFIN) and the Coahuila State Government (CGS), Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex) Guaranteed Provision of Natural Gas for less than Adequate Remuneration, and Debt Relief on Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior S.N.C. (Bancomext) Loans. Petitioners also alleged that AHMSA was uncreditworthy during calendar year 2000. On January 21, 2003, petitioners submitted additional factual information regarding their new subsidy allegations.

On March 26, 2003, we extended the period for completion of the preliminary results of review pursuant to section 751(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Act). See *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (68 FR 14580). On April 29, 2003, we issued our first supplemental questionnaires to AHMSA and the GOM.

On June 3, 2003, we issued a memorandum concerning petitioners' new subsidy allegations. In the memorandum, we agreed with petitioners that asset tax relief provided under the Immediate Deduction Program was related to a program previously found countervailable by the

Department and that the program merited an examination in the instant proceeding. Furthermore, we initiated investigations of the following programs: Provision of Debt Relief from AHMSA's Creditors by Nacional Financiera (NAFIN) and the Coahuila State Government (CGS), Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex) Guaranteed Provision of Natural Gas for less than Adequate Remuneration, and Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior S.N.C. (Bancomext) Debt Relief. In addition, we initiated an investigation of AHMSA's creditworthiness covering calendar year 2000. We declined to initiate an investigation of PROSEC because we found no record evidence to support petitioners allegation that the PROSEC program was countervailable. For more information, see the June 3, 2003, memorandum from the Team to Melissa G. Skinner, Director, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, the public version of which is on file in Room B-099 of the Central Records Unit (CRU) in the Main Commerce Building (*New Subsidies Memorandum*). The programs for which we initiated investigations are discussed in further detail in the "Creditworthiness and Calculation of Discount Rate" and "Analysis of Programs" sections of this preliminary results notice.

On June 3, 2003, we issued second supplemental questionnaires to AHMSA and the GOM. On June 30, 2003, we issued a third supplemental questionnaire to AHMSA.

From July 16 through July 24, 2003, we conducted a verification of the questionnaire responses submitted by AHMSA and the GOM. The results of our verification are contained in the September 2, 2003, memoranda from Lyman Armstrong to Eric Greynolds, Program Manager, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI (AHMSA Verification Report and GOM Verification Report, respectively), the public versions of which are on file in the CRU.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters for which a review was specifically requested, *i.e.*, AHMSA, and 17 programs.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this administrative review are certain cut-to-length carbon steel plates. These products include hot-rolled carbon steel universal mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 millimeters but not exceeding 1,250 millimeters and of a thickness of not less than 4 millimeters, not in coils and without patterns in relief), of

rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances; and certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat-rolled products in straight lengths, of rectangular shape, hot rolled, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, 4.75 millimeters or more in thickness and of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7208.31.0000, 7208.32.0000, 7208.33.1000, 7208.33.5000, 7208.41.0000, 7208.42.0000, 7208.43.0000, 7208.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.11.0000, 7211.12.0000, 7211.21.0000, 7211.22.0045, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, and 7212.50.0000. Included in this administrative review are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this administrative review is grade X-70 plate. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Allocation Period

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(d)(2), we will presume the allocation period for non-recurring subsidies to be the average useful life (AUL) of renewable physical assets for the industry concerned, as listed in the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) 1977 Class Life Asset Depreciation Range System, as updated by the Department of the Treasury. The presumption will apply unless a party claims and establishes that these tables do not reasonably reflect the AUL of the renewable physical assets for the company or industry under investigation or review, and that the difference between the company-specific AUL and the AUL for the industry under investigation is significant.

In this administrative review, the Department is considering both non-recurring subsidies previously allocated in the initial investigation and non-recurring subsidies received since the period of investigation (POI). For non-recurring subsidies previously allocated in the initial investigation, the

¹ Petitioners are Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation.