

2. Absence of De Facto Control

As stated in previous cases, there is some evidence that certain enactments of the PRC central government have not been implemented uniformly among different sectors and/or jurisdictions in the PRC. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People's Republic of China*, 63 FR 72255, 72256 (Dec. 31, 1998). Therefore, the Department has determined that an analysis of *de facto* control is critical in determining whether respondents are, in fact, subject to a degree of governmental control which would preclude the Department from assigning separate rates.

The Department typically considers four factors in evaluating whether each respondent is subject to *de facto* governmental control of its export functions: (1) Whether the export prices are set by, or subject to, the approval of a governmental authority; (2) whether the respondent has authority to negotiate and sign contracts, and other agreements; (3) whether the respondent has autonomy from the government in making decisions regarding the selection of its management; and (4) whether the respondent retains the proceeds of its export sales and makes independent decisions regarding disposition of profits or financing of losses. See *Id.*

The mandatory respondents have asserted the following: (1) They establish their own export prices; (2) they negotiate contracts without guidance from any governmental entities or organizations; (3) they make their own personnel decisions; and (4) they retain the proceeds of their export sales and use profits according to their business needs. Additionally, the respondents' questionnaire responses indicate that they do not coordinate with other exporters in setting prices or in determining which companies will sell to which markets. This information supports a preliminary finding that there is an absence of *de facto* governmental control of the export functions of these companies. Consequently, we preliminarily determine that the mandatory respondents have met the criteria for the application of separate rates.

Margins for Cooperative Exporters Not Selected

For those exporters: (1) Who submitted a timely response to section A of the Department's questionnaire, but were not selected as mandatory respondents, and (2) for whom the section A response indicates that the

exporter is eligible for a separate rate, we assigned a weighted-average of the rates of the fully analyzed companies, excluding any rates that were zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available. See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the People's Republic of China*, 67 FR 36570, 36571 (May 24, 2002) (*Welded Steel Pipe*). Companies receiving this rate are identified by name in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

PRC-Wide Rate and Use of Facts Otherwise Available

As in all NME cases, the Department implements a policy whereby there is a rebuttable presumption that all exporters or producers located in the NME comprise a single exporter under common government control, the "NME entity." The Department assigns a single NME rate to the NME entity unless an exporter can demonstrate eligibility for a separate rate.

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party or any other person: (A) withholds information that has been requested by the administering authority; (B) fails to provide such information by the deadline, or in the form or manner requested; (C) significantly impedes a proceeding; or (D) provides such information that cannot be verified, the Department shall use, subject to sections 782(d) and (e) of the Act, facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination.

Pursuant to section 782(e) of the Act, the Department shall not decline to consider submitted information if all of the following requirements are met: (1) The information is submitted by the established deadline; (2) the information can be verified; (3) the information is not so incomplete that it cannot serve as a reliable basis for reaching the applicable determination; (4) the interested party has demonstrated that it acted to the best of its ability; and (5) the information can be used without undue difficulties.

Information on the record of this investigation indicates that there are numerous producers/exporters of the subject merchandise in the PRC. As noted in the "Case History" section above, all exporters were given the opportunity to respond to the Department's questionnaire. Based upon our knowledge of the PRC and the fact that U.S. import statistics show that the responding companies did not account for all imports into the United States from the PRC, we have preliminarily determined that certain PRC exporters

of CTVs failed to respond to our questionnaire. As a result, use of facts available (FA), pursuant to section 776(a)(2)(A) of the Act, is appropriate.

In selecting among the facts otherwise available, section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use adverse facts available (AFA) if the Department finds that an interested party failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with the request for information. See, e.g., *Bicycles*, 61 FR at 19028; *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From the Russian Federation*, 65 FR 5510, 5518 (Feb. 4, 2000). MOFCOM was notified in the Department's questionnaire that failure to submit the requested information by the date specified might result in use of FA. The producers/exporters that decided not to respond to the Department's questionnaire failed to act to the best of their ability in this investigation. Absent a response, we must presume government control of these companies. The Department has determined, therefore, that in selecting from among the facts otherwise available an adverse inference pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act is warranted.

In accordance with our standard practice, as AFA, we are assigning as the PRC-wide rate the higher of: (1) The highest margin stated in the notice of initiation (*i.e.*, the recalculated petition margin); or (2) the highest margin calculated for any respondent in this investigation. See, e.g., *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from the People's Republic of China*, 65 FR 34660 (May 31, 2000) and accompanying decision memorandum at *Comment 1*. In this case, the preliminary AFA margin is 78.45 percent, which is the highest margin stated in the notice of initiation. See *Initiation Notice*, 68 FR at 32016.

Corroboration of Information

Section 776(b) of the Act authorizes the Department to use AFA information derived from the petition, the final determination from the LTFV investigation, a previous administrative review, or any other information placed on the record.

Section 776(c) of the Act requires the Department to corroborate, to the extent practicable, secondary information used as FA. Secondary information is defined as "[i]nformation derived from the petition that gave rise to the investigation or review, the final determination concerning the subject merchandise, or any previous review