

International Corporation, on August 5, 2003. On August 8, 2003, the Department issued its model match criteria via sections B and C of the questionnaire (refer to below). On August 28, 2003, the Department clarified its model match criteria. On September 4, 2003, the Petitioner submitted additional comments regarding model match criteria. On October 9, 2003, the Department met with the Petitioner's counsel to discuss its model match comments.

On July 28, 2003 and July 30, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments regarding the scope of the investigation. On August 7, 2003, General Company Limited, an interested party, submitted comments regarding the scope of the investigation. On September 2, 2003, the Petitioner submitted a "test" description to the Department, for the purpose of determining whether a product should be classified as a wax, resin enhanced wax, or wax/resin ribbon. On September 9, 2003, Armor submitted comments on the Petitioner's September 2 test proposal. On September 11, 2003, the Department issued a clarification to the scope of this investigation. See *Memorandum from Edward C. Yang, Office Director to Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary; Antidumping Investigation on Certain Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbon from France, Japan and Korea: Scope Clarification*. The Department removed the word "pure" from the section discussing the exclusion of resin TTR in the scope language.

On November 4, 2003, the Petitioner submitted a letter to the Department correcting a typographical error in the color specification of the scope, as written in the petition and initiation notice: " $-20 > a^* < 35$ " should read, " $-20 < a^* < 35$ ".

On August 1, 2003, the Department issued section A of its questionnaire to UC and DNP. On August 18, 2003, UC informed the Department that it declined to respond to the questionnaire. On August 7, 2003, the Department, pursuant to DNP's request, extended its deadline for responding to section A of the questionnaire, to September 5. On September 5, 2003, the Department received a response to section A of its questionnaire. On September 15, 2003, the Department received a revised quantity and value chart, pursuant to the Department's September 11, 2003 scope ruling. On September 22, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments on DNP's response to section A of the questionnaire.

On September 24, 2003, the Department issued its first supplemental section A questionnaire to DNP. On

October 7, 2003, the Department extended the deadline for certain questions in the first supplemental section A questionnaire to October 8, 2003, and the remaining questions to October 10, 2003, at DNP's request. On October 8, 2003 and October 10, 2003, the Department received responses to the first supplemental section A questionnaire. On October 14, 2003, the Department requested DNP to respond to 28 questions from the first supplemental section A questionnaire it had failed to answer in full in its October 8, 2003 and October 10, 2003 responses. On October 17, 2003, the Department received a response to the 28 questions from the first supplemental section A questionnaire.

On September 26, 2003, the Department issued its second supplemental A questionnaire to DNP. On October 3, 2003, the Department received a response to the second supplemental A questionnaire. On October 7, 2003, the Department also requested that DNP provide a complete response to its September 26, 2003, second supplemental A questionnaire. On October 8, 2003, the Department received a response to its October 7, 2003 request.

On October 10, 2003, the Department issued its third supplemental A questionnaire to DNP. On October 15, 2003, the Department received a response to the third supplemental A questionnaire.

On August 8, 2003, the Department issued sections B through E of its questionnaire to UC and DNP. On August 14, 2003, the Department, pursuant to DNP's request, extended its deadline for responding to sections B through E of the questionnaire, to September 22, 2003. On September 17, 2003, the Department again extended the deadlines for sections B through E to September 23 for Section B, and September 25 for sections C and E, again at DNP's request. On September 23, 2003, the Department received a response to section B and on September 25, 2003, the Department received a response to sections C and E of the questionnaire. On October 3, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments on DNP's response to section B of the questionnaire. On October 6, 2003, the Department rejected DNP's September 24, 2003 section B response and September 26, 2003 sections C and E responses in accordance with section 777(b)(1)(B) of the Act. On October 8, 2003, DNP resubmitted its responses to sections B, C, and E of the questionnaire. On October 10, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments on DNP's response to section C of the

questionnaire. On October 17, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments on DNP's response to section E of the questionnaire.

On October 21, 2003, the Department issued its supplemental B questionnaire to DNP based on DNP's October 8, 2003 third country sales response. On October 23, 2003, the Department issued its supplemental C questionnaire to DNP. On November 3, 2003, the Department issued its supplemental E questionnaire to DNP.

On September 26, 2003, the Department requested a Section B response based on DNP's Japanese home market sales of merchandise under investigation. On October 6, 2003, the Department extended the deadline for filing market viability allegations, at the Petitioner's request. On October 10, 2003, DNP requested the Department rescind its request for a Section B response based on DNP's Japanese home market sales of merchandise under investigation. On October 14, 2003, the Department extended the deadline for DNP's Section B response based on its Japanese home market sales to October 23, 2003, at DNP's request. On October 20, 2003, the Petitioner submitted comments on DNP's home market viability. On October 21, DNP submitted comments on home market viability and again requested the Department rescind its request for a Section B response based on DNP's Japanese home market sales of merchandise under investigation. On October 23, 2003, the Department again extended the deadline for DNP's Section B response based on its Japanese home market sales to November 3, 2003, again at DNP's request.

On September 12, 2003, the Department issued its positions on Armor's cost reporting issues, which we released to DNP. See *Memorandum from Cheryl Werner, Case Analyst through James C. Doyle, Program Manager, to the File; Antidumping Duty Investigation of Certain Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbons ("TTR") from Japan: Clarification of Cost Reporting*, dated September 29, 2003 ("*Cost Clarification Memorandum*"). In the *Cost Clarification Memorandum*, the Department stated that in the event of a sales below cost allegation for DNP's merchandise under investigation, DNP would be subject to the clarifications in reporting of cost information discussed in this letter. *Id.* On October 14, 2003, the Petitioner alleged that DNP's third country sales were made at prices below DNP's cost of production.

On November 3, 2003, DNP declined the opportunity to respond to the