

2003 and August 6, 2003; Dai Nippon Printing Company, Ltd., on August 5, 2003; and Brother International Corporation, on August 6, 2003. On August 28, 2003, the Department issued a letter to interested parties in which it clarified its model match criteria. On October 9, 2003, the Department met with petitioner's counsel to discuss its model match comments. *See* Memorandum to the file dated October 10, 2003 on file in room B-099 of the Department of Commerce building.

On August 1, 2003, the Department issued section A of its questionnaire to ITW. On August 8, 2003, the Department issued sections B, C and E of its questionnaire, including model match criteria. On September 5, 2003, ITW submitted its section A response. On September 8, 2003, ITW submitted a supplemental section A response, consisting of the section A response of an affiliated U.S. reseller (Reseller 1).<sup>2</sup> We received ITW's sections B, C, and E responses on September 24, 2003. ITW also submitted on September 24, 2003, a supplemental section C response consisting of the section C response of Reseller 1.

On October 1, 2003 the Department returned ITW's section A response to ITW with a request that it rebracket numerous sections of the response because the Department determined that numerous portions of its submission for which ITW had requested proprietary treatment did not merit proprietary treatment. ITW submitted a rebracketed section A response on October 8, 2003. On November 12, 2003 the Department returned ITW's sections B, C, and E responses and its supplemental sections A and C responses (*i.e.*, the responses of Reseller 1) with a request that it rebracket portions of those submissions because the Department determined that numerous portions for which ITW had requested proprietary treatment did not merit proprietary treatment. ITW submitted rebracketed versions on November 20, 2003.

On November 3, 2003 the Department requested that ITW submit an additional section B response in order to report all of its home market sales of slit TTR. (In its September 24, 2003 section B response ITW had submitted only its home market sales of jumbo roll TTR.) Also on November 3, 2003 the Department requested that ITW submit section C responses from two additional affiliated U.S. resellers (Reseller 2 and Reseller 3). (The actual names of these resellers are business proprietary

information.) We received all three of these responses on November 21, 2003.

On October 15, 2003 petitioner made a submission alleging that ITW had made sales in its home market below their cost of production, and requested that the Department initiate a below-cost investigation of ITW's home market sales. On October 29, 2003 the Department requested that petitioner revise its cost allegation. *See* Memorandum from Laurens van Houten to the File dated October 29, 2003, on file in room B-099 of the Department of Commerce building. On November 5, 2003 petitioner submitted a revised cost allegation. The Department initiated a below-cost sales investigation on November 19, 2003. *See* Memorandum from Neal Halper to Richard Weible dated November 19, 2003 on file in room B-099 of the Department of Commerce building. On November 20, 2003 the Department requested that ITW respond to section D of the Department's August 8, 2003 questionnaire. The due date for ITW's section D response is now December 16, 2003.

On September 30, 2003, we received comments from petitioner about ITW's and Reseller 1's section A responses. On November 7, 2003, we received comments from petitioner concerning ITW's and Reseller 1's section C responses, and ITW's sections B and E responses. On November 28, 2003, the Department issued to ITW a supplemental questionnaire concerning its section E response. ITW's response to this supplemental questionnaire is due December 18, 2003. On December 1, 2003, the Department issued to ITW a supplemental questionnaire about its sections A, B, and C responses and Reseller 1's sections A and C responses. ITW's response to this supplemental questionnaire is due December 22, 2003. On December 8, 2003 petitioner submitted additional comments concerning the proper calculation of ITW's dumping margin in the preliminary determination. ITW responded to petitioner's comments in a submission dated December 10, 2003.

On October 3, 2003, the petitioner made a timely request for a forty-day postponement of the preliminary determination pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act. On October 21, 2003, we postponed the preliminary determination until no later than December 16, 2003. *See Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbons from France, Japan, and the Republic of Korea; Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations in Antidumping Duty Investigations*, 68 FR 60085 (October 21, 2003).

## Selection of Respondents

Section 777A(c)(1) of the Tariff Act directs the Department to calculate individual dumping margins for each known exporter and producer of the subject merchandise. Where it is not practicable to examine all known producers/exporters of subject merchandise, section 777A(c)(2) of the Tariff Act permits the Department to investigate either: (1) A sample of exporters, producers, or types of products that is statistically valid, based on the information available at the time of selection; or (2) exporters and producers accounting for the largest volume of the subject merchandise that can reasonably be examined.

During the period of investigation (POI), only ITW was identified as a producer/exporter of subject merchandise from Korea. Therefore, we selected ITW as the sole respondent in the investigation of TTR from Korea.

## Period of Investigation

The POI is April 1, 2002, through March 31, 2003. This period corresponds to the four most recently completed fiscal quarters as of the month prior to the month of filing of the petition (*i.e.*, June 2003) involving imports from a market economy, and is in accordance with our regulations. *See* 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1).

## Scope of Investigation

This investigation covers wax and wax/resin thermal transfer ribbons (TTR), in slit or unslit ("jumbo") form originating from Korea with a total wax (natural or synthetic) content of all the image side layers, that transfer in whole or in part, of equal to or greater than 20 percent by weight and a wax content of the colorant layer of equal to or greater than 10 percent by weight, and a black color as defined by industry standards by the CIELAB (International Commission on Illumination) color specification such that  $L^* < 35$ ,  $-20 < a^* < 35$  and  $-40 < b^* < 31$ , and black and near-black TTR. TTR is typically used in printers generating alphanumeric and machine-readable characters, such as bar codes and facsimile machines.

The petition does not cover pure resin TTR, and finished thermal transfer ribbons with a width greater than 212 millimeters (mm), but not greater than 220 mm (or 8.35 to 8.66 inches) and a length of 230 meters (m) or less (*i.e.*, slit fax TTR, including cassetted TTR), and ribbons with a magnetic content of greater than or equal to 45 percent, by weight, in the colorant layer. The merchandise subject to this

<sup>2</sup> The actual name of this reseller has been afforded treatment as business proprietary information.