




UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
Washington, D.C. 20230

A-533-808
Sunset Review
Public Document
O5: DR

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

FROM: Christian Marsh 
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Sunset
Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Stainless Steel
Wire Rods from India

SUMMARY:

We have analyzed the substantive responses of the interested parties in the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods (wire rods) from India. We recommend that you approve the positions developed in the *Discussion of the Issues* section of this memorandum. Below is a complete list of the issues in this sunset review for which we received substantive responses:

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping
2. Magnitude of the margin likely to prevail

History of the Order

On October 20, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final affirmative determination of sales at less than fair value (LTFV) in the *Federal Register* with respect to imports of wire rods from India.¹ In the final determination, the Department found the following antidumping duty margins:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)</u>
Mukand Ltd.	48.80
Sunstar Metals Ltd.	48.80
Grand Foundry Ltd.	48.80
All Others	48.80

¹ *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India*, 58 FR 54110 (October 20, 1993).



Following the publication of the Department's final determination, the International Trade Commission (ITC) found that the U.S. industry was materially injured by reason of the imports of subject merchandise.² On December 1, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India (the order).³

Administrative Reviews and New Shipper Reviews

Since the publication of the antidumping duty order, the Department has completed seven administrative reviews and three new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India.⁴

Since the publication of the 2005 sunset review results,⁵ the Department initiated but later rescinded the *2004/2005 Review*,⁶ completed the *Eighth Administrative Review*, and completed the *2005/2006 New Shipper Review*. The Department found in both the *Eighth Administrative Review* and the *2005/2006 New Shipper Review* that producers/exporters of the subject merchandise continue to dump in the United States at levels exceeding *de minimis*.

Deposit rates remain in effect for imports of subject merchandise from India.

Duty-Absorption Findings, Changed-Circumstances Reviews, Scope Inquiries

There have been no duty-absorption findings concerning the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India.

There has been one changed-circumstances review.⁷

² *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India*, 58 FR 63394 (December 1, 1993).

³ *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India*, 58 FR 63335 (December 1, 1993).

⁴ *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Final Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 38976 (July 21, 1997); *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative and New Shipper Reviews*, 64 FR 856 (January 6, 1999); *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 65 FR 31302 (May 17, 2000); *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 37391 (May 29, 2002); *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 26288 (May 15, 2003), amended in *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Notice of Amended Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 38301 (June 27, 2003); *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 29923 (May 26, 2004); *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination to Revoke Order in Part*, 70 FR 40318 (July 13, 2005), amended in *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 47177 (August 12, 2005); *Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part*, 72 FR 68123 (December 4, 2007) (*Eighth Administrative Review*); *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New-Shipper Review*, 73 FR 4828 (January 28, 2008) (*2005/2006 New Shipper Review*).

⁵ *Stainless Steel Wire Rods from Brazil, France, and India; Notice of Final Results of Five-year (Sunset) Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 70 FR 67447 (November 7, 2005) (*2005 Sunset Review*).

⁶ See *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 40696 (July 18, 2006) (*2004/2005 Review*).

⁷ *Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India: Final Results of Changed-Circumstances Antidumping Duty Review*, 73 FR 65832 (November 5, 2008).

There have been two scope rulings with respect to wire rods from India.⁸

Sunset Reviews

The Department has conducted two sunset reviews of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and found in both reviews that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigation.⁹ The ITC determined, pursuant to Section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.¹⁰ Following the publication of the ITC's determinations, the Department published continuation notices of the order.¹¹

On July 1, 2011, the Department published the notice of initiation of the third sunset review of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 76 FR 38613 (July 1, 2011) (*Notice of Initiation*). The Department received a notice of intent to participate on behalf of Carpenter Technology Corporation (the petitioner), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i) (Sunset Regulation). The petitioner claimed interested-party status under Section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a manufacturer of a domestic-like product in the United States.

On August 1, 2011, the Department received a complete substantive response to the *Notice of Initiation* from the petitioner within the 30-day period specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department received no substantive responses from respondent interested parties. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act, the Department is conducting an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India.

Discussion of the Issues

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order. In addition, section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the Department shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Below

⁸ *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 70 FR 41374 (July 19, 2005); *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 70 FR 55110 (September 20, 2005).

⁹ *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India*, 65 FR 5315 (February 3, 2000); *2005 Sunset Review*.

¹⁰ *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, France, India, and Spain*, 65 FR 45409 (July 21, 2000); *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, France, and India*, 71 FR 42118 (July 25, 2006).

¹¹ *Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders: Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, France, and India*, 65 FR 47403 (August 2, 2000); *Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India*, 71 FR 45023 (August 8, 2006).

we address the comments of the interested party, which were submitted in its August 1, 2011, substantive response.

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Interested-Party Comments

The petitioner argues that revocation of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by the manufacturers/producers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

The petitioner cites section 752(c)(1) of the Act, which instructs the Department to determine whether revocation of an antidumping duty order would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by considering the weighted-average margins determined in the investigation and reviews, and by considering the volume of imports of subject merchandise prior to and following issuance of the order. The petitioner also refers to *Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) (*Policy Bulletin*), quoting the Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (*SAA*), H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994) at 889, which explains that declining import volumes accompanied by continued dumping following issuance of an order may indicate that dumping would be likely to continue absent an order, because information would indicate that the exporter would need to dump to sell at pre-order volumes. Additionally, the petitioner continues, the *Policy Bulletin* explains that existence of dumping following implementation of an order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping as companies that dump with an order in place would likely continue dumping were the order removed. Thus, the petitioner maintains, citing *SAA* at 890, the Department will normally determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping where:

- (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after issuance of an order;
- (b) imports of subject merchandise ceased following issuance of an order;
- (c) dumping was eliminated following issuance of an order but import volumes declined.

The petitioner states that, with the sole exception of Viraj, which was revoked from the order in 2005, Indian producers/exporters have continued to dump subject merchandise in the United States. Specifically, the petitioner asserts that dumping margins above *de minimis* continue to exist for all Indian producers/exporters still subject to the order. According to the petitioner, the continued existence of margins above *de minimis* is a sufficient basis for the Department to conclude that dumping is likely to continue were the order revoked as a result of this sunset review, citing *Policy Bulletin* at 18872.

Additionally, the petitioner explains, the imposition of the antidumping duty order resulted in dramatic reductions in the import volume of subject merchandise. The petitioner provides a chart demonstrating import volumes between 1990 (three years prior to imposition of the order), and 2011 which, according to the petitioner, was derived from the Department's official import

statistics. The petitioner contends that the import statistics illustrate that during the most recent sunset review period (2006-2010), imports remain at an average of just 18 percent of the pre-order peak level in 1992. Thus, the petitioner asserts, the decline and low import volume demonstrate that Indian respondents are not able to sell subject wire rods at pre-order volumes under the discipline of the order.

Accordingly, the petitioner contends, in light of continued existence of dumping margins and the decline in imports on wire rods from India following imposition of the order, the Department should again conclude that dumping is likely to continue or recur were the order revoked, consistent with the previously completed sunset reviews.

Department's Position:

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically the SAA, the House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1, (1994) (House Report), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (Senate Report), the Department's determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis for each case.¹² In addition, the Department will normally determine that the revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping if one or more of the following factors are met: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the orders; (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the orders; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the orders and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.¹³ In addition, pursuant to section 752(c)(1)(B) of the Act, in order to determine whether revocation of an antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to a continuation of dumping, the Department considers the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order.

The Department did not receive any substantive response from any respondent interested party pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3). Accordingly, the Department finds that respondent interested parties have decided not to participate in the Department's sunset review.

Pursuant to sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act, the Department considered the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and the subsequent reviews, and import volumes of subject merchandise both prior to and following implementation of the antidumping duty order.

¹² See SAA at 879 and House Report. See also *Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review*, 74 FR 4138 (January 23, 2009), and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1, and *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 65832 (November 5, 2008), and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1 (*Crawfish Tail Meat – PRC*).

¹³ See SAA at 889-890, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52. See also *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 74 FR 5819 (February 2, 2009), and the accompanying Issues & Decision Memorandum at 3, *Crawfish Tail Meat – PRC*, and *Folding Gift Boxes from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 16765 (April 5, 2007), and the accompanying Issues & Decision Memorandum at 5.

The record of the proceeding demonstrates that dumping has persisted since the issuance of the order. Since the publication of the order, the Department has conducted several administrative reviews for subject merchandise from India. In general, with the exception of Viraj, the Department found that dumping has continued at margins exceeding *de minimis*, including during the period since the last sunset review. See *Eighth Administrative Review* and *2005/2006 New Shipper Review*. Using statistics derived from the Global Trade Atlas, the Department also finds that imports of wire rods from India remain significantly below pre-order levels. See Attachment. Since the last sunset review, the total import volume averaged 724,424 kilograms per year. In the years leading up to implementation of the order, imports of wire rods from India totaled 1,570,510 kilograms (1991), 3,942,855 kilograms (1992), and 3,403,285 kilograms (1993, the year in which the order was imposed), which averages 2,972,217 kilograms per year. *Id.* Thus, because dumping of the subject merchandise continues at margins above *de minimis*, because import volumes remain at significantly lower levels than the pre-order volumes, and because no party argued or submitted any evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the order is revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail

Interested-Party Comments

Citing the Department's *Policy Bulletin*, the petitioner explains that the Department normally will report to the ITC the company-specific antidumping duty margins that were determined in the original investigation because, the petitioner maintains, those margins best represent the behavior of these producers and exporters in the absence of an antidumping duty order. Thus, the petitioner requests that the Department report the antidumping duty margins for wire rods from India as follows:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)</u>
Mukand Ltd.	48.80
Sunstar Metals Ltd.	48.80
Grand Foundry Ltd.	48.80
All Others	48.80

Department's Position:

Section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the Department will report to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if an order were revoked. The Department will normally provide to the ITC the company-specific margin from the investigation for each company. See SAA at 890 and *Eveready Battery Co., Inc. v. United States*, 77 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1333 n.9 (CIT 1999). For companies not investigated specifically or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the all-others rate from the investigation. See *Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine; Final Results of Expedited Sunset*

Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 71 FR 70506 (December 5, 2006), and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2”.

The Department’s preference for selecting a margin from the investigation is based on the fact that it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order. *Id.*; see SAA at 890 and House Report at 64. Under certain circumstances, the Department may select a more recently calculated margin to report to the ITC. See section 752(c)(3) of the Act and *Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide From the Netherlands*, 65 FR 65294 (November 1, 2000), and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at “Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail,” Comment 3 (citing SAA at 890-91 and House Report at 64).

The Department does not find any indication that the margins calculated in subsequent reviews of the order on wire rods from India are more probative of behaviors of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of the order. Given the absence of argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department finds that the margins calculated in the original investigation are probative of the behavior of producers and exporters of subject merchandise from India if the order is revoked. Consistent with section 752(c)(3) of the Act, the Department will report to the ITC company-specific and all-others rates from the investigation as indicated in the “Final Results of Review” section of this memorandum.

Final Results of Review

The Department determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on wire rods from India would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)</u>
Mukand Ltd.	48.80
Sunstar Metals Ltd.	48.80
Grand Foundry Ltd.	48.80
All Others	48.80

Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the substantive response received, we recommend adopting all of the above positions. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the final results of this review in the *Federal Register*, and notify the ITC of our determination.

Agree ✓

Disagree _____

Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

10/26/2011
Date

Attachment

Value

Quantity

Unit Price

Qty & Val

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 1993 - 1995

Annual		Dec	1995	HS: 7221					
Rank	Partner Country	Unit	1993	Quantity 1994	1995	% Share			% Change
						1993	1994	1995	1995/1994
	World	KC	38,666,090	49,038,329	53,420,284	100.0	100.0	100.0	8.94
1	Korea, South	KC	2,765,511	8,157,017	10,330,449	7.15	16.63	19.34	26.64
2	Taiwan	KC	4,353,310	7,998,234	9,242,097	11.26	16.31	17.30	15.55
3	Italy	KC	4,138,323	7,893,994	8,987,339	10.70	16.10	16.82	13.85
4	Sweden	KC	5,482,802	6,109,990	6,990,525	14.18	12.46	13.09	14.41
5	Japan	KC	6,037,868	6,400,210	5,799,099	15.62	13.05	10.86	- 9.39
6	France	KC	6,204,507	5,365,524	3,636,861	16.05	10.94	6.81	- 32.22
7	Spain	KC	4,238,068	3,008,086	2,518,750	10.96	6.13	4.71	- 16.27
8	United Kingdom	KC	1,026,314	1,470,285	2,261,854	2.65	3.00	4.23	53.84
9	Germany	KC	171,361	2,471,853	1,876,200	0.44	5.04	3.51	- 24.10
10	Russia	KC	0	0	1,021,111	0.00	0.00	1.91	
11	Canada	KC	1,630	18,983	357,324	0.00	0.04	0.67	1782.34
12	Poland	KC	0	12,794	129,925	0.00	0.03	0.24	915.52
13	China	KC	0	0	125,717	0.00	0.00	0.24	
14	Czech Republic	KC	0	0	74,483	0.00	0.00	0.14	
15	India	KC	3,403,285	19,010	46,179	8.80	0.04	0.09	142.92
16	Netherlands	KC	3,932	16,181	16,147	0.01	0.03	0.03	- 0.21
17	Mexico	KC	858	0	4,046	0.00	0.00	0.01	
18	Austria	KC	0	202	2,178	0.00	0.00	0.00	978.22
19	Belgium	KC	0	68,486	0	0.00	0.14	0.00	100.00
20	Brazil	KC	825,891	14,550	0	2.14	0.03	0.00	100.00
21	Singapore	KC	0	12,930	0	0.00	0.03	0.00	100.00
22	Slovenia	KC	11,636	0	0	0.03	0.00	0.00	
23	South Africa	KC	794	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value

Quantity


Unit Price

Qty & Val

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 1996 - 1998

Annual Dec 1998 

Rank	Partner Country	Unit	Quantity		
			1996	1997	1998
	World	KG	59,093,553	74,690,116	54,477,572 1
1	Taiwan	KG	12,085,446	20,247,179	16,024,398
2	Korea, South	KG	9,621,094	11,974,581	11,761,872
3	Sweden	KG	8,741,824	6,464,338	6,751,058
4	Italy	KG	8,290,038	7,877,635	5,158,550
5	France	KG	2,832,535	2,860,575	4,873,506
6	United Kingdom	KG	1,584,916	2,140,585	4,009,564
7	Japan	KG	9,911,007	12,450,374	2,722,663
8	Spain	KG	2,533,004	4,349,038	1,699,194
9	Russia	KG	818,373	286,518	681,869
10	Germany	KG	2,084,349	5,542,596	411,221
11	Poland	KG	104,434	86,552	166,153
12	Latvia	KG	0	0	120,995
13	Netherlands	KG	35,679	32,498	37,576
14	China	KG	43,822	27	27,179
15	India	KG	1,842	212,616	21,832
16	New Zealand	KG	0	0	8,167
17	Trinidad & Tobago	KG	0	0	990
18	Canada	KG	241,355	3,223	500
19	Denmark	KG	0	0	285
20	Finland	KG	0	499	0
21	Czech Republic	KG	128,130	0	0
22	Australia	KG	7,071	0	0
23	Austria	KG	8,545	22,895	0
24	Belgium	KG	0	103,258	0
25	Thailand	KG	20,040	19,092	0
26	South Africa	KG	0	15,999	0
27	South Korea	KG	0	0	0


Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value	Quantity	Unit Price	Qty & Val
-------	----------	------------	-----------

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 1999 - 2001

Annual Dec 2001 

Rank	Partner Country	Unit	Quantity		
			1999	2000	2001
	World	KG	59,924,681	77,095,455	56,396,781
1	Taiwan	KG	19,030,293	18,876,520	12,355,932
2	France	KG	6,025,827	5,031,501	7,542,417
3	United Kingdom	KG	6,117,404	8,142,126	7,143,978
4	Italy	KG	5,482,666	12,335,829	6,928,784
5	Sweden	KG	6,868,086	7,093,338	6,555,685
6	Korea, South	KG	9,589,026	8,233,818	5,057,995
7	Spain	KG	4,292,557	3,629,005	4,231,355
8	India	KG	617,390	7,050,663	2,725,352
9	China	KG	76,699	1,926,790	1,244,859
10	Germany	KG	652,655	1,076,403	1,227,418
11	Japan	KG	1,079,814	945,109	875,516
12	Trinidad & Tobago	KG	5,050	222,295	478,286
13	Egypt	KG	0	0	17,272
14	Netherlands	KG	0	185	7,673
15	Israel	KG	0	1,396	3,230
16	New Zealand	KG	7,933	8,827	440
17	Russia	KG	16,850	0	370
18	Switzerland	KG	0	100	219
19	Mexico	KG	43,154	0	0
20	Thailand	KG	0	25,088	0
21	Slovenia	KG	0	19,035	0
22	Australia	KG	0	1,428	0
23	Austria	KG	1,566	829	0
24	Belgium	KG	14,326	3,037	0
25	Brazil	KG	0	2,433,928	0
26	Canada	KG	3,385	38,205	0

Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value

Quantity

Unit Price

Qty & Val

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 2002 - 2004

Annual		Dec	2004	HS: 7221					
Rank	Partner Country	Unit	Quantity			% Share		% Change	
			2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2004/2003
	World	KC	52,900,416	32,291,921	43,002,437	100.00	100.00	100.00	33.17
1	United Kingdom	KC	5,858,606	5,862,891	13,563,712	11.07	18.16	31.54	131.35
2	Taiwan	KC	12,118,867	4,225,919	10,890,488	22.91	13.09	25.33	157.71
3	Sweden	KC	3,985,132	4,062,051	4,396,081	7.53	12.58	10.22	8.22
4	China	KC	2,548,140	1,946,681	4,116,612	4.82	6.03	9.57	111.47
5	Italy	KC	6,714,330	4,106,203	3,335,701	12.69	12.72	7.76	- 18.76
6	Germany	KC	1,849,768	1,310,235	1,879,998	3.50	4.06	4.37	43.49
7	Korea, South	KC	4,066,058	1,303,201	1,798,433	7.69	4.04	4.18	38.00
8	France	KC	5,704,290	3,374,969	1,423,663	10.78	10.45	3.31	- 57.82
9	India	KC	3,980,628	2,038,579	1,162,887	7.52	6.31	2.70	- 42.96
10	Japan	KC	724,171	272,278	262,654	1.37	0.84	0.61	- 3.53
11	Austria	KC	7,213	17,108	111,217	0.01	0.05	0.26	550.09
12	Spain	KC	5,338,577	3,771,806	30,721	10.09	11.68	0.07	- 99.19
13	Netherlands	KC	1,263	0	11,205	0.00	0.00	0.03	
14	Canada	KC	65	0	8,689	0.00	0.00	0.02	
15	Brazil	KC	0	0	6,793	0.00	0.00	0.02	
16	United Arab Emirates	KC	0	0	2,794	0.00	0.00	0.01	
17	Latvia	KC	0	0	789	0.00	0.00	0.00	
18	Norway	KC	58	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	
19	Switzerland	KC	75	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	
20	Finland	KC	25	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	
21	Israel	KC	3,150	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.00	

Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value	Quantity	Unit Price	Qty & Val
-------	----------	------------	-----------

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 2005 - 2007

Annual		Dec	2007	HS: 7221					
Rank	Partner Country	Unit	2005	Quantity 2006	2007	% Share		% Change	
						2005	2006	2007	2007/2006
	World	KC	37,688,581	28,539,827	27,727,037	100.0	100.0	100.0	- 2.85
1	Taiwan	KC	11,019,480	7,642,690	7,949,315	29.24	26.78	28.67	4.01
2	United Kingdom	KC	7,686,701	6,963,223	7,182,189	20.40	24.40	25.90	3.14
3	China	KC	4,403,529	4,640,924	3,554,291	11.68	16.26	12.82	- 23.41
4	France	KC	1,586,804	2,111,543	3,014,596	4.21	7.40	10.87	42.77
5	Italy	KC	5,203,181	2,653,333	2,180,342	13.81	9.30	7.86	- 17.83
6	Sweden	KC	3,803,666	2,570,432	1,475,851	10.09	9.01	5.32	- 42.58
7	India	KC	252,409	621,414	1,277,539	0.67	2.18	4.61	105.59
8	Germany	KC	1,024,764	595,334	891,621	2.72	2.09	3.22	49.77
9	Japan	KC	216,697	233,281	103,611	0.57	0.82	0.37	- 55.59
10	Canada	KC	43,079	51,448	33,678	0.11	0.18	0.12	- 34.54
11	Belgium	KC	0	28,134	29,128	0.00	0.10	0.11	3.53
12	Korea, South	KC	2,382,439	349,664	21,994	6.32	1.23	0.08	- 93.71
13	Austria	KC	57,430	50,416	11,428	0.15	0.18	0.04	- 77.33
14	Mexico	KC	718	0	1,454	0.00	0.00	0.01	
15	Norway	KC	0	660	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	- 100.00
16	Russia	KC	518	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	
17	Spain	KC	7,166	18,408	0	0.02	0.06	0.00	- 100.00
18	Australia	KC	0	89	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	- 100.00
19	Finland	KC	0	8,834	0	0.00	0.03	0.00	- 100.00

Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value

Quantity

Unit Price

Qty & Val

USA Import Statistics**Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils****Calendar Year: 2008 - 2010**

Annual			Dec	2010	HS: 7221				
Rank	Partner Country	Unit	Quantity			% Share		% Change	
			2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2010/2009
	World	KC	27,110,424	13,091,846	22,054,775	100.0	100.0	100.0	68.46
1	Taiwan	KC	6,709,218	4,778,783	7,567,467	24.75	36.50	34.31	58.36
2	United Kingdom	KC	6,805,271	3,608,410	5,613,919	25.10	27.56	25.45	55.58
3	France	KC	4,199,535	1,351,695	3,411,968	15.49	10.32	15.47	152.42
4	Sweden	KC	2,140,010	1,805,293	2,437,933	7.89	13.79	11.05	35.04
5	China	KC	4,043,868	842,508	1,681,687	14.92	6.44	7.63	99.60
6	Italy	KC	1,076,413	236,406	597,444	3.97	1.81	2.71	152.72
7	India	KC	1,015,355	247,054	460,759	3.75	1.89	2.09	86.50
8	Germany	KC	955,547	137,098	102,484	3.52	1.05	0.46	- 25.25
9	Canada	KC	40,463	63,402	79,866	0.15	0.48	0.36	25.97
10	Japan	KC	100,466	13,826	77,256	0.37	0.11	0.35	458.77
11	Austria	KC	24,278	7,371	17,093	0.09	0.06	0.08	131.90
12	Brazil	KC	0	0	4,817	0.00	0.00	0.02	
13	Korea, South	KC	0	0	1,800	0.00	0.00	0.01	
14	Mexico	KC	0	0	282	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Copyright GTIS, 2011

Value

Quantity

Unit Price

Qty & Val

USA Import Statistics

Commodity: 722100, Bars & Rods, Stainless Steel, Hot Rolled In Irregularly Wound Coils

Calendar Year: 1990 - 1992

Annual		Dec	1992	HS: 7221					
Rank	Partner Country	Unit	1990	Quantity 1991	1992	% Share 1990 1991 1992		% Change 1992/1991	
	World	KC	22,083,861	23,808,123	37,997,647	100.0	100.0	100.0	59.60
1	France	KC	4,124,589	5,047,194	10,103,308	18.68	21.20	26.59	100.18
2	Japan	KC	4,868,157	4,206,374	6,588,808	22.04	17.67	17.34	56.64
3	Sweden	KC	4,194,868	3,884,017	4,766,666	19.00	16.31	12.54	22.73
4	India	KC	88,129	1,570,510	3,942,855	0.40	6.60	10.38	151.06
5	Italy	KC	2,357,438	2,736,733	3,642,600	10.67	11.49	9.59	33.10
6	Spain	KC	3,170,857	3,001,542	3,632,032	14.36	12.61	9.56	21.01
7	Brazil	KC	1,866,408	1,515,803	3,055,572	8.45	6.37	8.04	101.58
8	Taiwan	KC	0	136,643	856,186	0.00	0.57	2.25	526.59
9	Korea, South	KC	799,023	1,463,126	776,963	3.62	6.15	2.04	- 46.90
10	United Kingdom	KC	166,775	108,962	499,399	0.76	0.46	1.31	358.32
11	Germany	KC	197,484	0	89,220	0.89	0.00	0.23	
12	Canada	KC	243,202	134,732	23,287	1.10	0.57	0.06	- 82.72
13	Netherlands	KC	6,852	0	19,068	0.03	0.00	0.05	
14	Mexico	KC	0	0	1,683	0.00	0.00	0.00	
15	Austria	KC	0	2,487	0	0.00	0.01	0.00	100.00
16	Ireland	KC	79	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Copyright GTIS, 2011