

EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATIONS ON ADEQUACY

in

Silicon Metal from Argentina, Brazil, and China, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-470-472 (Review)
and
Silicomanganese from Brazil, China, and Ukraine, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-671-673 (Review)

On February 3, 2000, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(5)). The Commission, in consultation with the Department of Commerce, grouped these reviews because they involve similar domestic like products. *See* 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(5)(D); 63 *Fed. Reg.* 29372, 29374 (May 29, 1998).

***Silicon Metal from Argentina, Brazil, and China*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-470-472 (Review)**

With respect to *Silicon Metal from Argentina* and *Silicon Metal from Brazil*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-470-471 (Review), the Commission determined that both domestic and respondent interested party group responses to the notice of institution were adequate and voted to conduct full reviews. As pertains to domestic interested parties, the Commission received a joint response containing company-specific information on behalf of three domestic producers of silicon metal accounting for the majority of U.S. production of silicon metal, as well as a response from unions representing all silicon metal workers in the United States. As pertains to respondent interested parties, the Commission received responses from the sole Argentine producer of silicon metal as well as from six Brazilian producers and exporters accounting for nearly all Brazilian production and exports to the United States. The Commission also received responses from an importer and end user of silicon metal from Brazil and from a Brazilian trade/business association, seven of whose 19 members are Brazilian producers and exporters of silicon metal.

With respect to *Silicon Metal from China*, Inv. No. 731-TA-472 (Review), the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate. The Commission received a joint response containing company-specific information on behalf of three domestic producers of silicon metal accounting for the majority of U.S. production of silicon metal, as well as a response from unions representing all silicon metal workers in the United States. Because no respondent interested party responded to the notice of institution, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission further determined to conduct a full review, however, because conducting a full review would promote administrative efficiency in light of the Commission's decision to conduct full reviews with respect to *Silicon Metal from Argentina* and *Silicon Metal from Brazil*.

***Silicomanganese from Brazil, China, and Ukraine*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-671-673 (Review)**

With regard to *Silicomanganese from Brazil* and *Silicomanganese from Ukraine*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-671 and 673 (Review), the Commission determined that both domestic and respondent interested party group responses to the notice of institution were adequate and voted to conduct full reviews. Regarding domestic interested parties, the Commission received a response from the sole domestic producer of silicomanganese and the union representing silicomanganese workers in the United States. Regarding respondent interested parties, the Commission received responses from two Brazilian producers that account for a substantial portion of Brazilian production and nearly all subject imports,

and Ukrainian producers accounting for all Ukrainian production. The Commission also received responses from the Ukraine Ministry of Industrial Policy and from Ronly Holdings, Ltd., an exporter of subject merchandise from Ukraine.

With regard to *Silicomanganese from China*, Inv. No. 731-TA-672 (Review), the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate. The Commission received a response from the sole domestic producer of silicomanganese and the union representing silicomanganese workers in the United States. Because no respondent interested party responded to the notice of institution, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission further determined to conduct a full review, however, because conducting a full review would promote administrative efficiency in light of the Commission's decision to conduct full reviews with respect to *Silicomanganese from Brazil* and *Silicomanganese from Ukraine*.