

of the subject merchandise are fundamental and are more than simply minor variations on a theme.

54 Fed. Reg. at 19002. In the present cases, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the differences between pipe over 2 inches in outside diameter and 2 inches or less in outside diameter, rise to the level of a class or kind distinction.

Furthermore, with regard to Siderca's allegation that a two-inch breakpoint is widely recognized in the U.S. market for seamless pipe, the Department has found only one technical source of U.S. market data for seamless pipe, the *Preston Pipe Report*, which routinely collects and publishes U.S. market data for this merchandise, publishes shipment data for the size ranges $\frac{1}{2}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches: it does not recognize a break point at 2 inches. Accordingly, the Department does not agree with Siderca that "the U.S. market" recognizes 2 inches as a physical boundary line for the subject merchandise.

In these present cases, therefore, the Department finds that there is insufficient evidence that any physical differences between pipe over 2 inches in outside diameter and 2 inches or less in outside diameter, or between carbon and alloy steel, rise to the level of class or kind distinctions.

2. Ultimate Use and Purchaser Expectations

We find no evidence that pipe above and below two inches is used exclusively in any specific applications. Rather, the record indicates that there are overlapping applications. For example, pipe above and below two inches may both be used as line and pressure pipe. The technical definitions for line and pressure pipe provided by ASTM, AISI, and a variety of other sources do not recognize a distinction between pipe over and under two inches.

Likewise, despite the fact that alloy grade steels are associated with enhanced heat and pressure tolerances, there is no evidence that the carbon or alloy content of the subject merchandise can be differentiated in the ultimate use or expectations of the ultimate purchaser of seamless pipe.

3. Channels of Trade

Based on information supplied by the parties, we determine that the vast majority of the subject merchandise is sold through the same channel of distribution in the United States and is triple-stenciled in order to meet the greatest number of applications.

Accordingly, the channels of trade offer no basis for dividing the subject merchandise into multiple classes or kinds based on either the size of the outside diameter or on pipe having a carbon or alloy content.

4. Cost

Based on the evidence on the record, we find that cost differences between the various products do exist. However, the parties varied considerably in the factors which they characterized as most significant in terms of affecting cost. There is no evidence that the size ranges above and below two inches, and the difference between carbon and alloy grade steels, form a break point in cost which would support a finding of separate classes or kinds.

In conclusion, while we recognize that certain differences do exist between the products in the proposed class or kind of merchandise, we find that the similarities significantly outweigh any differences. Therefore, for purposes of the final determination, we will continue to consider the scope as constituting one class or kind of merchandise.

C. Miscellaneous Scope Clarification Issues and Exclusion Requests

The miscellaneous scope issues include: (1) whether OCTG and unfinished OCTG are excluded from the scope of these investigations; (2) whether pipes produced to non-standard wall thicknesses (commonly referred to as "tubes") are covered by the scope; (3) whether certain merchandise (e.g., boiler tubing, mechanical tubing) produced to a specification listed in the scope but used in an application excluded from the scope is covered by the scope; and (4) whether redraw hollows used for cold drawing are excluded from the scope. For a complete discussion of interested party comments and the Department's analysis on these topics, see June 12, 1995, *Additional Scope Clarifications Decision Memorandum* from DAS to AS.

Regarding OCTG, petitioner requested that OCTG and unfinished OCTG be included within the scope of these investigations if used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application. However, OCTG and unfinished OCTG, even when used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, may come within the scope of certain separate, concurrent investigations. We intend that merchandise from a particular country not be classified simultaneously as subject to both an OCTG order and a seamless pipe order. Thus, to eliminate any confusion, we have

revised the scope language above to exclude finished and unfinished OCTG, if covered by the scope of another antidumping duty order from the same country. If not covered by such an OCTG order, finished and unfinished OCTG are included in this scope when used in a standard, line or pressure pipe application, and, as with other non-listed specifications, may be subject to end-use certification if there is evidence of substitution. Regarding pipe produced in non-standard wall thicknesses, we determine that these products are clearly within the parameters of the scope of these investigations. For clarification purposes, we note that the physical parameters of the scope include all seamless carbon and alloy steel pipes, of circular cross-section, not more than 4.5 inches in outside diameter, *regardless of wall thickness*. Therefore, the fact that such products may be referred to as tubes by some parties, and may be multiple-stenciled, does not render them outside the scope.

Regarding pipe produced to a covered specification but used in a non-covered application, we determine that these products are within the scope. We agree with the petitioner that the scope of this investigation includes all merchandise produced to the covered specifications and meeting the physical parameters of the scope, regardless of application. The end-use criteria included in the scope is only applicable to products which can be substituted in the applications to which the covered specifications are put *i.e.* standard, line, and pressure applications.

It is apparent that at least one party in this case interpreted the scope incorrectly. Therefore, we have clarified the scope to make it more explicit that all products made to ASTM A-335, ASTM A-106, ASTM A-53 and API 5L are covered, regardless of end use.

With respect to redraw hollows for cold drawing, the scope language excludes such products specifically when used in the production of cold-drawn pipe or tube. We understand that petitioner included this exclusion language expressly and intentionally to ensure that hollows imported into the United States are sold as intermediate products, not as merchandise to be used in a covered application.

Standing

The Argentine, Brazilian, and German respondents have challenged the standing of Gulf States Tube to file the petition with respect to pipe and tube between 2.0 and 4.5 inches in outside diameter, arguing that Gulf States Tube does not produce these products.