

In order to approximate this mark-up, we calculated the difference between the average short-term corporate borrowing rate in Italy and the average interest rate on short-term Italian government debt, for each year in which Dalmine received long-term lire loans or non-recurring grants from the government. We then added this mark-up to the Italian reference rate used in the preliminary determination to approximate an average long-term corporate benchmark interest rate. We also used these rates as the discount rates for allocating over time the benefit from non-recurring grants. See *Certain Steel Products from Spain*, 58 FR at 37376.

For long-term loans denominated in other currencies, we used, as the benchmark interest rate, an average long-term fixed interest rate for loans denominated in the same currency. (See section E—Article 54 Loans below.)

Calculation Methodology

For purposes of this determination, the period for which we are measuring subsidies (the POI) is calendar year 1993. In determining the benefits received under the various programs described below, we used the following calculation methodology. We first calculated the benefit attributable to the POI for each countervailable program, using the methodologies described in each program section below. For each program, we then divided the benefit attributable to Dalmine in the POI by Dalmine's total sales revenue, as none of the programs was limited to either certain subsidiaries or products of Dalmine. Next, we added the benefits for all programs, including the benefits for programs which were not allocated over time, to arrive at Dalmine's total subsidy rate. Because Dalmine is the only respondent company in this investigation, this rate is also the country-wide rate.

Based upon our analysis of the petition, the responses to our questionnaires, verification, and comments by interested parties, we determine the following:

I. Programs Determined To Be Countervailable

A. Benefits Provided Under Law 675/77

Law 675/77 was enacted to bring about restructuring and reconversion in the following industrial sectors: (1) electronic technology; (2) the manufacturing industry; (3) the agro-food industry; (4) the chemical industry; (5) the steel industry; (6) the pulp and paper industry; (7) the fashion sector; and (8) the automobile and aviation

sectors. Law 675/77 also sought to promote optimal exploitation of energy resources, and ecological and environmental recovery.

A primary goal of this legislation was to bring all government industrial assistance programs under a single law in order to develop a system to replace indiscriminate and random public intervention by the GOI. Other goals were (1) to reorganize and develop the industrial sector as a whole; (2) to increase employment in the South; and (3) to maintain employment in depressed areas. Among other measures taken, the Interministerial Committee for the Coordination of Industrial Policy ("CIPI") was created as a result of Law 675/77. CIPI approves individual projects in each of the industrial sectors listed above.

Six main programs were provided under Law 675/77: (1) interest contributions on bank loans; (2) mortgage loans provided by the Ministry of Industry at subsidized interest rates; (3) interest contributions on funds raised by bond issues; (4) capital grants for projects in the South; (5) personnel retraining grants; and (6) VAT reductions on purchases of capital goods by companies in the South. Dalmine reported that it received benefits under items (1), (2), and (5) above.

In its response, the GOI asserts that the steel and automobile industries did not receive a "disproportionate" share of benefits associated with interest contributions when the extent of investment in those industries is compared to the extent of investment in other industries. However, in keeping with past practice, we did not consider the level of investment in the individual industries receiving benefits under Law 675/77. Instead, we followed the analysis outlined in *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel From Italy (Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel)*, 59 FR 18357 (April 18, 1994), and *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products From Brazil*, 58 FR 37295, 37295 (July 9, 1993), of comparing the share of benefits received by the steel industry to the collective share of benefits provided to other users of the programs.

According to the information provided by the GOI, of the eight industrial sectors eligible for benefits under Law 675/77, the two dominant users of the interest contribution program were (1) the Italian auto industry which accounted for 34 percent of the benefits, and (2) the Italian steel industry which accounted for 33 percent of the benefits. Likewise,

with respect to the mortgage loans, the two dominant users were the auto and steel industries which received 45 percent and 31 percent of the benefits, respectively.

In light of the above evidence, we determine that the steel industry was a dominant user of both the interest contribution and the mortgage loan programs under Law 675/77. (See section 355.43(b)(2)(iii) of the *Proposed Regulations*). Therefore, we determine that benefits received by Dalmine under these programs are being provided to a specific enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. On this basis, we find Law 675/77 financing to be countervailable to the extent that it is granted on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

Under the interest contribution program, Italian commercial banks provided loans to industries designated under Law 675/77. The interest owed by the recipient companies was partially offset by interest contributions from the GOI. Dalmine received bank loans with interest contributions under Law 675/77 which were outstanding in the POI.

Because the GOI interest contributions were automatically available when the loans were taken out, we consider the contributions to constitute reductions in the interest rates charged, rather than grants (see *Certain Steel From Italy* at 37335).

At verification, we established that Dalmine had repaid each of the loans it received under this program in June 1994. We further found that Dalmine had not yet received a portion of the interest contributions originally owed to it by the GOI under this program, due to delays in GOI approval of several Dalmine internal asset transfers. Finally, we established that Dalmine had paid interest on each of the loans during the loan grace periods, contrary to what Dalmine reported in its questionnaire responses.

Dalmine argues that the GOI terminated the subsidized loan portion of this program in 1982, and that Dalmine repaid each of the loans in June 1994, after the POI, but before the publication of the preliminary determination. Consequently, Dalmine contends, no further benefits can accrue to Dalmine under this program. Therefore, according to Dalmine, the Department should, in accordance with the Department's policy to take program-wide changes into account in setting the duty deposit rate, set Dalmine's deposit rate for this program to zero.

Contrary to Dalmine's assertion, we determine that the termination of the subsidized loan portion of this program