

does not constitute a program-wide change as defined in section 355.50(b)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*. Specifically, although Dalmine has repaid the loans it received under the program, there could be other Italian companies with loans that are still outstanding. Therefore, despite termination of the program in 1982, there may still be residual benefits under the program. Under our program-wide change policy, the change at issue cannot be limited to individual firms. Consequently, we determine that the "termination" of the subsidized loan portion of this program does not constitute a program-wide change. See *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Countervailing Duty Orders; Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube Products From Argentina (Argentine Pipe)*, 53 FR 37619 (September 27, 1988); Section 355.50(b)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*.

Alternatively, Dalmine claims that the Department should recalculate the benefits under this program to reflect the delayed receipt of GOI interest contributions, as well as Dalmine's payment of grace period interest.

With respect to the grace period, we have adjusted our calculations to reflect that Dalmine paid interest during that time, as established at verification. However, we are treating the interest contributions as countervailable on the date Dalmine made the corresponding interest payments, despite any delay in receipt by Dalmine. This is because Dalmine's entitlement to the interest contributions was automatic when it made the interest payments. Thus, we find, for purposes of benefit calculation, that the interest contributions were received at the time the interest payments were made. See *Steel Wire Nails from New Zealand*, 52 FR 37196 (1987).

Under the mortgage loan program, the GOI provides long-term loans at subsidized interest rates. Dalmine received financing under this program which was outstanding in the POI.

To determine whether these programs conferred a benefit, we compared the effective interest rate paid by Dalmine to the benchmark interest rate, discussed above. Based on this comparison, we determine that the financing provided under these programs is inconsistent with commercial considerations, *i.e.*, on terms more favorable than the benchmark financing.

To calculate the benefit from these programs, we used our standard long-term loan methodology as described in section 355.49(c)(1) of the *Proposed Regulations*. We then divided the

benefit allocated to the POI for each program by Dalmine's total sales in 1993. On this basis, we determine the net subsidy from these programs to be 0.46 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters in Italy of the subject merchandise.

With respect to retraining grants provided to Dalmine under Law 675/77, it is the Department's practice to treat training benefits as recurring grants. (See *Certain Steel General Issues Appendix* at 37226). Since the only grant reported under this program was received by Dalmine in 1986, any benefit to Dalmine as a result of this grant cannot be attributed to the POI. Therefore, we determine that retraining benefits provided under Law 675/77 conferred no benefit to Dalmine during the POI.

B. Grants Under Law 193/84

According to the GOI, Articles 2, 3, and 4 of Law 193/84 provide for subsidies to close steel plants. As stated in Art. 20 of Law N. 46 of 17/2/1982, steel enterprises, including enterprises producing seamless pipes, welded pipes, conduits and welded pipes for water and gas, are the recipients of these subsidies. As benefits under this program are limited to the steel industry, we determine that Law 193/84 is *de jure* specific and, therefore, countervailable.

At verification, we found that Dalmine received an additional benefit under this program not reported in its questionnaire responses. We have included this additional benefit in our calculation of the benefits received by Dalmine under this program.

To calculate the benefit during the POI, we used our standard grant methodology (see section 355.49(b) of the *Proposed Regulations*). We then divided the benefits attributable to Dalmine under Law 193/84 in the POI by Dalmine's total sales. On this basis, we determine the estimated net subsidy to be 0.81 percent *ad valorem* for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters in Italy of the subject merchandise.

C. Exchange Rate Guarantee Program

This program, which was enacted by Law 796/76, provides exchange rate guarantees on foreign currency loans from the European Coal and Steel Community ("ECSC") and *The Council of European Resettlement Fund* ("CER"). Under the program, repayment amounts are calculated by reference to the exchange rate in effect at the time the loan is agreed upon. The program sets a ceiling and a floor on repayment to limit the effect on the borrower of exchange rate changes over time. For

example, if the lire depreciates five percent against the DM (the currency in which the loan is taken out), borrowers would normally find that they would have to repay five percent more (in lire terms). However, under the Exchange Rate Guarantee Program, the ceiling would act to limit the increased repayment amount to two percent. There is also a floor in the program which would apply if the lire appreciated against the DM. The floor would limit any windfall to the borrower.

In *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel*, the Department found this program to be not countervailable because of incomplete information regarding the specificity of the program. The Department stated that, because the determination was reached while lacking certain important information, the finding of non-countervailability would not carry over to future investigations.

In this investigation, information provided by the GOI shows that the steel industry received 25% of the benefits under the program. Furthermore, at verification, we found that in the years Dalmine took out loans on which it received exchange rate guarantees under this program, the steel industry received virtually all the benefits under the program. Based on this information, the Department determines that the steel industry was a dominant user of exchange rate guarantees under Law 796/76 and, thus, that benefits received by Dalmine under this law are being provided to a specific enterprise or industry or group of enterprises or industries. (See section 355.43(b)(2)(iii) of the *Proposed Regulations*). Therefore, we determine that the exchange rate guarantees offered under the program are countervailable to the extent they are provided on terms inconsistent with commercial considerations.

Dalmine provided information that it could have purchased an exchange rate guarantee from commercial sources. However, Dalmine's information pertained to 1993, not to the period when the government guarantees were provided. The GOI's response indicates that commercial exchange rate guarantees were not available in 1986, the year in which the loans and the guarantees were received. Therefore, we determine the benefit to be the total amount of payments to Dalmine made during the POI by the GOI. (Because the amount the government will pay in any given year will not be known until that year, benefits can only be calculated on a year-by-year basis.) We divided the GOI's payments in 1993 by Dalmine's