

for consumption on or after the publication date of this notice in the **Federal Register**, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For the exporters listed above, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed for each exporter in the table in the “Final Results” section of this notice; (2) for previously investigated PRC and non-PRC exporters that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate previously established for the PRC-wide entity (*i.e.*, 238.95 percent);²² and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers Regarding the Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this POR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties has occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Order (“APO”)

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to APO of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing these final results of administrative review and publishing

this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: June 13, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix—Issues and Decision Memorandum

Summary
Background
Scope of the Order

Discussion of the Issues

- Comment 1: Surrogate Country
Comment 2: Conversion of the Market Economy Price for Wafers
Comment 3: Valuation of “Unclassified Stores” of Polysilicon
Comment 4: Valuation of Brokerage and Handling in Doing Business in Thailand
Comment 5: Whether the Department should adjust the brokerage and handling SV used for Trina in the Preliminary Results
Comment 6: Calculation of Surrogate Labor Value
Comment 7: Surrogate Value for Aluminum Angle Keys
Comment 8: Surrogate Value for Aluminum Frames
Comment 9: Differential Pricing
Comment 10: Valuing Tempered Glass
Comment 11: Surrogate Value for Junction Boxes
Comment 12: Financial Statements
Comment 13: Surrogate Value for Semi-finished Polysilicon Ingots and Blocks
Comment 14: Surrogate Value for Backsheets
Comment 15: World Cup Sponsorship
Comment 16: Data Source to use to Value Polysilicon and Wafers
Comment 17: Calculation of Scrap for Waste Cells and Modules
Comment 18: Whether the Department applied the correct surrogate value to Trina’s silver paste
Comment 19: Whether the Department should apply partial AFA to Trina’s unreported factors of production for purchased solar cells
Comment 20: Whether the Department erroneously valued certain overhead items as direct materials
Comment 21: Whether the Department applied the correct surrogate value to nitrogen
Comment 22: Whether the Department should not include import data with zero quantities in the average unit SV calculation
Comment 23: Whether the Department should revise the SV for brokerage and handling
Comment 24: Whether the Department should revise Trina’s credit expenses and inventory carrying costs
Comment 25: Whether the Department should revise Trina’s warranty expenses when calculating CEP
Comment 26: Whether the Department should revise Trina’s insurance expenses

[FR Doc. 2016–14532 Filed 6–17–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–809]

Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On December 8, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the *Preliminary Results* of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe (CWP) from the Republic of Korea (Korea) for the period November 1, 2013, through October 31, 2014.¹ The review covers three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise: Husteel Co., Ltd. (Husteel), Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO), and SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH). For these final results, we continue to find that Husteel and HYSCO sold subject merchandise at below normal value. We also determine that SeAH did not make sales of subject merchandise at below normal value.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 20, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph Shuler, Jennifer Meek, or Lana Nigro, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1293, (202) 482–2778, or (202) 482–1779, respectively.

Background

Following the *Preliminary Results*, the Department sent a supplemental questionnaire to SeAH and received a timely response.²

On January 4 and January 20, 2016, the Department extended the briefing schedule.³ On April 5, 2016, the

¹ See *Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014*, 80 FR 76267 (December 8, 2015) (*Preliminary Results*) and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

² See Letter to SeAH, “Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Circular Welding Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Supplemental Questionnaire,” (December 18, 2015); see also Letter from SeAH, “Administrative Review of the Antidumping Order on Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea for the 2013–2014 Review Period—Response to December 18 Supplemental Questionnaire,” (December 28, 2015).

³ See Memorandum to the File, “Extension of the Briefing Schedule,” (January 4, 2016) and Memorandum to all interested parties, “Second Extension of the Briefing Schedule,” (January 20,

²² See *Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic Cells, Whether or Not Assembled Into Modules, From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2012–2013*, 80 FR 40998, 41002 (July 14, 2015).

Department issued a memorandum extending the time period for issuing the final results of this administrative review by 60 days, from April 12, 2016 to June 10, 2016, as permitted by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).⁴

On January 7, 2016, Husteel and HYSCO both requested a hearing. These requests were subsequently withdrawn.⁵ On February 3, 2016, we received case briefs from JMC Steel Group (JMC) and Allied Tube and Conduit (Allied) (the petitioners), Husteel, HYSCO, and SeAH.⁶ On February 12, 2015, we received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners, SeAH, and HYSCO.⁷

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube. The product is currently classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the

2016); we also extended the deadline to submit rebuttal briefs. See memorandum to all interested parties, "Extension of the Deadline to submit Rebuttal Briefs," (February 5, 2016).

⁴ See Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations entitled "Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review," (April 5, 2016).

⁵ See Letter from Hyundai Steel Company, "Administrative Review of Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Request for Public Hearing," (January 7, 2016); see also Letter from Husteel, "Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea, Case No. A-580-809: Request for Hearing," (January 7, 2016); and the withdrawal requests, see See Letter from Hyundai Steel Company, "Administrative Review of Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Withdrawal of Request for Hearing," (February 22, 2016); see also Letter from Husteel, "Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea, 11/1/2014-10/31/2014 Administrative Review, Case No. A-580-809: Withdrawal of Request for Hearing," (February 19, 2016).

⁶ See Case Brief of the Petitioners, "Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea: Case Brief," (February 3, 2016); see also Case Brief of Husteel, "Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea, Case No. A-580-809: Case Brief," (February 3, 2016); Case Brief of HYSCO, "Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Case Brief," (February 3, 2016); Case Brief of SeAH, "Administrative Review of the Antidumping Order on Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea for the 2013-2014 Review Period—Case Brief," (February 3, 2016).

⁷ See Rebuttal Brief of the petitioners, "Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea: Rebuttal Brief," (February 12, 2016), and see Rebuttal Brief from Hundai HYSCO, "Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Rebuttal Brief," (February 12, 2016); see also Rebuttal Brief from SeAH, "Administrative Review of the Antidumping Order on Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea for the 2013-2014 Review Period—Rebuttal Brief," (February 12, 2016).

United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, and 7306.30.50.90. Although the HTSUS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written product description remains dispositive.

A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: 2013-2014," dated concurrently with this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum), and which is hereby adopted by this notice.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the parties' briefs are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov>, and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://trade.gov/enforcement>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes From the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received from interested parties, we have made certain changes for SeAH since the *Preliminary Results*. For home market sales that SeAH identified as consignment sales, in accordance with the Department's practice, we have used the date the customer withdrew the merchandise from consignment inventory as the appropriate date of sale. For all remaining sales we continue to follow our practice as described in the *Preliminary Results*. Additionally, we have recalculated inventory carrying costs for direct shipment CEP sales based on the inventory period from

factory production to shipment to the U.S. customer.⁸

Final Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period November 1, 2013 through October 31, 2014:

Producer/Exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Husteel Co., Ltd	1.42
Hyundai HYSCO	1.62
SeAH Steel Corporation	0.00

Disclosure

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to these proceedings within five days of the date of publication of this notice pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(b).

Assessment Rates

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(A) and (C) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), the Department has determined, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

For assessment purposes, Husteel, HYSCO, and SeAH reported the name of the importer of record and the entered value for all of their sales to the United States during the period of review (POR). Accordingly, for each respondent, we calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* antidumping duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for the importer's examined sales and the total entered value of those same sales in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). Where an importer-specific assessment rate is zero or *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.5 percent), we will instruct CBP to liquidate the appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2).

For entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by Husteel, HYSCO, and SeAH which they did not know were destined for the United States, we will instruct CBP to liquidate

⁸ For a discussion of these changes, see the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 7 and SeAH's Final Determination Calculation Memorandum dated concurrently with this Federal Register notice.

unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company or companies involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Husteel, HYSCO, and SeAH will be equal to the respective weighted-average dumping margins established in the final results of this review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review, but covered in a prior segment of the proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding for the manufacturer of subject merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 4.80 percent, the “all others” rate established pursuant to a court decision.⁹ These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers Regarding the Reimbursement of Duties

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

⁹ See *Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Korea: Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Determination*, 60 FR 55833 (November 3, 1995).

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3), which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

Notification to Interested Parties

These final results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 10, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix—List of Issues Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

Summary
Background
Changes Since the *Preliminary Results*
List of Comments
Scope of the Order
Discussion of the Issues
Comment 1: Whether the *Cohen’s d* Test Measures “Targeted” or Masked Dumping
Comment 2: Whether the Ratio Test Is Arbitrary and Whether the “Meaningful Difference Requirement” Was Satisfied
Comment 3: Whether Consideration of an Alternative Comparison Method Is Permitted in Administrative Reviews
Comment 4: Whether the Mixed Methodology Leads to Zeroing
Comment 5: The Appropriate Universe of HYSCO’s Home Market Sales
Comment 6: Whether Certain HYSCO Sales Are Outside the Ordinary Course of Trade
Comment 7: SeAH’s Reported Credit Expense for Back-to-Back U.S. Sales
Comment 8: Whether To Use SeAH’s Reported Nominal Outside Diameter
Comment 9: Husteel’s Cost Reallocation
Comment 10: HYSCO’s Cost Reallocation
Comment 11: SeAH’s Cost Reallocation
Comment 12: Whether To Assign HYSCO’s Cash Deposit Rate to Hyundai Steel Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2016–14425 Filed 6–17–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–038]

Certain Amorphous Silica Fabric From the People’s Republic of China: Postponement of Preliminary Determination of the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 20, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Hoefke at (202) 482–4947 or Mike Heaney at (202) 482–4475, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 16, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an antidumping duty investigation on certain amorphous silica fabric from the People’s Republic of China.¹ The notice of initiation stated that the Department, in accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), would issue its preliminary determination for this investigation, unless postponed, no later than 140 days after the date of the initiation. The deadline for the preliminary determination of this antidumping duty investigation is currently July 5, 2016.

Postponement of the Preliminary Determination

Section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act permits the Department to postpone the time limit for the preliminary determination if it receives a timely request from the petitioner for postponement. The Department may postpone the preliminary determination under section 733(c)(1) of the Act until no later than 190 days after the date on which the Department initiates an investigation.

On June 1, 2016, Auburn Manufacturing, Inc. (the Petitioner) submitted a timely request pursuant to section 733(c)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(e) for a 50-day postponement of the preliminary determination in this investigation.² The petitioner stated that

¹ See *Certain Amorphous Silica Fabric from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation*, 81 FR 8913 (February 23, 2016).

² See Letter from Petitioner, “Certain Amorphous Silica Fabric from the People’s Republic of China: