

intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. *See Assessment of Antidumping Duties* for a full discussion of this clarification.

The Department will issue instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication of the final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of CTL plate from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) The cash deposit rate for DSM will be the 1.64 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer has its own rate, the cash deposit rate will be 0.98 percent;² the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation, adjusted for the export-subsidy rate in the companion countervailing duty investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importer

This notice 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 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.

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 as explained in the APO itself. *See* 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the 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 sanctionable violation.

These final results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: April 4, 2012.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2012-8604 Filed 4-9-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-848]

Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Rescission of Review in Part

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On October 7, 2011, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The review covers five exporters. The period of review is September 1, 2009, through August 31, 2010.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations for one company. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 10, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dmitry Vladimirov or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0665 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 7, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Rescind Review in Part*, 76 FR 62349 (October 7, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*),¹ in the **Federal Register**. The administrative review covers Xiping Opeck Food Co., Ltd. (Xiping Opeck), Shanghai Ocean Flavor International Trading Co., Ltd. (Shanghai Ocean Flavor), China Kingdom (Beijing) Import & Export Co., Ltd. (China Kingdom), Xuzhou Jinjiang Foodstuffs Co., Ltd. (Xuzhou Jinjiang), and Nanjing Gensen International Co., Ltd. (Nanjing Gensen).

On January 25, 2012, we published *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 3730 (January 25, 2012), in which we extended fully the deadline for the final results to April 4, 2012.

On February 13, 2012, we determined a rate for Xiping Opeck, the sole mandatory respondent in this review, on the basis of adverse facts available (AFA). *See* memorandum to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, entitled "Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China—Post-Preliminary Analysis Memorandum—The Use of Adverse Facts Available," dated February 13, 2012 (AFA Memo). We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results* and the AFA Memo.

We received case and rebuttal briefs from Xiping Opeck and the petitioner, the Crawfish Processors Alliance. No interested party requested a hearing.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the antidumping duty order is freshwater crawfish tail meat, in all its forms (whether washed or with fat on, whether purged or un-purged), grades, and sizes; whether frozen, fresh, or chilled; and regardless of how it is packed, preserved, or prepared. Excluded from the scope of the order are live crawfish and other whole crawfish,

¹ In publishing the *Preliminary Results*, the **Federal Register** distorted the title of the notice; the **Federal Register** thereafter published the correct title of the notice in 76 FR 65497 (October 21, 2011).

² *See Preliminary Results*, 77 FR at 2036, and *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 19046, 19048 (April 27, 2009).

whether boiled, frozen, fresh, or chilled. Also excluded are saltwater crawfish of any type, and parts thereof.

Freshwater crawfish tail meat is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 1605.40.10.10 and 1605.40.10.90, which are the HTSUS numbers for prepared foodstuffs, indicating peeled crawfish tail meat and other, as introduced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in 2000, and HTSUS numbers 0306.19.00.10 and 0306.29.00.00, which are reserved for fish and crustaceans in general. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Rescission of Administrative Review in Part

In the *Preliminary Results*, we preliminarily found that Shanghai Ocean Flavor, Xuzhou Jinjiang, and Nanjing Gensen had no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review and we stated our intent to rescind the administrative review with respect to these companies. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 62350. We have received no comments concerning our intent to rescind this administrative review in part. We continue to find that Shanghai Ocean Flavor, Xuzhou Jinjiang, and Nanjing Gensen had no shipments of freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC during the period of review. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), we are rescinding the review of Shanghai Ocean Flavor, Xuzhou Jinjiang, and Nanjing Gensen.

Adverse Facts Available

In the *Preliminary Results*, we stated that the record evidence suggests a lack of commercial soundness in the transactions reported by Xiping Opeck in this review and that another entity (hereinafter, Company A)² plays a role in the pricing associated with the entries of subject merchandise in this review. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 62350. For a detailed discussion on this issue, see the memorandum entitled “Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People’s Republic of China—Evaluation of an Allegation of Middleman Dumping and Nature of Transactions Pertaining to the Entries Under Review,” dated September 30, 2011. In the *Preliminary Results*, we also stated that further inquiry on this issue is necessary. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 62350. Consequently,

² We are withholding the identity of Company A because Xiping Opeck’s U.S. customer claimed business-proprietary treatment of this information.

on October 3, 2011, we issued a non-market economy questionnaire to Company A. Company A did not answer the non-market economy questionnaire, arguing that it was not required to submit a response. See AFA Memo at 2. We determined that Company A significantly impeded the proceeding because it did not provide any of the information which we determined to be critical and necessary for the completion of an administrative review of the entries and sales made by Xiping Opeck. See AFA Memo at 3. We found it necessary, pursuant to sections 776(a)(1), (2)(A) and (C) of the Act, to use facts otherwise available to calculate the dumping margin for Xiping Opeck in this review. See AFA Memo at 4. Because Company A did not cooperate to the best of its ability in this review, in relying on facts otherwise available, we found that pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act an adverse inference is warranted in determining a dumping margin for Xiping Opeck in this review. See AFA Memo at 4. In determining the AFA rate for Xiping Opeck in this review, we relied on primary information on the record. Using this information, we calculated an AFA rate of 70.12 percent for Xiping Opeck in this review. See AFA Memo at 4.

After our consideration of the comments on this issue, for the final results of this review, we continue to find that the use of AFA is warranted for Xiping Opeck in this review pursuant to sections 776(a) (1), (2)(A) and (C) and 776(b) of the Act.

Non-Market-Economy Country Status

In the *Preliminary Results*, we treated the PRC as a non-market-economy (NME) country. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 62350. No interested party commented on our designation of the PRC as an NME country. Therefore, for the final results of review, we have continued to treat the PRC as an NME country in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act.

Separate Rates

In proceedings involving NME countries, the Department begins with a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and, thus, should be assigned a single antidumping duty deposit rate. It is the Department’s policy to assign all exporters of merchandise subject to review in an NME country this single rate unless an exporter can demonstrate that it is sufficiently independent so as to be entitled to a separate rate.

In the *Preliminary Results*, we found that Xiping Opeck and China Kingdom

demonstrated their eligibility for separate-rate status. See *Preliminary Results*, 76 FR at 62351–62352. We received no comments from interested parties regarding the separate-rate status of these companies. Therefore, in these final results of review, we continue to find that the evidence placed on the record of this review by Xiping Opeck and China Kingdom demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to these companies’ exports of the subject merchandise. Thus, we have determined that Xiping Opeck and China Kingdom are eligible to receive a separate rate.

Separate Rate for a Non-Selected Company

China Kingdom is the only exporter of crawfish tail meat from the PRC that demonstrated its eligibility for a separate rate which was not selected for individual examination in this review. The statute and the Department’s regulations do not address the establishment of a rate to be applied to individual companies not selected for examination when the Department limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the Act. Generally, we have looked to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in an investigation, for guidance when calculating the rate for respondents we did not examine in an administrative review. Section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act articulates a preference that we are not to calculate an all-others rate using any zero or *de minimis* margins or any margins based entirely on facts available. Accordingly, the Department’s usual practice has been to average the margins for the selected companies, excluding margins that are zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available.³ Section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act also provides that, where all margins are zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available, we may use “any reasonable method” for assigning the rate to non-selected respondents, including “averaging the estimated weighted-average dumping margins determined for the exporters and producers individually investigated.”

In previous cases, the Department has determined that a “reasonable method” to use when, as here, the rate of the respondent selected for individual

³ See *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Rescission of Reviews in Part*, 73 FR 52823, 52824 (September 11, 2008), and accompanying Issues and Decision (I&D) Memorandum at Comment 16.

examination is based entirely on facts available is to apply to those companies not selected for individual examination (but eligible for a separate rate in NME cases) the average of the most recently determined rates that are not zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available (which may be from a prior administrative review or a new shipper review).⁴ If any such non-selected company had its own calculated rate that is contemporaneous with or more recent than such prior determined rates, however, the Department has applied such individual rate to the non-selected company in the review in question, including when that rate is zero or *de minimis*.⁵ In this case, there is only one non-selected company under review that is eligible for a separate rate and this company received its own calculated rate that is contemporaneous with or more recent than the most recent rates determined for other companies that are not zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available. Accordingly, we have concluded that in this case a reasonable method for determining the rate for the non-selected company, China Kingdom, is to apply its most recent individually calculated rate. Pursuant to this method, we have assigned a rate of 18.87 percent to China Kingdom, its calculated rate in the previous administrative review.⁶ In

assigning this separate rate, we did not impute the actions of any other companies to the behavior of the company not individually examined but based this determination on record evidence that may be deemed reasonably reflective of the potential dumping margin for the non-individually examined company, China Kingdom, in this administrative review.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the I&D Memorandum which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice as an appendix. The I&D Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). Access to IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit (CRU), room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the I&D Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://www.trade.gov/ia/>. The signed I&D Memorandum and the electronic versions of the I&D Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

We determined the margin for Xiping Opeck based on AFA.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of the administrative review, we determine that the following percentage weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period September 1, 2009, through August 31, 2010:

Company	Margin (percent)
Xiping Opeck Food Co., Ltd. China Kingdom (Beijing) Import & Export Co., Ltd.	70.12 18.87

Assessment

For Xiping Opeck and China Kingdom, we will instruct CBP to apply the rates listed above to all entries of subject merchandise exported respectively by these companies. We intend to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon

publication of these final results of this review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For subject merchandise exported by Xiping Opeck and China Kingdom, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in this final results of review, as listed above, for each exporter; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all other PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be PRC-wide rate of 223.01 percent; (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC entity that supplied that exporter. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notifications

This notice also 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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely notification of the 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 sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 4, 2012.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

1. Determination that Company A is an Interested Party
2. Application of Adverse Facts Available

⁴ See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results and Preliminary Partial Rescission of Fifth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 8338, 8342 (February 14, 2011) (unchanged in *Administrative Review of Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 51940 (August 19, 2011)); see also *Administrative Review of Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 49460, 49463 (August 13, 2010), and *Amanda Foods (Vietnam) Ltd. v. United States*, 774 F. Supp. 2d 1286 (CIT April 14, 2011).

⁵ See *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Preliminary Results of the New Shipper Review and Fourth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of the Fourth Administrative Review*, 73 FR 52015 (September 8, 2008), *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews*, 74 FR 11349 (March 17, 2009) (changing rate for non-selected respondents because the final calculated rate for the selected respondent was above *de minimis*) (unchanged in *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Amended Final Results of the Fourth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 17816 (April 17, 2009)); see also *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results and Final Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 47191, 47195 (September 15, 2009), and accompanying I&D Memorandum at Comment 16.

⁶ See *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of*

Antidumping Duty Administrative and New-Shipper Reviews, 75 FR 79337 (December 20, 2010).

3. Selection of Adverse Facts Available Rate

[FR Doc. 2012–8601 Filed 4–9–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–836]

Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Partial Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order and Initiation of Scope Inquiry

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that glycine processed by Salvi Chemical Industries Limited (Salvi) and AICO Laboratories India Ltd. (AICO) and exported to the United States from India is circumventing the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (China), as provided in section 781(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).¹ With respect to Paras Intermediates Pvt. Ltd. (Paras), we preliminarily find that Paras is not circumventing the *Order* because it is producing glycine from raw materials of Indian origin and exporting such merchandise to the United States.

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 10, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Cordell, Dena Crossland, or Angelica Mendoza, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0408, (202) 482–3362, or (202) 482–3019, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) issued the antidumping duty order on glycine from China in 1995. *See Order*. The Department conducted a less-than-fair value investigation on glycine from India in 2007 through 2008, covering the period of investigation of January 1 through December 31, 2006, where we found that certain Chinese glycine further processed in India did not change the country of origin of such glycine.²

¹ *See Antidumping Duty Order: Glycine From the People's Republic of China*, 60 FR 16116 (March 29, 1995) (*Order*).

² *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Glycine from India*, 73 FR 16640 (March 28, 2008) (*Indian Investigation*) and

On December 18, 2009, GEO Specialty Chemicals, Inc. and Chattem Chemicals, Inc., domestic interested parties, requested that the Department initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry, pursuant to section 781(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.225(h), to determine whether U.S. imports of glycine exported by AICO and Paras, and made from Chinese-origin glycine, are circumventing the *Order*.³ In their request, domestic interested parties allege that AICO and Paras are circumventing the *Order* through completion and assembly in India of the same class or kind of merchandise that is subject to the *Order* and by labeling the merchandise as Indian origin. *Id.*

On January 15, 2010, the Department requested that domestic interested parties resubmit legible copies of AICO's financial statements and of the Port Import Export Reporting Service (PIERS) report regarding AICO's shipments to the United States, which they provided in their original Anti-Circumvention Allegation at Exhibits A and B, respectively. The legible copies of the requested documents were submitted by the domestic interested parties on January 22, 2010.⁴ On February 22, 2010, the Department requested additional information from the domestic interested parties in the form of a supplemental questionnaire.

On August 19, 2010, the domestic interested parties submitted additional information to supplement their December 18, 2009 Anti-Circumvention Allegation and included another allegation against a third company, Salvi, and its exporter/affiliate, Nutracare International. As part of their supplemental submission and allegation against Salvi, domestic interested parties included a market survey from a foreign market researcher, at Exhibit 12 of its submission.⁵ In their August 19, 2010 supplemental circumvention allegation, the domestic interested

accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 5. We note that this investigation did not result in an antidumping duty order because the International Trade Commission made a final negative injury determination. *See Glycine From India; Determination*, 73 FR 26413 (May 9, 2008); *Glycine From India Investigation No. 731-TA-1111 (Final)* Publication 3997 (United States International Trade Commission May 2008).

³ *See* Domestic Interested Parties' request for an anti-circumvention inquiry entitled "Antidumping Duty Order on Glycine from the People's Republic of China—Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order," dated December 18, 2009 (Anti-Circumvention Allegation).

⁴ *See* Letter from the domestic interested parties to the Department, dated January 22, 2010.

⁵ *See* Letter from domestic interested parties to the Department, entitled "Antidumping Duty Order on Glycine from the People's Republic of China—Supplement to Domestic Industry's Request for Circumvention Inquiry," dated August 19, 2010.

parties alleged that all three Indian companies, *i.e.*, AICO, Paras and Salvi, are importing technical-grade glycine from companies in China, processing and/or repackaging the Chinese-origin glycine, and then exporting the finished product to the United States, marked as Indian-origin glycine. *Id.*

On September 23, 2010, the Department conducted a telephone interview with the foreign market researcher to corroborate the information in the market survey that the domestic interested parties submitted on August 19, 2010.⁶ On October 6, 2010, the domestic interested parties amended their request for the initiation of an anti-circumvention inquiry with respect to AICO, citing the Telephone Interview Memo.⁷ Therein, the domestic interested parties alleged that, based on the telephone interview, AICO is both repackaging and refining glycine of Chinese origin. *Id.*

On October 22, 2010, based on sufficient record evidence, the Department initiated an anti-circumvention inquiry on imports of glycine produced and/or exported by AICO, Paras, and Salvi.⁸ In the *Initiation Notice*, the Department explicitly stated that "[t]hese anticircumvention inquiries pertain solely to Paras, Salvi, and AICO." *Id.* at 66356. The Department further stated that "[i]f, within sufficient time, the Department receives a formal request from an interested party regarding potential anti-circumvention of the *PRC Glycine Order* by other Indian companies, we will consider conducting additional inquiries concurrently." *Id.*

As discussed below in the "Questionnaires" section, from December 2010 through October 2011, AICO, Paras, and Salvi responded to the Department's initial and supplemental questionnaires.

On October 3, 2011, the domestic interested parties submitted comments, in which they requested that the Department preliminarily determine that all glycine exported from India is within the scope of the *Order* unless U.S. importers certify that the product

⁶ *See* the Memorandum to the File, entitled "Antidumping Circumvention Inquiry: Telephone Interview with the Foreign Market Researcher," dated October 5, 2010 (Telephone Interview Memo).

⁷ *See* Letter from domestic interested parties, entitled "Antidumping Duty Order on Glycine from the People's Republic of China (PRC): Antidumping Circumvention Inquiry—Amendment to Domestic Industry's Circumvention Allegation based on Department's Memorandum to File," dated October 6, 2010, at 2 (Amendment Letter).

⁸ *See Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Anticircumvention Inquiry*, 75 FR 66352 (October 28, 2010) (*Initiation Notice*).