

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration****[A–201–830]****Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico: Extension of Time Limits for the Preliminary Results of Fifth Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Greynolds or Jolanta Lawska, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6071 and (202) 482–8362, respectively.

Background

On November 29, 2010, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico, covering the period October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 75 FR 73036 (November 29, 2010) (“Initiation Notice”). The preliminary results of the review are currently due no later than July 3, 2011.

Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act further states that if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period specified, the administering authority may extend the 245 day period to issue its preliminary results by up to 120 days.

We determine that completion of the preliminary results of this review within the 245 day period is not practicable for the following reasons. This review requires the Department to gather and analyze a significant amount of information pertaining to the company’s sales practices, manufacturing costs, and corporate relationships. Given the number and complexity of issues in this case, and in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we are extending the time period for issuing the

preliminary results of review by 120 days. The preliminary results will now be due no later than October 31, 2011, the first business day following 120 days from the current deadline. *See Notice of Clarification: Application of “Next Business Day” Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005). The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 3, 2011.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011–14359 Filed 6–9–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration****[A–122–853]****Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

SUMMARY: On February 2, 2011, the Department of Commerce (Department) published the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on citric acid and certain citrate salts (citric acid) from Canada. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States: Jungbunzlauer Canada Inc. (JBL Canada). The review covers the period November 20, 2008, through May 19, 2009, and May 29, 2009, through April 30, 2010. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the manufacturer/exporter is listed below in the “Final Results of Review” section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 10, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca Trainor or Kate Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482–4007 or (202) 482–4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 2, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the 2008–2010 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on citric acid from Canada. *See Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From Canada: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 5782 (February 2, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*). We invited parties to comment on the preliminary results of the review. We received case briefs from the petitioners (*i.e.*, Archer Daniels Midland Co., Cargill, Inc. and Tate & Lyle Americas LLC) and the respondent, JBL Canada, on March 4, 2011. We received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners and the respondent on March 9, 2011.

On March 4, 2011, both parties requested that a public hearing be held in this proceeding. On March 18, and 21, 2011, the petitioners and JBL Canada, respectively, withdrew their hearing requests.

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 scope of this order includes all grades and granulation sizes of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate in their unblended forms, whether dry or in solution, and regardless of packaging type. The scope also includes blends of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate; as well as blends with other ingredients, such as sugar, where the unblended form(s) of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate constitute 40 percent or more, by weight, of the blend. The scope of this order also includes all forms of crude calcium citrate, including dicalcium citrate monohydrate, and tricalcium citrate tetrahydrate, which are intermediate products in the production of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate. The scope of this order does not include calcium citrate that satisfies the standards set forth in the United States Pharmacopeia and has been mixed with a functional excipient, such as dextrose or starch, where the excipient constitutes at least 2 percent, by weight, of the product. The scope of this order includes the hydrous and anhydrous forms of citric acid, the dihydrate and anhydrous forms of sodium citrate, otherwise known as citric acid sodium salt, and the monohydrate and monopotassium forms of potassium citrate. Sodium citrate also includes both trisodium citrate and monosodium

citrate, which are also known as citric acid trisodium salt and citric acid monosodium salt, respectively. Citric acid and sodium citrate are classifiable under 2918.14.0000 and 2918.15.1000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), respectively. Potassium citrate and crude calcium citrate are classifiable under 2918.15.5000 and 3824.90.9290 of the HTSUS, respectively. Blends that include citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate are classifiable under 3824.90.9290 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is November 20, 2008, through May 19, 2009, and May 29, 2009, through April 30, 2010. In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, and subsequent to the imposition of the antidumping duty order, we instructed U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to terminate the suspension of liquidation and to liquidate, without regard to antidumping duties, entries of subject merchandise for the period May 20, 2009, through May 28, 2009. Accordingly, this administrative review does not include the period May 20, 2009, through May 28, 2009.

Cost of Production

As discussed in the *Preliminary Results*, we conducted an investigation to determine whether JBL Canada made comparison market sales of the foreign like product during the POR at prices below the costs of production (COP) within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. We performed the cost test for these final results following the same methodology as in the *Preliminary Results*. Based on this test, we did not disregard any of JBL Canada's home market sales of citric acid because, for all products, we found that less than 20 percent of these sales were at prices below the COP.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this administrative review are listed in the Appendix to this notice and addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (Decision Memo), which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room 7046, of the main Department building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations for JBL Canada. These changes are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we determined that the following weighted-average margin percentage applies for the period November 20, 2008, through May 19, 2009, and May 29, 2009, through April 30, 2010, as follows:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
Jungbunzlauer Canada, Inc.	1.60

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). Pursuant to 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue appropriate appraisal instructions for the respondent subject to this review directly to CBP 41 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

Because the respondent did not report entered value for all sales to each importer or customer, we calculated importer- or customer-specific per-unit duty assessment rates by aggregating the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales and dividing this amount by the total quantity of those sales. To determine whether the duty assessment rates are *de minimis*, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), we calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* ratios based on the estimated entered value.

We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate calculated in the final results of this review is above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.50 percent). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.50 percent). The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the

final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the company included in these final results of review for which the reviewed company did not know that the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (e.g., a reseller, trading company, or exporter) was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate effective during the POR if there is no rate for the intermediary involved in the transaction. *See Assessment Policy Notice* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the company listed above will be the rate shown above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not participating in this review, 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 original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) 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; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 23.21 percent, the all-others rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. *See Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From Canada and the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Orders*, 74 FR 25703 (May 29, 2009). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

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 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.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only 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). Timely written notification of return/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.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221.

Dated: June 2, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—Issues in Decision Memo

1. Currency Conversions
2. Post-Sale Billing Adjustments
3. Depreciation Expenses
4. Proposed Rules Regarding the Margin Calculation Methodology in Administrative Reviews
5. Corrections to the Dumping Margin Calculations

[FR Doc. 2011-14361 Filed 6-9-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties

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

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: In antidumping duty (“AD”) administrative reviews involving non-market economy countries (“NME”), the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) currently instructs U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to liquidate entries from non-reviewed exporters at the cash-deposit rate required at the time the subject merchandise entered into the United States, consistent with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(i). The Department is aware

of instances where merchandise from a non-reviewed exporter enters the United States at the cash-deposit rate of an exporter subject to review but where the basis for that cash deposit is not consistent with information subsequently reported to the Department during an administrative review. Accordingly, to ensure that entries are liquidated at appropriate rates and in accordance with the information reported to the Department during an administrative review, the Department is proposing to refine its practice with respect to the rate at which it instructs CBP to liquidate certain entries from non-reviewed exporters. Specifically, the Department proposes to instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the NME-wide rate. Through this notice, the Department invites the public to comment on the proposed refinement to its practice.

Effective Date: The Department proposes that this refinement in practice apply to all entries for which the anniversary for requesting an administrative review of an AD order is on or after the date of publication of a final notice on this issue.

DATES: Comments must be submitted to the Department by 30 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julia Hancock, Special Assistant, China/NME Unit, Office of Antidumping and Countervailing Operations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, at 202-482-1394.

Background

In AD proceedings, the Department establishes a cash-deposit rate for each company subject to the investigation or review. In market economy (“ME”) proceedings, the Department establishes an “all-others” rate that applies to exporters that have not been assigned a company-specific rate. *See* section 735(c)(1)(B)(i)(II) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). In NME proceedings, the Department establishes an “NME-wide” rate that applies to exporters that do not qualify for and do not receive a separate rate.¹

In an ME proceeding, importers enter subject merchandise into the United States at either a company-specific cash-deposit rate or at the all-others rate in ME proceedings. In an NME proceeding, importers enter subject merchandise at

a company-specific cash-deposit rate, a separate rate, or the NME-wide rate. Entries of subject merchandise are subject to cash-deposit requirements and are suspended from liquidation until the Department instructs CBP to liquidate the entries. *See* section 733(d)(2) of the Act. When no review is requested for a particular AD order for a given review period, the Department instructs CBP to liquidate all entries of subject merchandise for that period at the cash-deposit rate that was required at the time of entry. *See* 19 CFR 351.212(c). When a review is requested for a firm for a given review period, entries that have been identified by an importer as that firm's merchandise remain suspended from liquidation during the pendency of the administrative review.

Sometimes an importer identifies its entry as merchandise from a particular firm, but the sales underlying the entry from the firm are not reported to and/or reviewed by the Department during the administrative review of that firm. Nevertheless, such entries remain suspended during the administrative review because they were identified as merchandise from a firm under review. During its proceeding, the Department determines the merchandise to which its final results of administrative review apply. There may be suspended entries to which the Department's final review results do not apply.

In the past, in both ME and NME cases, the Department instructed CBP to assess AD duties on entries not examined and/or not otherwise covered by the final results of review for a firm that was subject to the review at the rate at which the merchandise entered the United States, *i.e.*, at the cash-deposit rate in effect at the time of entry. However, in May 2003, the Department announced a change to its practice. In ME cases with an anniversary month of May 2003 or later, the Department began instructing CBP to assess duties at the rate applicable to a party that did not have its own antidumping duty rate, *i.e.*, the all-others rate, on entries that were suspended at the deposit rate of the producer subject to review but that were not covered by the final results of review for that firm subject to review. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (“*2003 Antidumping Duties Notice*”). In other words, to the extent that a firm did not report sales to a particular importer or customer during a given review period, the customer or importer is not entitled to a rate that the Department previously established for that firm. The Department stated that its

¹ In proceedings involving NME countries, it is the Department's policy to assign all exporters of subject merchandise in an NME country a single antidumping duty rate, the NME-wide rate, unless an exporter can demonstrate that it is sufficiently independent of government control so as to be entitled to a “separate rate.”