

	Period to be reviewed
Samin Chemical Co., Ltd. Shaanxi Maxsun Trading Co., Ltd. Shijiazhuang Green Carbon Products Co., Ltd. Showa Denko K.K. Sinochem Qingdao Company, Ltd. Tianjin Tiancheng Pharmaceutical Company. Yuki Gosei Kogyo Co., Ltd.	
None.	
None.	

Countervailing Duty Proceedings**Suspension Agreements**

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under 19 CFR 351.211 or a determination under 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, consistent with *FAG Italia v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed. Cir. 2002), as appropriate, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures "gap" period, of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the POR.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under

³ If one of the above-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of Certain Tissue Paper Products from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

⁴ If the above-named company does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of Circular Welded Austenitic Stainless Pressure Pipe from the PRC who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

⁵ If one of the above-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of Glycine from the PRC who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures* (73 FR 3634). Those procedures apply to administrative reviews included in this notice of initiation. Parties wishing to participate in any of these administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1765(a)), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: April 19, 2010.

John M. Andersen,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010-9491 Filed 4-23-10; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A-570-967]

Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Hollwitz, Andrea Staebler Berton or Charles Riggle, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, (202) 482-2336, (202) 482-4037 or (202) 482-0650, respectively; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 31, 2010, the Department of Commerce

(the "Department") received a petition concerning imports of aluminum extrusions from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") filed in proper form by the Aluminum Extrusions Fair Trade Committee,¹ and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (collectively, "Petitioners"). See Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China dated March 31, 2010 ("Petition"). On April 6 and April 7, 2010, the Department issued requests for information and clarification of certain areas of the Petition. Petitioners timely filed additional information on April 9, 2010,² and on April 19, 2010.³ On April 14, 2010, the Department asked Petitioners additional questions regarding the re-bracketing of certain information. Petitioners responded to the Department's questions in the Second Supplement to the AD Petition, dated April 15, 2010 ("Second Supplement to the AD Petition").

The period of investigation ("POI") is July 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009. See 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1).

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, ("the Act"), Petitioners allege that imports of

¹ The Aluminum Extrusions fair Trade Committee is comprised of Aerolite Extrusion Company, Alexandria Extrusion Company, Benada Aluminum of Florida, Inc., William L. Bonnell Company, Inc., Frontier Aluminum Corporation, Futura Industries Corporation, Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc., Kaiser Aluminum Corporation, Profile Extrusions Company, Sapa Extrusions, Inc. and Western Extrusions Corporation.

² See Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Petitioner's Response to the Department's April 6, 2010, Request for Clarification of Certain Items Contained in the Petition, dated April 9, 2010 ("Supplement to General Issues Petition").

³ See Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Petitioner's Response to the Department's April 7, 2010, Request for Clarification of Certain Items Contained in the Petition, dated April 19, 2010 ("Supplement to the AD Petition").

aluminum extrusions from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioners are an interested party, as defined in section 771(9)(C), (D), and (F) of the Act, and have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigation that Petitioners are requesting the Department to initiate (*see* “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below).

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are aluminum extrusions from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of the investigation, please *see* “Scope of Investigation,” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, we discussed the scope with Petitioners to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the regulations (*Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages interested parties to submit such comments by Monday, May 10, 2010, which is twenty calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration’s APO/Dockets Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and to consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

Comments on Product Characteristics for Antidumping Duty Questionnaires

We are requesting comments from interested parties regarding the appropriate physical characteristics of aluminum extrusions to be reported in response to the Department’s antidumping questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the merchandise under consideration in

order to more accurately report the relevant factors and costs of production, as well as to develop appropriate product comparison criteria.

Interested parties may provide information or comments that they believe are relevant to the development of an accurate listing of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: 1) general product characteristics; and 2) the product comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product comparison criteria. We base product comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, while there may be some physical product characteristics utilized by manufacturers to describe aluminum extrusions, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the order in which the physical characteristics should be used in product matching. Generally, the Department attempts to list the most important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

In order to consider the suggestions of interested parties in developing and issuing the antidumping duty questionnaires, we must receive comments at the above-referenced address by May 10, 2010. Additionally, rebuttal comments must be received by May 17, 2010.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine

industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the industry.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the “industry” as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”), which is responsible for determining whether “the domestic industry” has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (*see* section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department’s determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law. *See* USEC, Inc. v. United States, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001), citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff’d* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989), cert. denied 492 U.S. 919 (1989).

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as “a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.” Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is “the article subject to an investigation” (*i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioners do not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that aluminum extrusions constitute a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product. For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Aluminum Extrusions from the People’s Republic of China (“Checklist”), at Attachment II, Industry Support, on file in the Central Records Unit, Room 1117 of the main Department of Commerce building.

In determining whether Petitioners have standing under section

732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the "Scope of Investigations" section above. To establish industry support, Petitioners provided their production of the domestic like product in 2009. *See* Volume I of the Petition at Exhibit I-3. In addition Petitioners provided letters of support from ten additional companies that produce the domestic like product. *See id.* Petitioners compared their production and the production of the supporters of the Petition to the estimated total production of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry. *See* Volume I of the Petition at 3-4 and Exhibits I-3 and I-4. Petitioners estimated total industry production of the domestic like product for 2009 using industry wide shipment data from the Aluminum Association, which according to Petitioners is "an independent and authoritative source for aluminum industry data." *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 3. We have relied upon data Petitioners provided for purposes of measuring industry support. For further discussion, *see* Checklist at Attachment II.

Our review of the data provided in the Petition, supplemental submissions, and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioners have established industry support. First, the Petition established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.*, polling). *See* Section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act, and Checklist at Attachment 2. Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product. *See* Checklist at Attachment II. Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition. Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within

the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act. *See id.*

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C), (D), and (F) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigation that it is requesting the Department initiate. *See id.*

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioners alleged that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than normal value ("NV"). In addition, Petitioners alleged that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.

Petitioners contended that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by reduced market share, increased raw material cost, declining capacity, production, shipments, underselling and price depression or suppression, reduced employment, hours worked, and wages paid, declines in financial performance, lost sales and revenue, and an increase in import penetration. *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 16, 19-27, 30-33, and Exhibits I-10 through I-15, III-33; and Supplement to AD/CVD Petitions, dated April 9, 2010, at 8-9, and Attachment 4. We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See* Checklist at Attachment III.

Allegations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate this investigation of imports of aluminum extrusions from the PRC. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to the U.S. price and the factors of production are also discussed in the initiation checklist. *See* Checklist.

U.S. Price

Petitioners calculated export price ("EP") based on documentation of offers for sale obtained from a confidential source. *See* Checklist; *see also* Volume II of the Petition, at 1 and Exhibits II-1 and II-2. Based on the terms of sale,

Petitioners adjusted the export price for brokerage and handling and foreign domestic inland freight. *See* Checklist; *see also* Volume II of the Petition, at 1-2 and Exhibits II-2 and II-3.

Normal Value

Petitioners claim the PRC is a non-market economy ("NME") country and that no determination to the contrary has been made by the Department. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 2. In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, the presumption of NME status remains in effect until revoked by the Department. The presumption of NME status for the PRC has not been revoked by the Department and, therefore, remains in effect for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. Accordingly, the NV of the product for the PRC investigation is appropriately based on factors of production valued in a surrogate market-economy country in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. In the course of this investigation, all parties, including the public, will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issue of the PRC's NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters.

Petitioners contend that India is the appropriate surrogate country for the PRC because: 1) it is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and 2) it is a significant producer and exporter of comparable merchandise. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 3-5, and Exhibits II-4 and II-16. Based on the information provided by Petitioners, we believe that it is appropriate to use India as a surrogate country for initiation purposes. After initiation of the investigation, interested parties will have the opportunity to submit comments regarding surrogate country selection and, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(i), will be provided an opportunity to submit publicly available information to value factors of production within 40 days after the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Petitioners calculated NV and the dumping margins using the Department's NME methodology as required by 19 CFR 351.202(b)(7)(i)(C) and 19 CFR 351.408. In calculating NV, Petitioners based the quantity of each of the inputs used to manufacture aluminum extrusions in the PRC on product-specific production costs and/or consumption rates of an aluminum extrusions producer in the United States ("Surrogate Domestic Producer") for identical or similar merchandise during the POI. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 5-8 and Exhibits II-2, II-6, II-7 and

II–9. Petitioners state that the actual usage rates of the foreign manufacturers of aluminum extrusions are not reasonably available; however, Petitioners note that according to the information available, the production of aluminum extrusions relies on similar production methods to the Surrogate Domestic Producer. See Volume II of the Petition, at 5 and Exhibit II–8.

As noted above, Petitioners determined the consumption quantities of all raw materials based on the production experience of the Surrogate Domestic Producer. Petitioners valued most of the factors of production based on reasonably available, public surrogate country data, specifically, Indian import statistics from the Global Trade Atlas (“GTA”). See Volume II of the Petition, at 6–8; see also Second Supplement to the AD Petition, at Exhibit S–2. Petitioners excluded from these import statistics imports from countries previously determined by the Department to be NME countries. Petitioners also excluded import statistics from Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, and Thailand, as the Department has previously excluded prices from these countries because they maintain broadly available, non–industry-specific export subsidies. See Second Supplement to the AD Petition, at Exhibit S–2. Petitioners valued certain other factors of production using price data obtained from the Bombay Metal Exchange, as published by Reuters India. See Volume II of the Petition, at 7, and Second Supplement to the AD Petition, at Exhibit S–1. In addition, Petitioners made currency conversions, where necessary, based on the POI–average rupee/U.S. dollar exchange rate, as reported on the Department’s web site. See Volume II of the Petition, at 7 and Exhibit II–11. Petitioners determined labor costs using the labor consumption, in hours, derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at 7 and Exhibits II–6 and II–9. Petitioners valued labor costs using the Department’s NME Wage Rate for the PRC at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/wages/07wages/final/final–2009–2007–wages.html>. See Volume II of the Petition, at 7 and Exhibit II–13. For purposes of initiation, the Department determines that the surrogate values used by Petitioners are reasonably available and, thus, acceptable for purposes of initiation.

Petitioners determined electricity costs using the electricity consumption, in kilowatt hours, derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at 7 and Exhibit II–14; see also

Supplement to the AD Petition at Exhibit S–3. Petitioners valued electricity using the Indian electricity rate reported by the Central Electric Authority of the Government of India. See Supplement to the AD Petition, at 7 and Exhibit S–3. Petitioners determined natural gas costs using the natural gas consumption, in million British thermal units (“mmBtu”), derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at 8, and Exhibit II–6 and II–9. Petitioners valued natural gas using the same methodology the Department used in the recent initiation of *Certain Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from Indonesia and the People’s Republic of China*, which was based on Indian import statistics. See Volume II of the Petition, at 8 and Exhibit II–15.

Petitioners determined packing costs using data from the GTA, derived from the Surrogate Domestic Producer’s experience. See Volume II of the Petition, at Exhibit II–6; see also Supplement to the AD Petition, at 4 and Exhibits S–4 and S–6.

Petitioners based factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses, and profit on data from Jindal Aluminium, Ltd., a producer of aluminum extrusions, for the 2008 2009 fiscal year. See Volume II of the Petition, at 8 and Exhibit II–16.

Fair-Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by Petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of aluminum extrusions from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Based on a comparison of U.S. prices and NV calculated in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, as described above, the estimated dumping margins for aluminum extrusions from the PRC range from 32.57 percent to 33.32 percent. See Checklist and Second Supplement to the AD Petition at Exhibit S–2.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

Based upon the examination of the Petition on aluminum extrusions from the PRC, the Department finds the Petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of aluminum extrusions from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determinations no

later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Targeted Dumping Allegations

On December 10, 2008, the Department issued an interim final rule for the purpose of withdrawing 19 CFR 351.414(f) and (g), the regulatory provisions governing the targeted dumping analysis in antidumping duty investigations, and the corresponding regulation governing the deadline for targeted dumping allegations, 19 CFR 351.301(d)(5). See *Withdrawal of the Regulatory Provisions Governing Targeted Dumping in Antidumping Duty Investigations*, 73 FR 74930 (December 10, 2008). The Department stated that “withdrawal will allow the Department to exercise the discretion intended by the statute and, thereby, develop a practice that will allow interested parties to pursue all statutory avenues of relief in this area.” *Id.* at 74931.

In order to accomplish this objective, if any interested party wishes to make a targeted dumping allegation in this investigation pursuant to section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act, such allegation is due no later than 45 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination.

Respondent Selection

For this investigation, the Department will request quantity and value information from known exporters and producers identified with complete contact information in the Petition. The quantity and value data received from NME exporters/producers will be used as the basis to select the mandatory respondents.

The Department requires that the respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate–rate application by the respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate–rate status. See *Circular Welded Austenitic Stainless Pressure Pipe from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 73 FR 10221, 10225 (February 26, 2008); *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Artist Canvas From the People’s Republic of China*, 70 FR 21996, 21999 (April 28, 2005). On the date of the publication of this initiation notice in the **Federal Register**, the Department will post the quantity and value questionnaire along with the filing instructions on the Import Administration web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html>, and a response to the quantity and value questionnaire is due no later than May 11, 2010. Also, the

Department will send the quantity and value questionnaire to those PRC companies identified in the Petition in Volume I of the Petition, at Exhibit I–8.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Department's web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/apo>.

Separate Rates Application

In order to obtain separate-rate status in NME investigations, exporters and producers must submit a separate-rate status application. See Policy Bulletin 05.1: Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigations involving Non-Market Economy Countries, dated April 5, 2005 ("Policy Bulletin"), available on the Department's web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/policy/bull05-1.pdf>. Based on our experience in processing the separate-rate applications in previous antidumping duty investigations, we have modified the application for this investigation to make it more administrable and easier for applicants to complete. See, e.g., *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain New Pneumatic Off-the-Road Tires From the People's Republic of China*, 72 FR 43591, 43594–95 (August 6, 2007). The specific requirements for submitting the separate-rate application in this investigation are outlined in detail in the application itself, which will be available on the Department's web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html> on the date of publication of this initiation notice in the **Federal Register**. The separate-rate application will be due 60 days after publication of this initiation notice. For exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate status application and subsequently are selected as mandatory respondents, these exporters and producers will no longer be eligible for consideration for separate rate status unless they respond to all parts of the questionnaire as mandatory respondents. As noted in the "Respondent Selection" section above, the Department requires that respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate rate application by the respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status.

Use of Combination Rates in an NME Investigation

The Department will calculate combination rates for certain respondents that are eligible for a

separate rate in this investigation. The Policy Bulletin states:

{ }hile continuing the practice of assigning separate rates only to exporters, all separate rates that the Department will now assign in its NME investigations will be specific to those producers that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation. Note, however, that one rate is calculated for the exporter and all of the producers which supplied subject merchandise to it during the period of investigation. This practice applies both to mandatory respondents receiving an individually calculated separate rate as well as the pool of non-investigated firms receiving the weighted-average of the individually calculated rates. This practice is referred to as the application of "combination rates" because such rates apply to specific combinations of exporters and one or more producers. The cash-deposit rate assigned to an exporter will apply only to merchandise both exported by the firm in question and produced by a firm that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation.

See Policy Bulletin at 6 (emphasis added).

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), copies of the public versions of the Petition have been provided to the representatives of the Government of the PRC. Because of the large number of producers/exporters identified in the Petition, the Department considers the service of the public version of the Petition to the foreign producers/exporters satisfied by the delivery of the public version to the Government of the PRC, consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, no later than May 17, 2010, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of aluminum extrusions from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 20, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Attachment I

Scope of the Investigations

The merchandise covered by these investigations is aluminum extrusions which are shapes and forms, produced by an extrusion process, made from aluminum alloys having metallic elements corresponding to the alloy series designations published by The Aluminum Association commencing with the numbers 1, 3, and 6 (or proprietary equivalents or other certifying body equivalents). Specifically, the subject merchandise made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 1 contains not less than 99 percent aluminum by weight. The subject merchandise made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 3 contains manganese as the major alloying element, with manganese accounting for not more than 3.0 percent of total materials by weight. The subject merchandise made from an aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 6 contains magnesium and silicon as the major alloying elements, with magnesium accounting for at least 0.1 percent but not more than 2.0 percent of total materials by weight, and silicon accounting for at least 0.1 percent but not more than 3.0 percent of total materials by weight. The subject aluminum extrusions are properly identified by a four-digit alloy series without either a decimal point or leading letter. Illustrative examples from among the approximately 160 registered alloys that may characterize the subject merchandise are as follows: 1350, 3003, and 6060. Aluminum extrusions are produced and imported in a wide variety of shapes and forms, including, but not limited to, hollow profiles, other solid profiles, pipes, tubes, bars, and rods. Aluminum extrusions that are drawn subsequent to extrusion ("drawn aluminum") are also included in the scope. Aluminum extrusions are produced and imported with a variety of finishes (both coatings and surface treatments), and types of fabrication. The types of coatings and treatments applied to subject aluminum extrusions include,

but are not limited to, extrusions that are mill finished (*i.e.*, without any coating or further finishing), brushed, buffed, polished, anodized (including bright-dip anodized), liquid painted, or powder coated. Aluminum extrusions may also be fabricated, *i.e.*, prepared for assembly. Such operations would include, but are not limited to, extrusions that are cut-to-length, machined, drilled, punched, notched, bent, stretched, knurled, swaged, mitered, chamfered, threaded, and spun. The subject merchandise includes aluminum extrusions that are finished (coated, painted, etc.), fabricated, or any combination thereof.

Subject aluminum extrusions may be described at the time of importation as parts for final finished products that are assembled after importation, including, but not limited to, window frames, door frames, solar panels, curtain walls, or furniture. Such parts that otherwise meet the definition of aluminum extrusions are included in the scope. The scope includes aluminum extrusions that are attached (*e.g.*, by welding or fasteners) to form subassemblies, *i.e.*, partially assembled merchandise.

Subject extrusions may be identified with reference to their end use, such as heat sinks, door thresholds, or carpet trim. Such goods are subject merchandise if they otherwise meet the scope definition, regardless of whether they are finished products and ready for use at the time of importation. The following aluminum extrusion products are excluded: aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designations commencing with the number 2 and containing in excess of 1.5 percent copper by weight; aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 5 and containing in excess of 1.0 percent magnesium by weight; and aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 7 and containing in excess of 2.0 percent zinc by weight.

The scope also excludes finished merchandise containing aluminum extrusions as parts that are fully and permanently assembled and completed at the time of entry, such as finished windows with glass, doors, picture frames, and solar panels. The scope also excludes finished goods containing aluminum extrusions that are entered unassembled in a "kit." A kit is understood to mean a packaged

combination of parts that contains, at the time of importation, all of the necessary parts to fully assemble a final finished good.

The scope also excludes aluminum alloy sheet or plates produced by other than the extrusion process, such as aluminum products produced by a method of casting. Cast aluminum products are properly identified by four digits with a decimal point between the third and fourth digit. A letter may also precede the four digits. The following Aluminum Association designations are representative of aluminum alloys for casting: 208.0, 295.0, 308.0, 355.0, C355.0, 356.0, A356.0, A357.0, 360.0, 366.0, 380.0, A380.0, 413.0, 443.0, 514.0, 518.1, and 712.0. The scope also excludes pure, unwrought aluminum in any form.

Imports of the subject merchandise are provided for under the following categories of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTS"): 7604.21.0000, 7604.29.1000, 7604.29.3010, 7604.29.3050, 7604.29.5030, 7604.29.5060, 7608.20.0030, and 7608.20.0090. The subject merchandise entered as parts of other aluminum products may be classifiable under the following additional Chapter 76 subheadings: 7610.10, 7610.90, 7615.19, 7615.20, and 7616.99 as well as under other HTS chapters. While HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope in this proceeding is dispositive. [FR Doc. 2010-9743 Filed 4-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(C-570-968)

Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 28, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Tran and Brandon Farlander, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1503 and (202) 482-0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On March 31, 2010, the Department of Commerce ("Department") received a countervailing duty ("CVD") petition concerning imports of certain aluminum extrusions from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") filed in proper form by the Aluminum Extrusions Fair Trade Committee¹ and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (collectively, "Petitioners"). See The Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties Against Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China, dated March 31, 2010 (the Petition). On April 6, 2010, the Department issued requests to Petitioners for additional information and for clarification of certain areas of the Petition. Based on the Department's requests, Petitioners filed a supplement to the Petition, regarding general issues, on April 9, 2010 ("Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions").

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), Petitioners allege that producers/exporters of aluminum extrusions from the PRC received countervailable subsidies within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act, and that imports from these producers/exporters materially injure, and threaten further material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioners are interested parties, as defined in section 771(9)(C),(D), and (F) of the Act, and have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the investigation that they request the Department to initiate (*see* "Determination of Industry Support for the Petition" below).

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are aluminum extrusions from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of the investigation, please see the "Scope of the Investigation" in Appendix I of this notice.

¹ The individual members of the Aluminum Extrusions Fair Trade Committee are Aerolite Extrusion Company, Alexandria Extrusion Company, Benada Aluminum of Florida, Inc., William L. Bonnell Company, Inc., Frontier Aluminum Corporation, Futura Industries Corporation, Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc., Kaiser Aluminum Corporation, Profile Extrusion Company, Sapa Extrusions, Inc., and Western Extrusions Corporation.