

microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003. See *Notice of Final Result of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Orders, and Intent To Revoke Orders in Part*, 68 FR 64079 (November 12, 2003).

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such

products for other than those applications; end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this changed circumstances review are addressed in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum*, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised, and to which we have responded in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum*, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The *Issues and Decision Memorandum* is available in the Central Records Unit, room 7046, of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i), we have determined that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa and should be accorded the same antidumping treatment as Sicartsa. We will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection that a cash deposit rate of 1.26 percent will be effective for AMLT’s shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of these final results. For the cash deposit rate calculated for Sicartsa, see *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico*, 71 FR 27989 (May 15, 2006).

Notification

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.306. 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.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221.

Dated: July 22, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

APPENDIX

Comment 1 Date of Sicartsa’s Acquisition
 Comment 2 Management
 Comment 3 Supplier Base
 Comment 4 Customer Base
 Comment 5 Production Facilities

[FR Doc. 2011–19292 Filed 7–28–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–806, A–570–815]

Sulfanilic Acid From India and the People’s Republic of China; Final Results of Third Expedited Sunset Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: On April 1, 2011, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) initiated the third sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the People’s Republic of China (“the PRC”), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, as well as lack of response from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews. As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The dumping margins are identified in the Final

Results of Reviews section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 29, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel LaCivita or Eugene Degnan, Office 8, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-4243 or (202) 482-0414.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 1, 2011, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the PRC.¹ On April 7, 2011, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from Nation Ford Chemical Company (“NFC”), the domestic interested party, within the deadline specified in section 315.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department’s regulations. NFC claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a producer of the domestic-like product in the United States. On April 29, 2011, the Department received a complete substantive response from NFC within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(3)(i) of the Department’s regulations. We did not receive responses from any respondent interested parties to these proceedings. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2) of the Department’s regulations, the Department determined to conduct expedited reviews of these orders.

Scope of the Orders

Imports covered by the antidumping duty orders are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid, classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.22 of the

Harmonized Tariff Schedule (“HTS”), contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid, also classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.22 of the HTS, contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt (sodium sulfanilate), classifiable under the HTS subheading 2921.42.90, is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content.

Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these proceedings is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in these reviews are addressed in the “Issues and Decision Memorandum” (“Decision Memorandum”) from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated concurrently with this notice, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in room 7046 of the main Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>, under the heading “July 2011.” The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/exporters/producers	Weighted average margin (percent)
India:	
All Indian Manufacturers and Exporters	≈ 114.80
The PRC
China National Chemicals I&E Corporation, Hebei Branch	19.14
PRC-Wide Entity	85.20

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 25, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011-19308 Filed 7-28-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-423-808]

Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

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

² The Department published its final affirmative determination of sales at less than fair value with respect to imports of sulfanilic acid from India on January 8, 1993. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfanilic Acid from India*, 58 FR 3251 (January 8, 1993). In this determination, the Department published a weighted-average dumping margin for all manufacturers/producers/exporters of 114.80 percent. However, consistent with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act, which prohibits assessing antidumping duties on the portion of the margin attributable to an export subsidy, we established an estimated antidumping duty deposit rate of 71.09 percent for duty deposit purposes. The Department issued its antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from India on March 2, 1993. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Sulfanilic Acid from India*, 58 FR 12025 (March 2, 1993). The Department has not conducted an administrative review of this order since its imposition.

¹ See *Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 76 FR 18163 (April 1, 2011) (“*Initiation Notice*”).