

Dated: March 1, 2012.

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

[FR Doc. 2012-5579 Filed 3-6-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-830]

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On November 1, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod (wire rod) from Mexico.¹ This review covers imports of wire rod from ArcelorMittal Las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (AMLT) and its affiliate, ArcelorMittal International America LLC (AMIA).² The period of review (POR) is October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010.

Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the *Final Results of Review* section.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 7, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: 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) 482-8362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 1, 2011, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* of the fifth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on wire rod from Mexico. See *Preliminary Results*.

¹ See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* 76 FR 67407 (November 1, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*).

² We determined that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa in an antidumping changed circumstances review. The final **Federal Register** notice was published on July 29, 2011. See *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, 76 FR 45509 (July 29, 2011).

We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On December 1, 2011, the Department received case briefs from AMLT and petitioners, Nucor Corporation (Nucor) and Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc. (Cascade Mills). On December 6, 2011, the Department received rebuttal briefs from Nucor and Cascade Mills, and ArcelorMittal USA Inc., (ArcelorMittal USA), Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., (Gerdau), and Evraz Rocky Mountain Steel (Evraz Steel). No party requested a hearing.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 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 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 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 aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not

more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 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.

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 7213.91.3000, 7213.91.3010, 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3020, 7213.91.3090, 7213.91.3091, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.3093, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.4510, 7213.91.4590, 7213.91.6000, 7213.91.6010, 7213.91.6090, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0031, 7213.99.0038, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.20.0010, 7227.20.0020, 7227.20.0030, 7227.20.0080, 7227.20.0090, 7227.20.0095, 7227.90.6010, 7227.90.6020, 7227.90.6050, 7227.90.6051, 7227.90.6053, 7227.90.6058, 7227.90.6059, 7227.90.6080, and 7227.90.6085 of the HTSUS.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Fifth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, (Decision Memorandum), dated concurrently with this notice and which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised, and to which we have responded in the Decision Memorandum, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit, main Commerce Building, Room 7046. In addition, a complete version of the

Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/>. The signed Decision Memorandum and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received for AMLT, we have recalculated AMLT's inland freight expenses incurred in the home market. We have applied an inland freight expense of zero for those home market transactions in which AMLT reported that no inland freight costs were incurred. For all other home market sales, we have continued to apply the partial adverse facts available (AFA) methodology utilized in the *Preliminary Results*. AMLT's adjustments are discussed in detail in the accompanying Decision Memorandum. See February 29, 2012, Final Calculation Memorandum for AMLT.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010:

Producer/ Manufacturer	Weighted-Average margin (Percent)
AMLT	5.59

Assessment Rate

Pursuant to these final results, the Department has determined, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions for AMLT to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we calculated importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of the dumping margins calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of those same sales. We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific (or customer-specific) assessment rates calculated in the final results of this review are above *de minimis*.

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 of Antidumping Duties*). This clarification

will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by AMLT for which AMLT did not know the merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no company-specific rate for an intermediary involved in the transaction. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945, 65947 (October 29, 2002) (*Wire Rod Orders*) (establishing an all-others rate of 20.11 percent). See *Assessment of Antidumping Duties* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of wire rod from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act): (1) The cash deposit rate for AMLT will be the rate established in the final results of review; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the 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 (3) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 20.11 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Wire Rod Orders* at 65947. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

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 POR. 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. See 19 CFR 351.402(f)(3).

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their

responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3), which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/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.

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

Dated: February 29, 2012.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

List of Comments:

ArcelorMittal Las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (AMLT)

- Comment 1: Treatment of Sales with Negative Dumping Margins (Zeroing)
 Comment 2: Application of Partial Adverse Facts Available to ArcelorMittal Las Truchas, S.A. de C.V.'s Reported Home Market Inland Freight Expenses

[FR Doc. 2012-5575 Filed 3-6-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-552-802]

Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Preliminary Results of Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("Department") is conducting the sixth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain frozen warmwater shrimp ("shrimp") from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam ("Vietnam") for the period of review ("POR") February 1, 2010, through January 31, 2011. As discussed below, we preliminarily determine that sales have been made below normal value ("NV"). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to assess antidumping duties on entries of subject merchandise during the POR for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 7, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Toni Dach or Seth Isenberg, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1655 or (202) 482-0588, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 1, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on frozen warmwater shrimp from Vietnam.¹ On February 1, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the *Order* for the period February 1, 2010, through January 31, 2011.²

From February 25, 2011, through February 28, 2011, we received requests to conduct administrative reviews from the American Shrimp Processors Association ("ASPA"), the Domestic Producers,³ and certain Vietnamese companies. On March 31, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of this administrative review.⁴

On October 20, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results by 90 days.⁵ On January 20, 2012, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an additional notice extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results by 30 days.⁶

On May 15, 2011, the Department received a letter from Quoc Viet

¹ See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam*, 70 FR 5152 (February 1, 2005) ("Order").

² See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 76 FR 5559 (February 1, 2011).

³ The Domestic Producers are the Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee members: Nancy Edens; Papa Rod, Inc.; Carolina Seafoods; Bosarge Boats, Inc.; Knight's Seafood Inc.; Big Grapes, Inc.; Versaggi Shrimp Co.; and Craig Wallis.

⁴ See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part, and Deferral of Administrative Review*, 76 FR 17825 (March 31, 2011).

⁵ See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 65178 (October 20, 2011).

⁶ See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Extension of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 2958 (January 20, 2012).

Seaproducts Processing Trading Import and Export Co., Ltd. ("Quoc Viet") indicating that it made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. On May 31, 2011, the Department received similar letters from Nam Hai Foodstuff and Export Company Ltd. ("Nam Hai") and Vinh Loi Import Export Company ("Vinh Loi"). Of the 68 companies/groups upon which we initiated an administrative review, 24 companies submitted separate-rate certifications, 10 companies submitted separate-rate applications, and three companies stated that they did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.

Respondent Selection

Section 777A(c)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), directs the Department to calculate individual dumping margins for each known exporter or producer of the subject merchandise.⁷ However, section 777A(c)(2) of the Act gives the Department the discretion to limit its examination to a reasonable number of exporters or producers if it is not practicable to examine all exporters or producers involved in an administrative review.

On April 19, 2011, the Department released CBP data for entries of subject merchandise during the POR under administrative protective order ("APO") to all interested parties having an APO as of the date of this release, and invited comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection. On April 29, 2011, the Department received comments from the ASPA, the Domestic Producers, and certain Vietnamese respondents regarding respondent selection for this review. No other interested parties submitted comments for respondent selection and no interested parties rebutted these respondent selection comments.

On June 17, 2011, the Department issued the respondent selection memorandum, in which it explained that, because of the large numbers of exporters or producers involved in the review, it would not be practicable to individually examine all companies. Rather, the Department determined that it could only reasonably examine two exporters in this review. Pursuant to section 777A(c)(2)(B) of the Act, the Department selected Minh Phu Seafood Corporation (and its affiliates Minh Qui Seafood Co., Ltd., and Minh Phat Seafood Co., Ltd.) (collectively "the Minh Phu Group"), and Nha Trang Seafood Company ("Nha Trang

⁷ See also 19 CFR 351.204(c) regarding respondent selection, in general.