

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (77 FR 65360, 10/26/2012). The FTZ Board has determined that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.14.

Dated: February 13, 2013.

**Andrew McGilvray,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-03867 Filed 2-19-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-405-803]

#### Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From Finland: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2010-2011

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

**SUMMARY:** On August 7, 2012, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its preliminary results of the 2010-2011 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland.<sup>1</sup> The Department issued the results of its targeted dumping post-preliminary analysis on December 26, 2012.<sup>2</sup> This review covers one respondent, CP Kelco Oy and CP Kelco, Inc. (collectively CP Kelco). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

**DATES:** Effective February 20, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tyler Weinhold or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Room 7850, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1121 or (202) 482-0649, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

<sup>1</sup> See *Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 47036 (August 7, 2012) (*Preliminary Results*).

<sup>2</sup> See Memorandum to Lynn Fischer Fox, Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from Finland: *Post-Preliminary Targeted Dumping Analysis Memorandum* (December 26, 2012).

#### Background

On August 7, 2012, the Department published the *Preliminary Results*. This review covers one respondent, CP Kelco. The petitioner in this proceeding is the Aqualon Company, a division of Hercules Incorporated (Petitioner). We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*, and in response, we received a case brief from Petitioner on September 6, 2012. CP Kelco filed a rebuttal brief on September 11, 2012. We also invited parties to comment on our post-preliminary analysis. We received comments from Petitioner and CP Kelco on January 2 and 3, 2013, respectively, and we received rebuttal comments from Petitioner and CP Kelco on January 8, 2013.

#### Period of Review (POR)

The POR is July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011.

#### Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order is all purified carboxymethylcellulose (CMC). A complete description of the scope of the Order is found in the Memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration (Issues and Decision Memorandum), which is dated concurrently with and hereby incorporated by reference. The Issues and 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 to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> and in the Central Records Unit (CRU), room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://www.trade.gov/ia/>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content. The merchandise subject to this order is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheading 3912.31.00. This tariff classification is provided for convenience and customs purposes; however, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this antidumping investigation are

addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice as Appendix I.

#### Changes Since the Preliminary Results

The Department conducted a targeted dumping analysis for these final results. The Department also corrected certain ministerial errors, as described in the Memorandum from Tyler Weinhold to the File, Regarding "Final Results of the 2010-2011 Administrative Review of Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from Finland: Analysis of Data Submitted by CP Kelco Oy and CP Kelco U.S. Inc. (collectively, CP Kelco)," dated February 5, 2013, and hereby incorporated by reference. This targeted dumping analysis added an analysis of targeted dumping by U.S. Census division, as well as the original consideration of targeted dumping by U.S. Census region.

#### Final Results of Review

We determine that the following dumping margin exists for the period July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percentage)
CP Kelco Oy .....	12.06

#### Assessment Rates

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review. For assessment purposes, we calculated importer (or customer)-specific assessment rates for merchandise subject to this review. Where appropriate, we calculated an *ad valorem* rate for each importer (or customer) by dividing the total dumping margins for reviewed sales to that party by the total entered values associated with those transactions. For duty assessment rates calculated on this basis, we will direct CBP to assess the resulting *ad valorem* rate against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise. Where appropriate, we calculated a per-unit rate for each importer (or customer) by dividing the total dumping margins for reviewed sales to that party by the total sales quantity associated with those transactions. For duty-assessment rates calculated on this basis, we will direct CBP to assess the resulting per-unit rate against the entered quantity of the subject merchandise. Where an importer

(or customer)-specific assessment rate is *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.50 percent), the Department will instruct CBP to assess that importer (or customer's) entries of subject merchandise without regard to antidumping duties, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2). The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

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). 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 their merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate un-reviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company involved in the transaction.

#### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, consistent with section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) For the company covered by this review, the cash deposit will be the rate listed above; (2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, but was covered in a previous review or the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, 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 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) 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 continue to be 6.65 percent, which is the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order; Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From Finland; Mexico, the Netherlands and Sweden*, 70 FR 39734 (July 11, 2005). 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) 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 doubled antidumping duties.

#### Administrative Protective Order

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, 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.

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

Dated: February 5, 2013.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### Appendix I

##### List of Issues Discussed in the Accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum

Issue 1: Authority to Conduct a Targeted Dumping Analysis and Apply an Alternative Methodology  
 Issue 2: The Department's Choice of a Targeted Dumping Analysis Methodology  
 Issue 3: Region vs. Region and Division Targeted Dumping Analysis

[FR Doc. 2013-03740 Filed 2-19-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### International Trade Administration

[A-580-855]

#### Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 2009-2010

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

**SUMMARY:** On December 6, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof (diamond sawblades) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). The period of review (POR) is January 23, 2009, through October 31, 2010. For the final results, we continue to find that the companies covered by the review made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* February 20, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sergio Balbontin or Yasmin Nair, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-6478 and (202) 482-3813, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On December 6, 2011, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades from Korea.<sup>1</sup> On January 5, 2012, we received case briefs with respect to the *Preliminary Results* from Ehwa and Shinhan. We did not receive rebuttal briefs. We did not receive a request for a hearing.

On April 5, 2012, the Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition (Petitioner) alleged that the Korean respondents Ehwa Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd. (Ehwa) and Shinhan Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd. and SH Trading, Inc. (collectively, Shinhan), and their respective Chinese subsidiaries Weihai Xiangguang Mechanical Industrial Co., Ltd., and Qingdao Shinhan Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd., sold diamond sawblades into the United States bearing false country of origin designations.

On April 29, 2012, Hyosung Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd., Western Diamond Tools Inc., and Hyosung D&P Co., Ltd. (collectively, "Hyosung") formally withdrew its participation in the administrative review.

We extended the due date for the final results of review to June 4, 2012.<sup>2</sup> On June 4, 2012, the Department deferred

<sup>1</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 76128 (December 6, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*).

<sup>2</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limits for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 77 FR 20788 (April 6, 2012).