

Dated: October 3, 2017.

**Gary Taverman,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

## Appendix

Summary

Background

Scope of the Order

Determination of No Shipments for Pacific Pipe

Discussion of the Issues

1. Whether to Disregard Saha Thai's Reported Pipe Specification/Grade Designations
2. Whether to Adjust Saha Thai's Reported Coil Costs
3. Whether to Grant a Duty Drawback Adjustment to Saha Thai
4. Whether to Revise the Date Range for Saha Thai's Home Market and U.S. Sales

[FR Doc. 2017-21747 Filed 10-6-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-580-870]

#### **Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2015-2016**

**AGENCY:** Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). The period of review (POR) is September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This review covers 31 producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. The Department preliminarily determines that NEXTEEL Co., Ltd. (NEXTEEL) and SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH), the two companies selected for individual examination, sold subject merchandise in the United States at prices below normal value during the POR. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**DATES:** Applicable October 10, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Victoria Cho or Deborah Scott, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone:

(202) 482-5075 or (202) 482-2657, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

The Department initiated this administrative review on November 9, 2016.<sup>1</sup> We selected two mandatory respondents in this review, NEXTEEL and SeAH. For a detailed description of the events that followed the initiation of this review, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum, dated concurrently with these preliminary results and hereby adopted by this notice.<sup>2</sup>

The Preliminary Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). Access to ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. A list of the topics discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum is attached to this notice as Appendix 1. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

##### **Scope of the Order**

The merchandise covered by the order is certain OCTG, which are hollow steel products of circular cross-section, including oil well casing and tubing, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both carbon and alloy), whether seamless or welded, regardless of end finish (*e.g.*, whether or not plain end, threaded, or threaded and coupled) whether or not conforming to American Petroleum Institute (API) or non-API specifications, whether finished (including limited service OCTG products) or unfinished (including green tubes and limited service OCTG products), whether or not thread protectors are attached. The scope of the order also covers OCTG coupling stock. For the full text of the scope of the

order, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

##### **Methodology**

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Export price and constructed export price are calculated in accordance with section 772 of the Act. Normal value is calculated in accordance with section 773 of the Act.

For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

##### **Preliminary Determination of No Shipments**

Among the companies under review, Hyundai RB Co., Ltd. (Hyundai RB), Samsung, Samsung C&T Corporation (Samsung C&T), and SeAH Besteel Corporation (SeAH Besteel) properly filed certifications reporting that they had no exports, sales, or entries of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.<sup>3</sup> Based on the certifications submitted by these companies and our analysis of information from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), we preliminarily determine that Hyundai RB, Samsung, Samsung C&T, and SeAH Besteel had no shipments during the POR. For a full explanation of the Department's analysis, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

The Department finds that it is not appropriate to preliminarily rescind the review with respect to these companies but, rather, intends to complete the review with respect to these companies and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of this review.

##### **Rates for Non-Examined Companies**

The statute and the Department's regulations do not address the establishment of a rate to be applied to companies not selected for examination when the Department limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the Act. Generally, the Department looks to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a market economy

<sup>1</sup> *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 78778 (November 9, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> *See Memorandum, "Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods from the Republic of Korea; 2015-2016,"* dated October 2, 2017 (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

<sup>3</sup> *See Letter from Hyundai RB, "Oil Country Tubular Goods from the Republic of Korea: No Shipment Letter,"* dated December 9, 2016; *Letter from Samsung and Samsung C&T, "Oil Country Tubular Goods from the Republic of Korea: No Shipment Letter,"* dated December 9, 2016; and *Letter from SeAH Besteel, "Administrative Review of the Antidumping Order on Oil Country Tubular Goods from Korea for the 2015-16 Review Period—No Shipments Letter,"* dated December 7, 2016.

investigation, for guidance when calculating the rate for companies which were not selected for individual examination in an administrative review. Under section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the all-others rate is normally “an amount equal to the weighted average of the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any zero or *de minimis* margins, and any margins determined entirely {on the basis of facts available}.”

In this review, we have preliminarily calculated weighted-average dumping margins for NEXTEEL and SeAH that are not zero, *de minimis*, or determined entirely on the basis of facts available. Accordingly, the Department preliminarily has assigned to the companies not individually examined (see Appendix 2 for a full list of these companies) a margin of 17.98 percent, which is the weighted average of NEXTEEL’s and SeAH’s calculated weighted-average dumping margins.<sup>4</sup>

**Preliminary Results of Review**

The Department preliminarily determines that, for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016, the following weighted-average dumping margins exist:

Producer or exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
NEXTEEL Co., Ltd. ....	46.37
SeAH Steel Corporation .....	6.66
Non-examined companies .....	19.68

**Disclosure, Public Comment, and Opportunity To Request a Hearing**

We intend to disclose the calculations performed for these preliminary results of review to interested parties within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c), interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, the content of which is limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the date for filing case briefs.<sup>5</sup> Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are encouraged to submit with each

argument: (1) A statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities.<sup>6</sup> Case and rebuttal briefs should be filed using ACCESS<sup>7</sup> and must be served on interested parties.<sup>8</sup> Executive summaries should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, filed electronically via the Department’s electronic records system, ACCESS. An electronically filed request must be received successfully in its entirety by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice.<sup>9</sup> Requests should contain: (1) The party’s name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues parties intend to discuss. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case and rebuttal briefs. If a request for a hearing is made, the Department intends to hold the hearing at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a date and time to be determined.<sup>10</sup> Parties should confirm the date, time, and location of the hearing two days before the scheduled date.

The Department intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of the issues raised in any case or rebuttal briefs, no later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice, unless extended.<sup>11</sup>

**Assessment Rates**

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We intend to issue liquidation instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

For any individually examined respondent whose weighted-average dumping margin is not zero or *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent) in the final results of this review, if the respondent reported reliable entered values, we will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for the examined sales made to each

importer and the total entered value of those same sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). If the respondent has not reported reliable entered values, we will calculate a per-unit assessment rate for each importer by dividing the total amount of dumping calculated for the examined sales made to that importer by the total sales quantity associated with those transactions. Where an importer-specific *ad valorem* assessment rate is zero or *de minimis* in the final results of review, we will instruct CBP to liquidate the appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2). If a respondent’s weighted-average dumping margin is zero or *de minimis* in the final results of review, we will instruct CBP not to assess duties on any of its entries in accordance with the *Final Modification for Reviews, i.e.*, “{w}here the weighted-average margin of dumping for the exporter is determined to be zero or *de minimis*, no antidumping duties will be assessed.”<sup>12</sup>

For entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by NEXTEEL or SeAH for which the producer did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States, or for any respondent for which we have a final determination of no shipments, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.<sup>13</sup>

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the companies listed in the final results of review will be equal to the weighted-average dumping margin established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a prior segment of the proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding in

<sup>4</sup> For more information regarding the calculation of this margin, see Memorandum, “Calculation of the Margin for Non-Examined Companies,” dated October 2, 2017. As the weighting factor, we relied on the publicly ranged sales data reported in NEXTEEL’s and SeAH’s quantity and value charts.

<sup>5</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(d).

<sup>6</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2).

<sup>7</sup> See generally 19 CFR 351.303.

<sup>8</sup> See 19 CFR 351.303(f).

<sup>9</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

<sup>10</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310(d).

<sup>11</sup> See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h).

<sup>12</sup> See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Proceedings: Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8102 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

<sup>13</sup> See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

which they were reviewed; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding for the producer of the merchandise; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers or exporters will continue to be 5.24 percent,<sup>14</sup> the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

The Department is issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 2, 2017.

#### Gary Taverman,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Performing the Non-Exclusive Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

#### Appendix 1

##### List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

1. Summary
2. Background
3. Scope of the Order
4. Preliminary Determination of No Shipments
5. Rates for Non-Examined Companies
6. Duty Absorption
7. Affiliation
8. Discussion of the Methodology
9. Currency Conversion
10. Recommendation

#### Appendix 2

##### List of Companies Not Individually Examined

BDP International  
Daewoo America  
Daewoo International Corporation  
Dong-A Steel Co. Ltd.

Dong Yang Steel Pipe  
Dongbu Incheon Steel  
DSEC  
Erndtbruecker Eisenwerk and Company  
Hansol Metal  
Husteel Co., Ltd.  
Hyundai HYSCO  
Hyundai Steel Company<sup>15</sup>  
ILJIN Steel Corporation  
Jim And Freight Co., Ltd.  
Kia Steel Co. Ltd.  
KSP Steel Company  
Kukje Steel  
Kurvers  
POSCO Daewoo Corporation  
POSCO Daewoo America  
Steel Canada  
Sumitomo Corporation  
TGS Pipe  
Yonghyun Base Materials  
ZEECO Asia

[FR Doc. 2017–21749 Filed 10–6–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–912]

#### Certain New Pneumatic Off-the-Road Tires From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Rescission of New Shipper Review; 2015–2016

**AGENCY:** Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Department) is conducting an administrative review (AR) and a new shipper review (NSR) of the antidumping duty order on certain new pneumatic off-the-road tires (OTR tires) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The period of review (POR) for the AR and NSR is September 1, 2015, through August 31, 2016. The administrative review covers six exporters of the subject merchandise. We preliminarily determine that Weihai Zhongwei Rubber Co., Ltd. (Zhongwei), one of three companies selected for individual examination, made sales of subject merchandise in the United States at prices below normal value (NV) during the POR. We also

<sup>15</sup> On September 21, 2016, the Department published the final results of a changed circumstances review with respect to OCTG from Korea, finding that Hyundai Steel Corporation is the successor-in-interest to Hyundai HYSCO for purposes of determining antidumping duty cash deposits and liabilities. *See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Oil Country Tubular Goods From the Republic of Korea*, 81 FR 64873 (September 21, 2016). Hyundai Steel Company is also known as Hyundai Steel Corporation and Hyundai Steel Co. Ltd.

preliminarily determine to rescind the new shipper review initiated for Carlisle (Meizhou) Rubber Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Carlisle Meizhou), and CTP Distribution (HK) Limited (CTP HK) (collectively, Carlstar). We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**DATES:** Effective October 10, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alex Rosen, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–7814.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On November 3, 2016, the Department initiated a new shipper review of exports of subject merchandise made by CTP Distribution (HK) Limited (CTP HK), produced in the PRC by Carlisle (Meizhou) Rubber Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Carlisle Meizhou).<sup>1</sup> On November 9, 2016, the Department initiated the eighth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on OTR tires from the PRC.<sup>3</sup> On March 2, 2017, the

<sup>1</sup> The NSR was requested by Carlstar Group LLC (formerly dba CTP Transportation Products) (Carlstar Group), a U.S. producer of OTR tires, and an importer of subject merchandise concerning merchandise produced by Carlisle Meizhou, its affiliated producer of OTR tires from the PRC, and exported by CTP HK, an affiliated trading company located in Hong Kong (collectively, Carlstar).

<sup>2</sup> See letter from Carlstar, "New Pneumatic Off-The-Road Tires from the People's Republic of China Entry of Appearance and Request for New Shipper Review," dated September 20, 2016 (NSR Request); see also *Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review*, 81 FR 76560 (November 3, 2016) (NSR Initiation).

<sup>3</sup> See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 81 FR 78778 (November 9, 2016) (*Initiation Notice*). The Department initiated on the following: Cheng Shin Rubber Industry Ltd. (Chengshin), Guizhou Tyre Co., Ltd., Guizhou Tyre Import and Export Co., Ltd. (GTC), Qingdao Milestone Tyres Co. Ltd. (Milestone), Qingdao Qihang Tyre Co. Ltd. (Qihang), Shandong Zhenhai Group Co., Ltd. (Zhenhai), Trelleborg Wheel Systems (Xingtai) Co., Ltd. (TWS), Weihai Zhongwei Rubber Co., Ltd. (Zhongwei), Weifang Jintongda Tyre Co., Ltd. (Jintongda), and Zhongce Rubber Group Company Limited (Zhongce). The Department previously collapsed GTC and Guizhou Tyre Import and Export Corporation (GTCIE) into a single entity in the original investigation, see *Certain New Pneumatic Off-The-Road Tires from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 73 FR 9278, 9283 (February 20, 2008), unchanged in *Certain New Pneumatic Off-The-Road Tires from the People's Republic of China: Final Affirmative Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Partial Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 73 FR 40485 (July 15, 2008). This decision is unchallenged in the instant review; thus, the Department continues to treat GTC and GTCIE as a single entity (collectively, GTC).

<sup>14</sup> See *Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods From the Republic of Korea: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Determination*, 81 FR 59603 (August 30, 2016).