Comment 20: Whether to Treat Point-of-Sale Packaging as Direct Material Costs
Comment 21: Whether to Provide an Export Subsidy Offset
VIII. RECOMMENDATION

Appendix III—Unresponsive Companies
1. Best Craftwork Products Co., Ltd.
2. Billton Trend International Co., Ltd.
3. Dongguan Xinghui Packaging Co., Ltd.
4. Fangtai Webbing Co.
5. Foshan City Shunde District Fangtai Webbing Co., Ltd.
7. Hangzhou Owner Party Co., Ltd.
8. Jiaxing Kaiya Textile Co., Ltd.
9. Long Fine Gift & Bags Factory
11. Ningbo Quanyi Color Ribbon Co., Ltd.
12. Ningbo Sellers Union Co., Ltd.
13. Qingdao Hileaders Co., Ltd.
14. Shanghai Foreign Trade Enterprises Pudong Co., Ltd.
15. Shenzhen Ao Wei Gift Co., Ltd.
17. Shenzhen Guangyunda Technology Co., Ltd.
18. True Color Gift Packing Co., Ltd.
19. Wellmark Gift (Shenzhen) Co Ltd
20. Wello Gift Co., Ltd.
21. Xiamen Golden Grand Lucky Ribbon & Bow Co., Ltd.
22. Xiamen Meisida Decorations Co., Ltd.
23. Yangzhou Bestpak Gifts & Crafts Co., Ltd.
24. Yiwu Eco-Tondo Artware Co., Ltd.
25. Yongjixian Gifts & Crafts Factory

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A–588–857]

Welded Large Diameter Line Pipe From Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: As a result of this sunset review, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order on welded large diameter line pipe from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and/or abandonment of the like product in the United States. Commerce therefore recommends that the antidumping duty order on welded large diameter line pipe from Japan be continued.

DATES: Applicable February 1, 2019.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
On September 11, 2018, Commerce published the notice of initiation of the third sunset review of the antidumping duty order on line pipe from Japan, pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).1 On September 17, 2018, Commerce received a notice of intent to participate in this review from American Cast Iron Pipe Company, Stupp Corporation, members of the American Line Pipe Producers Association (ALPPA), and JSW Steel (USA) Inc. (JSW Steel), (collectively, domestic interested parties) within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i).2 The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as manufacturers of a domestic like product in the United States. On October 1, 2018, we received a complete substantive response for this review from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no substantive responses from any other interested parties, nor was a hearing requested. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), Commerce conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the order.

Scope of the Order
The product covered by this order is certain welded carbon and alloy line pipe, of circular cross section and with an outside diameter greater than 16 inches, but less than 64 inches, in diameter, whether or not stenciled. This product is normally produced according to American Petroleum Institute (API) specifications, including Grades A25, A, B, and X grades ranging from X42 to X80, but can also be produced to other specifications. The product currently is classified under U.S. Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTSUS) item numbers 7305.11.10.30, 7305.11.10.60, 7305.11.50.00, 7305.12.10.30, 7305.12.10.60, 7305.12.50.00, and 7305.19.10.30. 7305.19.10.60, and 7305.19.50.00. Although the HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive. Specifically not included within the scope of this investigation is American Water Works Association (AWWA) specification water and sewage pipe and the following size-/grade combinations; of line pipe:

- Having an outside diameter greater than or equal to 18 inches and less than or equal to 22 inches, with a wall thickness measuring 0.750 inch or greater, regardless of grade.
- Having an outside diameter greater than or equal to 24 inches and less than 30 inches, with wall thickness measuring greater than 0.875 inches in grades A, B, and X42, with wall thickness measuring greater than 0.750 inches in grades X52 through X56, and with wall thickness measuring greater than 0.688 inches in grades X60 or greater.
- Having an outside diameter greater than or equal to 30 inches and less than 36 inches, with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.250 inches in grades A, B, and X42, with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.000 inches in grades X52 through X56, and with wall thickness measuring greater than 0.875 inches in grades X60 or greater.
- Having an outside diameter greater than or equal to 36 inches and less than 42 inches, with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.375 inches in grades A, B, and X42, with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.250 inches in grades X52 through X56, and with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.250 inches in grades X60 or greater.
- Having an outside diameter greater than or equal to 42 inches and less than 64 inches, with a wall thickness measuring greater than 1.500 inches in grades A, B, and X42, with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.375 inches in grades X52 through X56, and with wall thickness measuring greater than 1.250 inches in grades X60 or greater.

- In API grades X80 or above, having an outside diameter of 48 inches and including 52 inches, with a wall thickness of 0.90 inch or more.
- In API grades X100 or above, having an outside diameter of 48 inches and including 52 inches, with a wall thickness of 0.54 inch or more.
- An API grade X–80 having an outside diameter of 21 inches and wall thickness of 0.625 inch or more.

Footnotes:
1 See Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews, 83 FR 45887 (September 11, 2018).
2 We note that American Cast Iron Pipe Company, Berg Steel Pipe Corp., and Stupp Corporation were petitioners in the original antidumping duty investigation.
Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this review, including the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping in the event of revocation and the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked, are addressed in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice. The Issues and 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 is available to registered users at http://access.trade.gov, and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 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://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Sunset Review

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, we determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on line pipe from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail would be up to 30.80 percent.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to interested parties subject to an 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 written 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 these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218.


P. Lee Smith,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations.

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum
I. Summary
II. Background
III. Scope of the Order
IV. History of the Order
V. Legal Framework
VI. Discussion of the Issues
1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping
2. Magnitude of the Margins of Dumping Likely To Prevail
VII. Final Results of Sunset Review
VIII. Recommendation

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[C–570–046]

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is rescinding the administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1,1-Diphosphonic Acid (HEDP) from the People’s Republic of China (China) for the period of review (POR), November 14, 2016, through April 30, 2018.

DATES: Applicable February 1, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Annatha Cook, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone 202.482.0250

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 1, 2018, Commerce published in the Federal Register a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the CVD order on HEDP from China for the POR. On April 2, 2018, Commerce received a timely request for review by Compass Chemical International LLC (the petitioner), in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.213(b), to conduct an administrative review of this CVD order. On July 12, 2018, Commerce published in the Federal Register a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on HEDP from China, covering the POR. On October 19, 2018, the petitioner timely withdrew its request for an administrative review.4

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party who requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. As noted above, the petitioner withdrew its request for review by the 90-day deadline, and no other party requested an administrative review of this order. Therefore, we are rescinding the administrative review of the CVD order on HEDP from China covering the period November 14, 2016, through April 30, 2018.

Assessment

Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess countervailing duties on all appropriate entries. Countervailing duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). Commerce intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

This notice 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(a)(3). 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 sanctionable violation. This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

1 See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity To Request Administrative Review, 83 FR 19047 (May 1, 2018).
3 See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 83 FR 32270 [July 12, 2018].