chilled; and regardless of how it is packed, preserved, or prepared. Excluded from the scope of the order are live crawfish and other whole crawfish, whether boiled, frozen, fresh, or chilled. Also excluded are saltwater crawfish of any type, and parts thereof. Freshwater crawfish tail meat is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 1605.40.10.10 and 1605.40.10.90, which are the HTSUS numbers for prepared foodstuffs, indicating peeled crawfish tail meat and other, as introduced by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in 2000, and HTSUS numbers 0306.19.00.10 and 0306.29.00.00, which are reserved for fish and crustaceans in general. On February 10, 2012, Commerce added HTSUS classification number 0306.29.01.00 to the scope description pursuant to a request by CBP. On September 21, 2018, Commerce added HTSUS classification numbers 0306.39.0000 and 0306.99.0000 to the scope description pursuant to a request by CBP. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received
As stated above, we received no comments on the Preliminary Results.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results
We made no revisions to the Preliminary Results.

Final Results of New Shipper Review
As a result of this new shipper review, Commerce determines that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period September 1, 2017 through February 28, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Weighted-average margin (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanjing Yinxiangchen International Trade Co. Ltd</td>
<td>Nanjing Yinxiangchen International Trade Co. Ltd</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

China has been revoked as a result of the Revocation Notice, Commerce will not issue cash deposit instructions at the conclusion of this administrative review.

Notification to Importers
This notice 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 thisPOR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in Commerce’s presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Orders
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(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby required. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation subject to sanction. The final results of this new shipper review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214.

Dated: June 12, 2019.
Jeffrey I. Kessler,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2019–12838 Filed 6–17–19; 8:45 a.m.]
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AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: In response to allegations of circumvention from the American HFC Coalition (the petitioners), the Department of Commerce (Commerce) is initiating an anti-circumvention inquiry to determine whether certain hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) blends, containing HFC components from India and the People’s Republic of China (China), that are blended in India prior to importation into the United States, are circumventing the antidumping duty (AD) order on HFC blends from China.

DATES: Applicable June 18, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Andrew Medley or Manuel Rey, AD/ CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone:
(202) 482–4987 and (202) 482–5518, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 12, 2017, Gujarat Fluorochemicals Ltd. (GFL) filed a
scope ruling request asking Commerce to confirm that its blend of R–410A,
containing a 50–50 blend of the Chinese
manufactured HFC component, R–32,
and the Indian-produced HFC
component, R–125, blended in India, is
excluded from the Order.¹ On July 3,
2017, the petitioners filed a submission,
in opposition to GFL’s request, arguing
that HFC blends, containing Chinese
HFC components, are included in the
scope of the Order regardless of whether
the blending occurs in India.² On
October 13, 2017, Commerce initiated a
formal scope inquiry.³

On August 6, 2018, the petitioners
alleged that GFL was circumventing the
Order by: (1) importing HFC
component, R–32, from China into
India; (2) performing a minor blending
process in India with Indian-produced
HFC component, R–125; and (3)
exporting the HFC blend, R–410A, to
the United States, as Indian origin.⁴
Therefore, the petitioners requested that
Commerce conduct an anti-
circumvention analysis of the scope
ruling request filed by GFL, pursuant to
section 781(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930,
as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR
351.225(h) to determine whether GFL’s
exports of R–410A are circumventing the
Order.⁵

On August 27, 2018, GFL filed a letter
opposing the petitioners’ request that
Commerce apply section 781(b) of the
Act to GFL’s scope ruling request.⁶ In its
submission, GFL argued, among other


⁴ See Petitioners’ Letter, “Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People’s Republic of China: Request to Apply Section 781(b) of the Act,” dated August 6, 2018 (Initiation Request).

⁵ Id. at 4–5.


things, that its R–410A HFC blend is
already excluded from the Order
because the International Trade
Commission (ITC) reached a negative
determination with respect to Chinese
HFC components (i.e., R–32), blended in
third countries.⁷

Scope of the Order

The products subject to the Order are HFC blends. HFC blends covered by the
scope are R–404A, a zeotropic mixture
consisting of 52 percent 1,1,1,
Trifluoroethane, 44 percent
Pentafluoroethane, and 4 percent
1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R–407A, a
zeotropic mixture of 20 percent
Difluoromethane, 40 percent
Pentafluoroethane, and 40 percent
1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R–407C, a
zeotropic mixture of 23 percent
Difluoromethane, 25 percent
Pentafluoroethane, and 52 percent
1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R–410A, a
zeotropic mixture of 50 percent
Difluoromethane and 50 percent
Pentafluoroethane; and R–507A, an
azeotropic mixture of 50 percent
Pentafluoroethane and 50 percent
1,1,1,2–
Tetrafluoroethane also known as R–507.
The foregoing percentages are nominal
percentages by weight. Actual
percentages of single component
refrigerants by weight may vary by plus
or minus two percent points from the
nominal percentage identified above.⁸

Any blend that includes an HFC
component other than R–32, R–125,
R–134a, or R–134A is excluded from the
scope of the Order.⁹

Excluded from the Order are blends of
refrigerant chemicals that include
products other than HFCs, such as
blends including chlorofluorocarbons
(CFCs), hydrochlorofluorocarbons
(HCFCs), hydrocarbons (HCs), or
hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs).

Also excluded from the Order are
patented HFC blends, including, but not
limited to, ISCEON® blends, including
MO99™ (R–438A), MO70 (R–422A),
MO59 (R–417A), MO49Plus™ (R–437A)
and MO29™ (R–4 22D), Genetron®
Performax™ LT (R–407F), Choice®
R–421A, and Choice® R–421B.

HFC blends covered by the scope of
the Order are currently classified in the
Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the
United States (HTSUS) at subheadings
3824.78.0020 and 3824.78.0050.
Although the HTSUS subheadings
are provided for convenience and customs
purposes, the written description of the
scope is dispositive.⁹

Merchandise Subject to the Anti-
Circumvention Inquiry

This anti-circumvention inquiry
covers HFC blend R–410A, comprised of
Chinese manufactured HFC components
and Indian manufactured HFC
components, blended in India to
produce R–410A, prior to importation
into the United States. This inquiry will
also examine HFC blends R–404A, R–
407A, R–407C, and R–507A produced in
India using one or more HFC
components of Chinese origin, as
appropriate.

Initiation of Anti-Circumvention
Proceeding

Section 781(b) of the Act and 19 CFR
351.225(h) provide that Commerce may
find circumvention of an AD order
when merchandise that would be
subject to the AD order is completed or
assembled in another foreign country
before being exported to the United
States. In conducting anti-
circumvention inquiries under section
781(b)(1) of the Act, Commerce relies
upon the following criteria: (A)
Merchandise imported into the United
States is of the same class or kind as
merchandise produced in a foreign
country that is the subject of an AD
order; (B) before importation to the
United States, such imported
merchandise is completed or assembled in
another foreign country from
merchandise which is produced in the
foreign country with respect to which
such order applies; (C) the process of
assembly or completion in the foreign
country is minor or insignificant; (D) the
value of the merchandise produced in
the foreign country to which the AD
order applies is a significant portion of
the total value of the merchandise
exported to the United States; and (E)
Commerce determines that action is
appropriate to prevent evasion of the
AD order.

⁷ See Order.

⁸ R–404A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 404A, Genetron® 404A, Solkane® 404A, Klea® 404A, and Suva®404A. R–
407A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 407A, Solkane® 407A, Klea® 407A, and Suva®407A. R–407C is sold under various
410A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 410A, Genetron® 410A, Solkane® 410A, Klea® 410A, and Suva®410A.

⁹ See Hydrofluorocarbon Blends and Components from China, Inv. 731–TA–1279 (Final), USITC Pub. 4629, dated August 2016 (Final ITC Determination).

410A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 410A, Genetron® 410A, Solkane® 410A, Klea® 410A, and Suva®410A. R–
134a is sold under various trade names, including Solkane® 134a, Genetron® 134a, Forane® 134a, and Klea® 134a.
A. Merchandise of the Same Class or Kind

The petitioners maintain that, pursuant to section 781(b)(1)(A) of the Act, the HFC blend R–410A sold in the United States is of the same class or kind as merchandise subject to the Order.10

B. Completion of Merchandise in Another Foreign Country

The petitioners contend that section 781(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act, as described above, covers the manufacture of R–410A in India, because R–32, a component of R–410A which makes up 50 percent of the blend, is manufactured in China, the country to which the Order applies.11

C. Minor or Insignificant Process

Under sections 781(b)(1)(C) and 781(b)(2) of the Act, Commerce will take into account five factors to determine whether the process of assembly or completion of merchandise in the United States is minor or insignificant. Specifically, Commerce will consider: (A) the level of investment in the foreign country; (B) the level of research and development in the foreign country; (C) the nature of the production process in the foreign country; (D) the extent of production facilities in the foreign country; and (E) whether the value of processing performed in the foreign country represents a small proportion of the value of the merchandise imported into the United States.

(1) Level of Investment in the Foreign Country

The petitioners point to a blender’s testimony at an ITC staff conference that blending requires less than a $1 million investment, and state that GFL did not submit any evidence regarding its investments in India on holding tanks, pipes, valves, and other equipment used to blend R–32 and R–125.12 Petitioners further argue that, because GFL manufactures other chemicals, it has vessels and equipment needed to store, transfer, and blend HFC components, and, therefore, it is likely that GFL’s blending operations require no additional investment.13

(2) Level of Research and Development in the Foreign Country

The petitioners state that no research and development is required for blending operations and note that GFL did not submit any evidence regarding research and development.14

(3) Nature of the Production Process in the Foreign Country

The petitioners state that the production process only requires a holding tank for the finished R–410A blend, some pipes, and valves and is a very simple mixing operation with no chemical reaction and no temperature change involved.15 Petitioners state that the blending process simply combines the components together according to the recipe, and then packages the finished blend into containers.16 To produce R–410A to AHRI specifications, the blend must be a “nominal” composition of 50 percent R–32 and 50 percent R–125.17 Further, the petitioners state that the blender may also use equipment to test the finished blend to ensure it meets the requisite specification, and additionally may use equipment to package the finished blends.18

(4) Extent of Production Facilities in the Foreign Country

The petitioners provide evidence showing that blending is a simple operation that requires minimal personnel and very basic production facilities.19

(5) Value of ProcessingPerformed in the Foreign Country

The petitioners point to proprietary information from GFL’s scope ruling request and subsequent submission showing that the blending process represents a very small cost relative to the value of the components, and that Commerce found, in the original investigation, that third-country blending would not substantially transform or change the country of origin of the single components.20

D. Value of Merchandise Produced in the Foreign Country Is a Significant Portion of the Value of the Merchandise

The petitioners argue that HFC component R–32 is sourced from China, and R–32 constitutes nominally 50 percent of the total materials of R–410A. Additionally, the petitioners point to proprietary information from GFL’s scope ruling request which the petitioners argue demonstrates that the merchandise produced in China is a significant portion of the value of the merchandise exported to the United States.21

E. Factors To Consider in Determining Whether Action Is Necessary

Section 781(b)(1)(E) of the Act states that Commerce will determine whether action is appropriate to prevent evasion of an AD order, and section 781(b)(3) of the Act identifies additional factors that Commerce shall consider in determining whether to include parts or components in an AD order as part of an anti-circumvention inquiry, including: (A) The pattern of trade, including sourcing patterns; (B) whether the manufacturer or exporter of the merchandise described in section 781(b)(1)(B) is affiliated with the person who uses the merchandise described in (1)(B) to assemble or complete in the foreign country the merchandise that is subsequently imported into the United States; and (C) whether imports into the foreign country of the merchandise described in (1)(B) have increased after the initiation of the investigation which resulted in the issuance of an AD order.

While there are no known affiliations between Chinese manufacturers of R–32 and GFL, the petitioners argue there has been a change in the pattern of trade to avoid AD duties, and an increase in exports of HFC components from China to India, since the imposition of the Order in 2016.22 Specifically, based on numerous sources, the petitioners contend that the monthly average export volume of HFC components from China to India increased by 90.6 percent between 2015 and 2018.23 And U.S. imports of HFC blends from India have increased from zero kilogram in 2016 to over one million kilograms in the first five months in 2018.24 As such, the

---

11 See Initiation Request at 6–7.
12 Id. at 8 (citing the petitioners’ submission “Response to GFL’s Initial Scope Comments,” dated November 13, 2017 (Petitioners’ November 13, 2017 Submission) at Exhibit 3 (ITC Staff Conference testimony)).
13 Id.
14 Id. at 7 (citing Petitioners’ November 13, 2017 Submission at Exhibit 2 (ITC Hearing transcript) and Exhibit 3 (Dongyue Section D Response and TTI Section D Response)).
15 Id. at 7 (citing Petitioners’ November 13, 2017 Submission at Exhibit 4 (Petition)).
16 Id. at 7 (citing Final ITC Determination at 1–5).
17 Id. at 7 (citing GFL’s Scope Request at Attachment 4: GFL’s Supplemental Response at Exhibit 4).
18 Id. at 8–9; see also Hydrofluorocarbon Blends and Components Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, 81 FR 42314 (June 29, 2016), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4.
19 Id. at 12–14.
20 Id. at 12 and Exhibit 2 (Global Trade Atlas statistics).
21 Id. at 13 and Exhibit 3 (Census statistics).
petitioners argue that the only reason to export R–32 to India to be blended, and to not complete the blending in the country of origin, is to evade application of AD duties upon importation.

Conclusion

Based on the information provided by the petitioners, we determine that there is sufficient information to warrant an initiation of an anti-circumvention investigation, pursuant to section 781(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.225(h).

Commerce will determine whether the merchandise subject to the inquiry (as described in the “Merchandise Subject to the Anti-Circumvention Inquiry” section above) is circumventing the Order such that it should be included with the scope of the Order. Additionally, as part of this anti-circumvention inquiry, we will address the scope inquiry filed by GFL under 19 CFR 351.225(c).26 and our final findings in this anti-circumvention inquiry will include a final finding with regard to GFL’s scope inquiry.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(l)(2), if Commerce issues a preliminary affirmative determination, we will then instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend liquidation and require a cash deposit of estimated duties, at the applicable rate, for each unliquidated entry of the merchandise at issue, entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of initiation of the inquiry.

Following consultation with interested parties, Commerce will establish a schedule for questionnaires and comments on the issues related to the inquiry. Before issuance of any affirmative determination, Commerce intends to notify the ITC of any proposed inclusion of the inquiry merchandise under the Order in accordance with section 781(e)(1)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 781(f) of the Act, Commerce intends to issue its final determination within 300 days of the date of publication of this initiation.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is published in accordance with sections 781(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.225(h).

Dated: June 12, 2019.

Jeffrey I. Kessler,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2019–12841 Filed 6–17–19; 8:45 am]
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Strontium Chromate From Austria: Amended Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is amending the preliminary determination of the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation of strontium chromate from Austria to correct a significant ministerial error.

DATES: Applicable June 18, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Smith or Jaron Moore, AD/CVD Operations, Office VIII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1766 or (202) 482–3640, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 17, 2019, Commerce published in the Federal Register the Preliminary Determination,1 and completed the disclosure of all calculation materials to interested parties. On May 20, 2019, Lumimove Inc. d.b.a. WPC Technologies (the petitioner) timely filed a ministerial error allegation regarding the Preliminary Determination.2

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Scope of Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is strontium chromate from Austria. For a complete description of the scope of this investigation, see the Appendix to this notice.

Analysis of the Significant Ministerial Error Allegation

Commerce will analyze any comments received and, if appropriate, correct any significant ministerial error by amending the preliminary determination according to 19 CFR 351.351.224(e). A ministerial error is defined in 19 CFR 351.224(f) as “an error in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other similar type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial.”3 A significant ministerial error is defined as a ministerial error, the correction of which, singly or in combination with other errors, would result in: (1) a change of at least five absolute percentage points in, but not less than 25 percent of, the weighted-average dumping margin calculated in the original (erroneous) preliminary determination; or (2) a difference between a weighted-average dumping margin of zero or de minimis and a weighted-average dumping margin of greater than de minimis or vice versa.4

Amended Preliminary Determination

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(e) and (g)(1), Commerce is amending the Preliminary Determination to reflect the correction of one ministerial error made in the calculation of the estimated weighted-average dumping margin for Habich GmbH (Habich).5 This error is a significant ministerial error within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.224(g) because Habich’s margin increases from 1.24 percent to 2.50 percent as a result of correcting this ministerial error, exceeding the specified threshold, i.e., representing a difference between a de minimis margin and a margin above de minimis.6

All-Others Rate

Because the amended preliminary margin is above de minimis, we determined an estimated all-others rate for all exporters and producers not individually examined. This rate shall be an amount equal to the weighted average of the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any zero and de minimis margins, and any margins determined entirely under section 776 of the Act. We calculated an individual estimated weighted-average dumping margin for Habich, the only individually examined exporter/producer in this investigation. Because

---

1 See Strontium Chromate from Austria: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Not Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination, 84 FR 22443 (May 17, 2019) (Preliminary Determination).


3 See also section 733(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

4 See 19 CFR 351.224(g).

5 See Memorandum, “Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Strontium Chromate from Austria: Ministerial Error Allegation in the Preliminary Determination,” dated concurrently with this notice (Ministerial Error Memorandum).

6 Id.