

“Comments for the Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building;” and indicate which numbered questions described in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** of this notice your comments address. Comments by fax or paper delivery will not be accepted.

*Privacy Note:* Comments submitted in response to this notice may be made available to the public through relevant websites. Therefore, commenters should only include information they wish to make publicly available on the internet. Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

Please note the confidentiality of routine communication and responses to this public comment request are treated as public comments and may therefore be made publicly available, notwithstanding the inclusion of the routine notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Lucas Hitt, Designated Federal Official, Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20233 by email Gianna Marrone (*gianna.marrone@bea.gov*) or by phone (301) 278-9282.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Request for Comments**

The Advisory Committee will review, analyze, and make recommendations on how to promote the use of data for evidence building. The Advisory Committee will evaluate and provide recommendations to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on how to facilitate data sharing, data linkage, and privacy enhancing techniques in support of evidence building. As part of its evaluation, the Advisory Committee may consider best practices to improve the safe and appropriate access to data. The Advisory Committee will consider the coordination of data sharing and availability of data for evidence building across all agencies and levels of government. The FRN commentators may respond to any question and do not need to respond to all questions.

This request for comments offers researchers, evaluators, contractors, government entities, and other interested parties the opportunity to inform the Committee’s work. This is a general solicitation of comments from the public. The Advisory Committee will consider all feedback and recommendations on core topics and central issues such as:

- Capacity needs for secure data access and record linkage.

- Areas for research and development on state-of-the-art data access and data protection methods.
  - How to protect privacy when using personally identifiable information or confidential business information in support of evidence building.
  - How to promote transparency and facilitate public engagement with the evidence building process.
  - Agency needs for data management and data stewardship services.
  - How to best facilitate the needs of researchers, evaluators, and other evidence builders through a national data service or similar approach.
- Please clearly indicate which question(s) you address in your response and any evidence to support assertions, where practicable.

**Round 1**

Central Questions—

1. What are the main challenges faced by national, state/provincial, or local governments that are trying to build a basis for evidence-based policy? Briefly describe the bottlenecks and pain-points they face in the evidence-based decision-making process.

2. What are examples of high-impact data uses for evidence-based policy making that successfully effected change, reduced costs, or improved the welfare of citizens?

3. Which frameworks, policies, practices, or methods show promise in overcoming challenges experienced by governments in their evidence building?

4. The Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking (See: *www.cep.gov*) recommended the creation of a National Secure Data Service (See Commission Report at *www.cep.gov*). Do you agree with this recommendation, and if so, what should be the essential features of a National Secure Data Service?

5. How can federal agencies protect individual and organizational privacy when using data for evidence building? Recommend specific actions the Office of Management and Budget and/or other federal agencies can take when using data for evidence building, as well as suggested changes to federal laws, policies, and procedures.

Secure Data Access—

6. If created, how should a data service be structured to best facilitate (1) research and development of secure data access and confidentiality technologies and methods, (2) and agency adoption of those technologies and techniques?

7. Government agencies have argued that secure data access has value because it (1) improves service delivery, (2) improves efficiency (lowers costs), (3) produces metrics for performance

measurement, and (4) produces new learnings/insights from the data. Which of these propositions do you agree holds value and why? Do you have examples that demonstrate these benefits? Do you have other examples of the value of secure data access?

Data Services to Federal, State, Local Agencies and the Public—

8. What are the most pressing data needs of state and local decision makers and how would making data accessible from federal agencies help meet those needs? To share data, what guarantees do data owners (or data controllers) need regarding privacy, data stewardship, and retention?

9. What are the key problems and use cases where collaborative work between federal, state, and local authorities’ data analysis can inform decisions? What are key decision support tools? How would greater communication about data and tools benefit expanded evidence building?

Infrastructure for Meeting Public and Evidence Building Needs—

10. What basic public data services are essential for a data service to address existing capacity gaps and needs? What infrastructure or incentives can the federal government create that locals and states cannot?

Dated: December 9, 2020.

**Gianna Marrone,**

*Assistant Designated Federal Official, Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building.*

[FR Doc. 2021-01092 Filed 1-15-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-MN-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A-533-843]

**Certain Lined Paper Products From India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2018-2019**

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain lined paper products from India, covering the period of review (POR), September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. We preliminarily find that Navneet Education Ltd. (Navneet) and Super Impex did not make sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value during the POR. We invite interested

parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**DATES:** Applicable January 19, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Samuel Brummitt, 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) 482-7851.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On September 28, 2006, Commerce published the *Order* in the **Federal Register**.<sup>1</sup> On November 12, 2019, pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce initiated an administrative review of the *Order*.<sup>2</sup>

On April 24, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by 50 days.<sup>3</sup> On June 11, 2020, we extended the deadline for the preliminary results to November 18, 2020.<sup>4</sup> On July 21, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by an additional 60 days.<sup>5</sup> The deadline for the preliminary results of this review is now January 19, 2021.

Commerce initiated this administrative review covering the following 13 companies: Cellpage Ventures Private Limited (Cellpage); Goldenpalm Manufacturers PVT Limited (Goldenpalm); Kokuyo Riddhi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. (Kokuyo); Lodha Offset Limited (Lodha); Lotus Global Private Limited (Lotus Global); Magic International Pvt. Ltd. (Magic); Marisa International (Marisa); Navneet; Pioneer Stationery Pvt. Ltd. (Pioneer); PP Bafna Ventures Private Limited (PP Bafna); SAB International (SAB); SGM Paper Products (SGM); and Super Impex.<sup>6</sup> This review covers two

mandatory respondents, Navneet and Super Impex. The other 11 companies were not selected for individual examination and remain subject to this administrative review.

### Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the *Order* is certain lined paper products. The merchandise subject to this order is currently classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 4811.90.9035, 4811.90.9080, 4820.30.0040, 4810.22.5044, 4811.90.9050, 4811.90.9090, 4820.10.2010, 4820.10.2020, 4820.10.2030, 4820.10.2040, 4820.10.2050, 4820.10.2060, and 4820.10.4000. Although the HTSUS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written product description remains dispositive. A full description of the scope of the *Order* is contained in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.<sup>7</sup>

### Preliminary Determination of No Shipments

On November 19 and November 26, 2019, Lodha and Marisa, respectively, submitted responses to Commerce's quantity and value questionnaire which indicated that the companies had no exports or sales of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR.<sup>8</sup> To confirm Lodha and Marisa's no-shipment claims, on December 6, 2019, Commerce issued a no-shipment inquiry to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) concerning the two companies.<sup>9</sup> CBP reported that it had no information to contradict Marisa's no shipments claim during the POR, but it found certain inconsistencies with respect to Lodha's no shipment claim.<sup>10</sup>

Given that Marisa reported that it made no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR, and there is no information calling Marisa's claim into question, we preliminarily determine that Marisa did not have any reviewable transactions during the POR. Consistent with Commerce's practice, we will not

rescind the review with respect to Marisa but, rather, will complete the review and issue instructions to CBP based on the final results.<sup>11</sup> Concerning Lodha, for these preliminary results, we have included it among the firms subject to the rate for non-selected respondents.

### Methodology

Commerce is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(2) of the Act. Export price is 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 preliminary results, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum. 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 is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content. A list of the topics discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum is attached as an Appendix to this notice.

### Rate for Non-Selected Respondents

The statute and Commerce's regulations do not address the establishment of a rate to be applied to companies not selected for individual examination when Commerce limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the

<sup>11</sup> Commerce determined not to rescind a review with respect to exporters that demonstrate that they had no knowledge of sales through resellers to the United States because we find it appropriate to instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the all-others rate applicable to the proceeding. Further, Commerce explained that it is more consistent with the Automatic Assessment Clarification not to rescind a review in part under these circumstances but rather to complete the review and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of the review. See, e.g., *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2012–2013*, 79 FR 15951, 15952 (March 24, 2014), unchanged in *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Final Determination of No Shipments, and Partial Rescission of Review; 2012–2013*, 79 FR 51306, 51307 (August 28, 2014) at 6–7 (citing *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (Automatic Assessment Clarification)).

<sup>1</sup> See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Lined Paper Products from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Lined Paper Products from India, Indonesia and the People's Republic of China; and Notice of Countervailing Duty Orders: Certain Lined Paper Products from India and Indonesia*, 71 FR 56949 (September 28, 2006) (*Order*).

<sup>2</sup> *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 84 FR 61011 (November 12, 2019) (*Initiation Notice*).

<sup>3</sup> See Memorandum, "Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews in Response to Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19," dated April 24, 2020.

<sup>4</sup> See Memorandum, "Certain Lined Paper Products from India: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2018–2019," dated June 11, 2020.

<sup>5</sup> See Memorandum, "Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews," dated July 21, 2020.

<sup>6</sup> *Initiation Notice*, 84 FR at 61012–61013.

<sup>7</sup> See Memorandum, "Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Lined Paper Products from India; 2018–2019," dated concurrently and hereby adopted by this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

<sup>8</sup> See Lodha's Letter, "Response to Quantity & Value Questionnaire," dated November 19, 2019; see also Marisa's Letter, "Certain Lined Paper Products from India: Marisa International ('Marisa') No export or sales of subject merchandise," dated November 26, 2019.

<sup>9</sup> See Memorandum, "No Shipment Inquiry," dated December 10, 2019.

<sup>10</sup> See Memorandum, "Request for Entry Summary," dated January 27, 2020 at Attachment.

Act. Generally, Commerce looks to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a market economy 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.”

In this review, we have preliminarily calculated weighted-average dumping margins for Navneet and Super Impex that are zero. For the companies that were not selected for individual review, we preliminarily assigned a rate based on the rates for the respondents that were selected for individual review, excluding rates that are zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available.<sup>12</sup> In accordance with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit’s decision in *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, we are applying to the ten companies that had reviewable transactions during the POR the zero percent rates calculated for Navneet and Super Impex.<sup>13</sup> These are the only rates determined in this review for individual respondents and, thus, should be applied to the ten firms not selected for individual review under section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act.

**Preliminary Results of the Review**

As a result of this review, we preliminarily find that the following weighted-average dumping margins existed for the period September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

Producer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
Cellpage Ventures Private Limited .....	0.00
Goldenpalm Manufacturers PVT Limited .....	0.00
Kokuyo Riddhi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. ....	0.00
Lodha Offset Limited .....	0.00
Lotus Global Private Limited .....	0.00
Magic International Pvt. Ltd. ....	0.00
Navneet Education Ltd. ....	0.00
PP Bafna Ventures Private Limited .....	0.00
Pioneer Stationery Pvt. Ltd. ....	0.00
SAB International .....	0.00

<sup>12</sup> See section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act.

<sup>13</sup> See *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, 821 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

Producer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
SGM Paper Products .....	0.00
Super Impex .....	0.00

**Assessment Rates**

Upon issuance of the final results, Commerce shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review. If the weighted-average dumping margin for Navneet or Super Impex is not zero or *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent), we will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* antidumping duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for each importer’s examined sales to the total entered value of those same sales in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).<sup>14</sup> If the weighted-average dumping margin for the respondents listed above is zero or *de minimis* in the final results, or an importer-specific assessment rate is zero or *de minimis* in the final results, we will instruct CBP not to assess antidumping duties on any of their entries in accordance with the *Final Modification for Reviews*.<sup>15</sup>

In accordance with Commerce’s assessment practice, for entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by Navneet or Super Impex for which it did not know that its merchandise was destined for the United States, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate of 3.91 percent, as established in the less-than-fair-value investigation, if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.<sup>16</sup> For a full discussion of this practice, see *Assessment Policy Notice*.<sup>17</sup>

We intend to issue liquidation instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all

<sup>14</sup> In these preliminary results, Commerce applied the assessment rate calculation method adopted in *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Proceedings: Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, 77 FR at 8102.

<sup>16</sup> See *Order*, 71 FR at 5695.2.

<sup>17</sup> See *Automatic Assessment Clarification*.

shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for respondents noted above will be the rates established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this administrative 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; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but the producer is, then the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding for the producer of the subject merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers or exporters will continue to be 3.91 percent, the all-others rate established in the investigation. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

**Disclosure and Public Comment**

We will disclose to parties to the proceeding any calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results of review within five days after the date of publication of this notice.<sup>18</sup> Interested parties may submit case briefs not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.<sup>19</sup> Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than seven days after the date for filing case briefs.<sup>20</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>21</sup> All briefs must be filed electronically using ACCESS. An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the established deadline.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, limited to issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and

<sup>18</sup> See 19 CFR 351.224(b).

<sup>19</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii).

<sup>20</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(d)(1); see also *Temporary Rule Modifying AD/CVD Service Requirements Due to COVID-19; Extension of Effective Period*, 85 FR 41363 (July 10, 2020) (*Temporary Rule*).

<sup>21</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2) and 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements).

Compliance, within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice.<sup>22</sup> Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. 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, Commerce intends to hold the hearing at a time and date to be determined. Parties should confirm by telephone the date and time of the hearing two days before the scheduled date.

We intend to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues raised in any written briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

#### 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 and/or countervailing duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the presumption that reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(1).

Dated: January 7, 2021.

**Jeffrey I. Kessler,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

#### Appendix

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

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Preliminary Determination of No Shipments
- V. Companies Not Selected for Individual Examination
- VI. Discussion of the Methodology
- VII. Currency Conversion
- VIII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2021-01063 Filed 1-15-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-201-836]

#### Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: 2019-2020

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is rescinding the administrative review, in part, of the antidumping duty order on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube (LWRPT) from Mexico for the period of review August 1, 2019, through July 31, 2020, based on timely withdrawals of the requests for review.

**DATES:** Applicable January 19, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kyle Clahane, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5449.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 4, 2020, Commerce published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on LWRPT from Mexico for the period of review August 1, 2019, through July 31, 2020.<sup>1</sup> On August 28, 2020, Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S. de R.L. de C.V. (Regiopytsa) filed a timely request for a review of itself.<sup>2</sup> On August 31, 2020, Nucor Tubular Products Inc. (Nucor Tubular), a domestic producer, filed a timely request for review with respect to 19 companies.<sup>3</sup> Maquilacero S.A. de C.V. (Maquilacero),<sup>4</sup> and Perfiles LM,

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 85 FR 47167 (August 4, 2020).

<sup>2</sup> See Regiopytsa's Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico, Request for Review," dated August 28, 2020.

<sup>3</sup> See Nucor Tubular's Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Request for Administrative Review," dated August 31, 2020; see also Nucor Tubular's Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Clarification of Request for Administrative Review," dated September 23, 2020. Nucor Tubular consolidated its request for review of Hylsa S.A. de C.V. (Hylsa) and Ternium Mexico S.A. de C.V. (Ternium), into a request for review of Ternium, the successor-in-interest to Hylsa.

<sup>4</sup> See Maquilacero's Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico; Maquilacero S.A. de C.V.'s Request for Administrative Review," dated August 31, 2020.

S.A. de C.V. (Perfiles),<sup>5</sup> timely requested reviews of themselves. Based on these requests, on October 6, 2020, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on LWRPT from Mexico covering the period August 1, 2019 through July 31, 2020.<sup>6</sup>

On January 4, 2021, Nucor Tubular withdrew its request for administrative review with respect to Aceros Cuatro Caminos S.A. de C.V.; Arco Metal S.A. de C.V.; Fabricaciones y Servicios de Mexico; Galvak, S.A. de C.V.; Grupo Estructuras y Perfiles, Industrias Monterrey S.A. de C.V.; Internacional de Aceros, S.A. de C.V.; PEASA-Productos Especializados de Acero; Talleres Acero Rey S.A. de C.V.; Tuberias Aspe S.A. de C.V.; Tuberia Laguna, S.A. de C.V.; and Tuberias y Derivados S.A. de C.V.<sup>7</sup>

##### Partial Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), Commerce will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the party that requested the review withdraws its request within 90 days of the publication date of the notice of initiation of the requested review.

Because Nucor Tubular's request for review, for 12 companies, was withdrawn within the 90-day deadline, and no other interested party requested a review of these 12 companies, we are rescinding this review with respect to these 12 companies. The administrative review remains active with respect to the seven remaining companies for which a review was initiated, *i.e.*, Maquilacero S.A. de C.V.; Nacional de Acero S.A. de C.V.; Perfiles LM, S.A. de C.V.; Productos Laminados de Monterrey S.A. de C.V.; Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S.A. de C.V.; Regiomontana de Perfiles y Tubos S. de R.L. de C.V.; and Ternium Mexico S.A. de C.V.<sup>8</sup>

##### Assessment

Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of LWRPT from Mexico at a rate

<sup>5</sup> See Perfiles' Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico—Request for Administrative Review," dated August 31, 2020.

<sup>6</sup> See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 85 FR 63081 (October 6, 2020) (*Initiation Notice*).

<sup>7</sup> See Nucor Tubular's Letter, "Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Mexico: Partial Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review," dated January 4, 2020.

<sup>8</sup> See *Initiation Notice*.

<sup>22</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310(c).