Softwood lumber product imports are generally entered under Chapter 44 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the Order is dispositive.5

Initiation

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.216(d), Commerce will conduct a CCR upon receipt of information or a review request showing changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of an order. Among other things, Commerce has conducted CCRs to consider the applicability of cash deposit rates after there have been changes in the name or structure of a company, such as a merger or spinoff (successor-in-interest, or successorship, determinations).

We find the information provided is sufficient to warrant a CCR of the Order. Specifically, the information CHAP provided regarding L’Atelier’s name change to CHAP demonstrates changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a CCR with respect to the Order. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d), we are initiating a CCR to determine whether CHAP is the successor-in-interest to L’Atelier for purposes of the Order.

In addition, Commerce’s regulations (19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii)), permit it to initiate a CCR and issue the preliminary results of that CCR simultaneously if it concludes that expedited action is warranted. We have on the record the results of that CCR simultaneously if it initiate a CCR and issue the preliminary findings and, therefore, we warrant a CCR of the Order.

Consequently, we are combining the initiation of the CCR described above and our preliminary results, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii).

Preliminary Results

In determining whether one company is the successor to another for AD purposes, Commerce examines a number of factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) suppliers; and (4) customer base.7 While no one, or several, of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of succession, Commerce will generally consider one company to be the successor to another company if its resulting operations are essentially the same as those of its predecessor.8 Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the company, in its current form, operates as essentially the same business entity as the prior company, Commerce will assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor.9

CHAP provided evidence that: (1) L’Atelier’s name changed to CHAP in February 2021; and (2) there were no significant changes to management,10 production facilities,11 suppliers, or customer base.12 Based on the foregoing, which is explained in greater detail in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum, we preliminarily determine that CHAP is the successor-in-interest to L’Atelier for purposes of the Order.

Should our final results of review remain the same as these preliminary results of review, effective the date of publication of the final results of review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to apply L’Atelier’s cash deposit rate to CHAP.

Public Comment

Interested parties may submit case briefs not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice.13 Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed not later than seven days after the due date for case briefs.14 Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this CCR are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issues; and (2) a brief summary of the arguments with electronic versions included.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 14 days of publication of this notice.15 Hearing requests should contain the following information: (1) The party’s name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations at the hearing will be limited to issues raised in the 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 the date and the time of the hearing two days before the scheduled date.

All submissions, with limited exceptions, must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by 5 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on the due date.

Consistent with 19 CFR 351.216(e), we intend to issue the final results of this CCR no later than 270 days after the date on which these reviews were initiated or within 45 days if all parties agree to the outcome of the review.

We are issuing and publishing this initiation and preliminary results notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: June 7, 2021.

Ryan Majerus,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–138]


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

15 Commerce is exercising its discretion under 19 CFR 351.310(c) to alter the time limit for requesting a hearing.

16 ACCESS is available to registered users at https://access.trade.gov; see also Temporary Rule Modifying AD/CVD Service Requirements Due to Covid-19: Extension of Effective Period, 85 FR 41363, (July 10, 2020).
SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that critical circumstances exist, in part, with respect to imports of pentafluoroethane (R–125) from certain producers and exporters from the People’s Republic of China (China).


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joshua Tucker or Adam Simons, 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) 482–2044 or (202) 482–6172, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 11, 2021, Commerce received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of R–125 from China filed in proper form on behalf of the petitioner, Honeywell International, Inc. On February 1, 2021, we initiated this investigation, and on June 25, 2021, we published an affirmative Preliminary Determination. Commerce selected Zhejiang Quzhou Juxin Fluorine Chemical Co., Ltd. (Juxin) and Zhejiang Sanmei Chemical Ind. Co., Ltd. (Sanmei) as the individually-examined respondents in this investigation.

On June 4, 2021, the petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of R–125 from China, pursuant to section 703(e)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.206. On June 10, 2021, Commerce requested monthly shipment data from Juxin and Sanmei for subject merchandise for the period August 2020 to May 2021, which Commerce received on June 17, 2021.

In accordance with section 703(e)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.206(c)(1), because the petitioner submitted its critical circumstance allegation more than 30 days before the scheduled date of the final determination, Commerce will make a preliminary finding as to whether there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist. Commerce will issue its preliminary finding of critical circumstances within 30 days after the petitioner submits the allegation.

Period of Investigation (POI)

The POI is January 1, 2020, through December 31, 2020.

Critical Circumstances Allegation

The petitioner alleges that there was a massive increase of imports of R–125 from China and provided monthly import data for the period October 2020 through March 2021. The petitioner states that a comparison of total imports, by quantity, for the base period October 2020 through December 2020 to the comparison period January 2021 through March 2021, shows that imports of R–125 from China increased by 45.5 percent, which is “massive” under 19 CFR 351.206(h)(2). The petitioner also alleges that there is a reasonable basis to believe that there are subsidies in this investigation which are inconsistent with the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement of the World Trade Organization (SCM Agreement).

Critical Circumstances Analysis

Section 703(e)(1) of the Act provides that Commerce will preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist in a CVD investigation if there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that: (A) The alleged countervailable subsidy is inconsistent with the SCM Agreement; and (B) there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period.

In determining whether there are “massive imports” over a “relatively short period,” pursuant to section 703(e)(1)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.206(h) and (i), Commerce normally compares the import volumes of the subject merchandise for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of the petition (i.e., the base period) to a comparable period of at least three months following the filing of the petition (i.e., the comparison period). However, the regulations also provide that if Commerce finds that importers, or exporters or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely, Commerce may consider a period of not less than three months from the earlier time. Imports must increase by at least 15 percent during the comparison period to be considered massive.

Alleged Countervailable Subsidies Are Inconsistent With the SCM Agreement

Juxin, Sanmei, and All Other Companies

On May 3, 2021, the petitioner filed a New Subsidies Allegation, alleging that Chinese producers of subject merchandise benefited from additional subsidies provided by the Government of China, including the Export Buyer’s Credit Program and the Export Seller’s Credit Program. To determine whether there exists a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that an alleged countervailable subsidy is inconsistent with the SCM Agreement, in accordance with section 703(e)(1)(A) of the Act, Commerce considered the evidence on the record pertaining to the petitioner’s allegation that the Export Buyer’s Credit Program and the Export Seller’s Credit Program are inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. Specifically, with regard to these programs, the petitioner has alleged the elements of a subsidy, supported with information reasonably available to the petitioner, that appear to be export contingent, which would render them inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. Therefore, Commerce preliminarily determines that there is a massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period.

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire from Germany, 67 FR 55808, 55809–10 (August 30, 2002).

See Pentafluoroethane (R–125) from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Determination with Final Antidumping Determination, 86 FR 36348 (June 25, 2020) (Preliminary Determination), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).


The petitioner’s petition, “Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties Pursuant to sections 701 and 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended, on Behalf of Honeywell International, Inc.,” dated January 11, 2021 (Petition).

reasonable basis to believe or suspect that alleged subsidies in the New Subsidies Allegation are inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. As a result, we preliminarily find that the criterion under section 703(e)(1)(A) of the Act has been met for Juxin, Sanmei, and all other exporters or producers not individually examined.

Non-Responsive Companies

As explained in our Preliminary Determination, we preliminarily applied total adverse facts available (AFA) to Arkema Daikin Advanced Fluorochemicals (Changsu) Co., Ltd. (Arkema); Daikin Fluorochemicals (China) Co., Ltd. (Daikin); Hongkong Richmax Ltd. (Hongkong); and Weitron International Refrigeration Equipment (Kunshan) Co., Ltd. (Weitron), pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act. In applying total AFA to these four companies, we preliminarily determined that each benefited from countervailable subsidies under the “Export Loans from Chinese State-Owned Commercial Banks (SOCBs)” program.17 Although we did not make a preliminary finding as to whether the “Export Loans from SOCBs” program was inconsistent with the SCM Agreement in the Preliminary Determination, we now preliminarily find, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that the program, as alleged in the Petition and supported by information reasonably available to the petitioner, is export-contingent within the meaning of section 771(5)(A)(B) of the Act and, thus, inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.18 We are making the inconsistency determination with regard to this program, which is the only program which we countervalued in the Preliminary Determination alleged to be inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. In so doing, we intend to limit the corresponding offset to the dumping margin (if one is found) in the companion antidumping duty investigation, which best fulfills our statutory mandate “to ensure that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully.”19 and induce future cooperation by companies in investigations where the petitioners allege the existence of programs potentially inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.

Thus, because we preliminarily find that the “Export Loans from Chinese SOCBs” program is export-contingent, we preliminarily find that the criterion under section 703(e)(1)(A) of the Act has been met for Arkema, Daikin, Hongkong, and Weitron.

Massive Imports

Commerce compared the import volumes of Juxin’s and Sanmei’s reported shipments of subject merchandise for the five months immediately preceding and following the filing of the petition. Because the petition was filed on January 11, 2021, and in order to determine whether there was a massive surge in imports for the mandatory respondents, Commerce compared the total volume of shipments during the period of August 2020 through December 2020 (the base period) with the volume of shipments during the period of January 2021 through May 2021 (the comparison period).20 We preliminarily determine that imports from both Juxin and Sanmei increased by more than 15 percent between the base and comparison periods.21 However, for purposes of our “massive imports” determination, we received information on the record about seasonality with respect to Sanmei’s imports which we considered as part of our analysis. Sanmei stated that, while it did experience a massive surge of imports of R–125 between the base and comparison periods, this surge was seasonal in nature. Sanmei also provided its shipment data for comparable periods in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020.22 Based on our analysis of Sanmei’s shipment data reported for 2018 through 2021, we find that there is a consistent pattern of seasonality evidenced by a significant increase in shipments during the months of January through May (in 2019, 2020, and 2021), when compared to August through December (in 2018, 2019, and 2020). As a result, we preliminarily find that the record reflects that any surge in Sanmei’s imports between the base and comparison periods in this investigation can be explained by seasonal trends. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that, although the surge in imports of R–125 from Sanmei during the comparison period was massive, the import surge was massive as a result of seasonal trends and, therefore, critical circumstances do not exist for Sanmei, in accordance with section 733(e)(1)(B) of the Act.23

To determine whether imports were massive for all other exporters or producers, Commerce’s normal practice is to subtract shipments reported by the cooperating mandatory respondents from shipment data for subject merchandise from Global Trade Atlas.24 However, as discussed in the Initiation Notice,25 the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States number under which the subject merchandise enters is a basket category under which non-subject merchandise may enter. Therefore, consistent with our practice, we preliminarily relied on the data of the mandatory respondents as “facts available.” In accordance with section 776(a)(1) of the Act, to determine whether imports from all other exporters or producers were massive,26 because we preliminary determine that imports from both Juxin and Sanmei increased by more than 15 percent between the base and comparison periods, we also preliminarily determine that imports from all other exporters or producers were massive.

Finally, for Arkema, Daikin, Hongkong, and Weitron, we preliminarily determine, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, that there was a massive surge in imports between the base and comparison periods.

Accordingly, consistent with section 703(e)(1) of the Act, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist with respect to Arkema, Daikin, Hongkong, Juxin, Weitron, and all other exporters and producers not individually examined.

Final Determination

We will make a final determination concerning critical circumstances in the final determination of this investigation, which is currently scheduled for October 25, 2021.

17 See Preliminary Determination PDM at “Application of AFA: Non-Responsive Q&V Questionnaire Recipients.”
20 See Juxin Critical Circumstances Data; see also Sanmei Critical Circumstances Data.
22 See Sanmei Critical Circumstances Data. Juxin did not argue that its surge in imports between the base and comparison periods was due to seasonal trends nor did it provide data to permit Commerce to perform a seasonality analysis.
23 Id.
26 See, e.g., Kegs from Mexico Preliminary Critical Circumstances Determination, 84 FR at 18798.
Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance. Interested parties will be notified of the timeline for the submission of case briefs and written comments at a later date. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be submitted no later than seven days after the deadline date for case briefs. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2), parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this investigation 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.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 703(e)(2)(A) of the Act, for Arkema, Daikin, Hongkong, Juxin, Weitron, and all other exporters and producers, we intend to direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to suspend liquidation of any unliquidated entries of subject merchandise from China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after March 27, 2021, which is 90 days prior to the date of publication of the Preliminary Determination in the Federal Register. For such entries, CBP shall require a cash deposit equal to the estimated preliminary subsidy rates established in the Preliminary Determination. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.


In accordance with section 703(f) of the Act, we intend to notify the ITC of this preliminary determination of critical circumstances.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 6, 2021.

James Maeder,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Vessel and Gear Marking

The Department of Commerce will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, on or after the date of publication of this notice. We invite the general public and other Federal agencies to comment, as appropriate, concerning this information collection, which helps us assess the impact of our information collection requirements and minimize the public’s reporting burden. Public comments were previously requested via the Federal Register on March 22, 2021, (86 FR 15198) during a 60-day comment period. This notice allows for an additional 30 days for public comments.

Agency: National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.
Title: Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Vessel and Gear Marking.
OMB Control Number: 0648–0373.
Form Number(s): None.
Type of Request: Regular submission [extension of a current information collection].
Number of Respondents: 4,767.
Average Hours per Response: 45 minutes to mark the vessel; 15 minutes each to mark highflyers, buoyos, and floats.
Total Annual Burden Hours: 4,950.

Needs and Uses: This request is for an extension of a current information collection. These requirements apply to vessel owners in the Atlantic highly migratory species (HMS) Fishery.

Under current regulations at 50 CFR 635.6, fishing vessels permitted for Atlantic HMS fisheries must display their official vessel numbers on their vessels. Flotation devices and high-flyers attached to certain fishing gears must also be marked with the vessel’s official number to identify the vessel to which the gear belongs. These requirements are necessary for identification, law enforcement, and monitoring purposes.

Specifically, all vessel owners that hold a valid Atlantic HMS permit under 50 CFR 635.4, other than an Atlantic HMS Angling permit, are required to display their official vessel identification number. Numbers must be permanently affixed to, or painted on, the port and starboard sides of the deckhouse or hull and on an appropriate weather deck, so as to be clearly visible from an enforcement vessel or aircraft. In block Arabic numerals permanently affixed to or painted on the vessel in contrasting color to the background. At least 18 inches (45.7 cm) in height for vessels over 65 ft (19.8 m) in length; at least 10 inches (25.4 cm) in height for all other vessels over 25 ft (7.6 m) in length; and at least 3 inches (7.6 cm) in height for vessels 25 ft (7.6 m) in length or less.

Furthermore, the owner or operator of a vessel for which a permit has been issued under §635.4 and that uses handline, buoy gear, harpoon, longline, or gillnet, must display the vessel’s name, registration number or Atlantic Tunas, Atlantic HMS Angling, or Atlantic HMS Charter/Headboat permit number on each float attached to a handline, buoy gear, or harpoon, and on the terminal floats and high-flyers (if applicable) on a longline or gillnet used by the vessel. The vessel’s name or number must be at least 1 inch (2.5 cm) in height in block letters or Arabic numerals in a color that contrasts with the background color of the float or high-flyer.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations (vessel owners).
Frequency: Annually for each vessel or piece of gear required to be marked.

The estimated number of gear items that require marking per vessel owner range from 2 buoys for bottom longline vessels, up to 35 buoys for swordfish buoy gear and Caribbean Small Boat vessels.

Respondent’s Obligation: Mandatory.

This information collection request may be viewed at www.reginfo.gov. Follow the instructions to view the Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be submitted within 30 days of the publication of this notice on the following website www.reginfo.gov/public/do/RAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function and