

at that exporter's rate) at the PRC-wide rate.²²

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this review for shipments of the subject merchandise from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by sections 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For any companies listed that have a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be that established in the final results of this review (except, if the rate is zero or *de minimis*, then zero cash deposit will be required); (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be that for the PRC-wide entity; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice also 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 the 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.

These preliminary results are being issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: March 2, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I

List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum:

1. Summary
2. Case History
3. Scope of the Order

4. Discussion of the Methodology
 - a. Non-Market Economy Status
 - b. Companies that Did Not Establish Their Eligibility for a Separate Rate
 - c. Preliminary Determination of No Shipments
5. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2016-05404 Filed 3-9-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-475-818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is amending the *Final Results*¹ of the antidumping duty administrative review of certain pasta (pasta) from Italy to correct a ministerial error. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

DATES: Effective March 10, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joy Zhang, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1168.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 10, 2016, the Department disclosed to interested parties its calculations for the *Final Results*.² On February 17, 2016, the Department received a timely filed ministerial error allegation from La Molisana, S.p.A. (La Molisana) regarding the Department's final margin calculation.³

Period of Review

The POR covered by this review is July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

¹ See *Certain Pasta From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 81 FR 8043 (February 17, 2016) (*Final Results*).

² See Memorandum to Eric Greynolds, Program Manager, AD/CVD Operations, Office III from Joy Zhang, Case Analyst, "2013-2014 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Pasta from Italy—Final Results, Sales Analysis Memorandum for La Molisana," dated February 10, 2016 (Final Results Calculations).

³ See Letter from La Molisana, "Certain Pasta From Italy: A-475-818; Request for Correction of Clerical Error Pursuant to 17 CFR Section 351.224(f)," dated February 16, 2016.

Scope of the Order

Imports covered by the order are shipments of certain non-egg dry pasta. The merchandise subject to review is currently classifiable under items 1901.90.90.95 and 1902.19.20 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 merchandise subject to the order is dispositive.⁴

Ministerial Errors

Section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), and 19 CFR 351.224(f) defines a ministerial error as an error "in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which {the Department} considers ministerial." We analyzed La Molisana's ministerial error comments and determined, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), that there was a ministerial error in our margin calculation for La Molisana for the *Final Results*. For a complete discussion of the alleged error, see the Department's Ministerial Error Memorandum.⁵

In accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), we are amending the *Final Results*. Specifically, we are amending the weighted-average dumping margin for La Molisana as well as for the companies that were not selected for individual examination, who were assigned the rate determined for La Molisana.⁶ The revised weighted-average dumping margins for the affected companies are detailed below.

Amended Final Results

As a result of correcting for the ministerial error, we determined the following amended weighted-average dumping margins⁷ for the period July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014:

⁴ For a full description of the scope of the order, see the "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission: Certain Pasta from Italy; 2013-2014" from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, dated February 9, 2016 (Issues and Decision Memorandum) and incorporated herein by reference.

⁵ See "Amended Final Results of the 2013-2014 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy: Allegation of Ministerial Error," dated concurrently with this notice ("Ministerial Error Memorandum").

⁶ See *Final Results*, 80 FR at 61362.

⁷ The margin for the non-examined companies was based on the calculated weighted-average

²² *Id.*

Producer and/or exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
La Molisana S.p.A	6.43
Rummo S.p.A., Lenta Lavorazione, Pasta Castiglioni, and Rummo S.p.A. Molino e Pastificio (collectively, the Rummo Group)	0.00
Pastificio Andalini S.p.A. Delverde Industrie Alimentari S.p.A	6.43

Duty Assessment/Case Deposits

The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these amended final results to liquidate shipments of subject merchandise produced and/or exported by respondents listed above entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act, the Department also intends to instruct CBP to collect cash deposits of estimated dumping duties, in the amounts shown above for each of the respective companies shown above, on shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after February 17, 2016, the date of publication of the *Final Results*. For all non-reviewed firms, we will instruct CBP to continue to collect cash deposits at the most-recent company-specific or all-others rate applicable to the company, as appropriate. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3), which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

margin of La Molisana (the sole mandatory respondent receiving an above *de minimis* margin in these final results).

Disclosure

We will disclose the calculations performed for these amended final results to interested parties within five business days of the date of the publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b).

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(h) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

Dated: March 4, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–05407 Filed 3–9–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–489–817]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Turkey: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Determination of the Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

SUMMARY: On February 22, 2016, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained ¹ the Department of Commerce’s (the Department) final results of a redetermination ² issued pursuant to the CIT’s remand orders in *Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi Ve Ticaret A.S. and Borusan Istikbal Ticaret v. United States*, 61 F. Supp. 3d 1306 (CIT April 22, 2015) (*Borusan*) and *Maverick Tube Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 14–00229, Slip Op. 15–59 (CIT June 15, 2015) (*Maverick*) ³, with respect to the Department’s *Final Determination* of the countervailing duty (CVD) investigation of oil country tubular goods from Turkey.⁴ Consistent with the decision of

¹ See *Maverick Tube Corporation v. United States*, CIT Consol. Court No. 14–00229, Slip Op. 16–16 (February 22, 2016).

² See *Final Results of Remand Redetermination*, Court No. 14–00229, dated August 31, 2015, available at: <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands/RemandRedetermination>.

³ On June 22, 2015, the CIT granted a motion to consolidate Court No. 14–00214 into Consolidated Court No. 14–00229.

⁴ See *Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods From the Republic of Turkey: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Affirmative Critical Circumstances Determination*, 79 FR 41964 (July 18, 2014) (*Final Determination*). The Department issued a countervailing duty order in this proceeding on September 10, 2014. See *Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods From India and the Republic of Turkey: Countervailing Duty Orders*

the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*), the Department is notifying the public that the Court’s final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the *Final Determination*, and that the Department is amending the *Final Determination* with respect to Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. (Borusan), Toscelik Profil ve Sac Endustrisi A.S. (Toscelik), and the “all others” rate.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 3, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Peter Zukowski or Nicholas Czajkowski, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189 or (202) 482–1395, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In *Borusan*, the CIT remanded for further consideration the Department’s finding of distortion in the Turkish hot-rolled steel (HRS) market, the Department’s selection of a HRS benchmark, and the Department’s application of facts available with adverse inferences with respect to purchases of HRS by the respondent Borusan. In *Maverick*, the CIT remanded issues pertaining to the Department’s HRS benchmark calculations as well and, in addition, the Department’s benchmark valuation for a parcel of land that the Government of Turkey (GOT) granted to the respondent Toscelik in 2008 for less than adequate remuneration (LTAR).

On August 31, 2015, the Department issued its *Remand Redetermination*. In its *Remand Redetermination*, the Department, under protest, conducted a new HRS market analysis consistent with the Court’s remand order, determined that under that specific analysis the HRS market was not distorted in Turkey, and pursuant to section 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2)(ii), determined to use transaction prices in Turkey as a benchmark to calculate the benefit from the provision of HRS to Borusan and Toscelik during the period of investigation.⁵ In addition, the Department revised the benchmark valuation to calculate the benefit

and Amended Affirmative Final Countervailing Duty Determination for India, 79 FR 53688 (September 10, 2014) (Order).

⁵ *Remand Redetermination* at 18.