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upon publication of the final results of this review for shipments of the subject merchandise from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by sections 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act.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

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 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.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
On February 10, 2016, the Department disclosed to interested parties its calculations for the Final Results. 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.

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

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.

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.

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. 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:

1 See Certain Pasta From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014, 81 FR 8043 (February 17, 2016) (Final Results).
4 For a full description of the scope of the order, see “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.
6 See Final Results, 80 FR at 61362.
7 The margin for the non-examined companies was based on the calculated weighted-average
Disclosure

We will disclose the calculations performed for these amended final results to interested parties within five business days of the date of 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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

Billings Code 3510–05–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. (Borusan), Toscellik Profil ve Sac Endustrisi A.S. (Toscellik), and the “all others” rate.

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), Toscellik Profil ve Sac Endustrisi A.S. (Toscellik), 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 Toscellik 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)(i), determined to use transaction prices in Turkey as a benchmark to calculate the benefit from the provision of HRS to Borusan and Toscellik during the period of investigation.

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

3 On June 22, 2015, the CIT granted a motion to consolidate Court No. 14–00214 into Consolidated Court No. 14–00229.
5 Remand Redetermination at 18.