

a top coat;⁵ and without an adhesive backing. Certain lightweight thermal paper is typically (but not exclusively) used in point-of-sale applications such as ATM receipts, credit card receipts, gas pump receipts, and retail store receipts. The merchandise subject to this review may be classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) under subheadings 3703.10.60, 4811.59.20, 4811.90.8040, 4811.90.9090, 4820.10.20, 4823.40.00, 4811.90.8030, 4811.90.8050, 4811.90.9030, and 4811.90.9050.^{6,7} Although HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive.

Final Results of Review

The Department continues to find that Jaan Huey and Hanhong are not eligible for a separate rate and are part of the PRC-wide entity for the period November 1, 2014, through October 31, 2015. Because no party requested a review of the PRC-wide entity, and the Department no longer considers the PRC-wide entity as an exporter conditionally subject to administrative reviews, we did not conduct a review of the PRC-wide entity and the PRC-wide entity’s rate is not subject to change in this administrative review.⁸

Assessment Rates

We will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to apply an *ad valorem* assessment rate of 115.29 percent (the rate applicable to the PRC-wide entity) to all entries of subject merchandise during the POR which

⁵ A top coat, when applied, is typically made of polyvinyl acetone, polyvinyl alcohol, and/or like materials and is intended to provide environmental protection, an improved surface for press printing, and/or wear protection for the thermal print head.

⁶ HTSUS subheading 4811.90.8000 was a classification used for LWTP until January 1, 2007. Effective that date, subheading 4811.90.8000 was replaced with 4811.90.8020 (for gift wrap, a non-subject product) and 4811.90.8040 (for “other” including LWTP). HTSUS subheading 4811.90.9000 was a classification for LWTP until July 1, 2005. Effective that date, subheading 4811.90.9000 was replaced with 4811.90.9010 (for tissue paper, a non-subject product) and 4811.90.9090 (for “other,” including LWTP).

⁷ As of January 1, 2009, the International Trade Commission deleted HTSUS subheadings 4811.90.8040 and 4811.90.9090 and added HTSUS subheadings 4811.90.8030, 4811.90.8050, 4811.90.9030, and 4811.90.9050 to the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (2009)*. See *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (2009)*, available at <www.usitc.gov>. These HTSUS subheadings were added to the scope of the order in LWTP’s LTFV investigation.

⁸ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963 (November 4, 2013).

were exported by Jaan Huey and Hanhong. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Jaan Huey and Hanhong, as part of the PRC-wide entity, will be the PRC-wide rate of 115.29 percent; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters who are not under review in this segment of the proceeding but who have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (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 the PRC-wide rate of 115.29 percent; 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(s) 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 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 this period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

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.

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

Dated: December 12, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–30308 Filed 12–15–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–869]

Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2015

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

SUMMARY: On June 17, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diffusion-annealed, nickel-plated flat rolled steel products from Japan.¹ The review covers one company, Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd. (Toyo Kohan). The period of review (POR) is November 19, 2013 through April 30, 2015. As a result of our analysis of the comments and information received, these final results do not differ from the *Preliminary Results*.

DATES: Effective December 16, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dena Crossland or Brian Davis, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3362 or (202) 482–7924, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 17, 2016, the Department published the *Preliminary Results*. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii), we invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*.² We received a case brief from Thomas Steel Strip Corporation (Petitioner) on

¹ See *Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products from Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2015*, 81 FR 39627 (June 17, 2016) (*Preliminary Results*).

² See *Preliminary Results*, 81 FR at 39628.

August 1, 2016,³ and a rebuttal brief from Toyo Kohan on August 12, 2016.⁴

On October 13, 2016, the Department issued a memorandum extending the time period for issuing the final results of this administrative review from October 15, 2016, to December 9, 2016.⁵

Scope of the Order

The diffusion-annealed, nickel-plated flat-rolled steel products included in this order are flat-rolled, cold-reduced steel products, regardless of chemistry; whether or not in coils; either plated or coated with nickel or nickel-based alloys and subsequently annealed (*i.e.*, “diffusion-annealed”); whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other metallic or nonmetallic substances; and less than or equal to 2.0 mm in nominal thickness. For purposes of this order, “nickel-based alloys” include all nickel alloys with other metals in which nickel accounts for at least 80 percent of the alloy by volume.

Imports of merchandise included in the scope of this order are classified primarily under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings 7212.50.0000 and 7210.90.6000, but may also be classified under HTSUS subheadings 7210.70.6090, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7219.90.0020, 7219.90.0025, 7219.90.0060, 7219.90.0080, 7220.90.0010, 7220.90.0015, 7225.99.0090, or 7226.99.0180. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice.⁶

³ See Case Brief of Thomas Steel Strip Corporation, dated August 1, 2016 (Petitioner’s Case Brief).

⁴ See Letter from Toyo Kohan to the Department of Commerce regarding “Toyo Kohan’s Rebuttal Brief: Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products from Japan,” dated August 12, 2016 (Toyo Kohan’s Rebuttal Brief).

⁵ See Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, from Dena Crossland, International Trade Compliance Analyst, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Office VI, through Scot Fullerton, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Office VI, on the subject of “Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products from Japan: Extension of Deadline for Final Results of Antidumping; 2013/2015,” dated October 13, 2016.

⁶ See Memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and

A list of the issues that parties raised and to which we responded is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Issues and 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 <http://access.trade.gov> and in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on a review of the record and comments received from interested parties regarding our *Preliminary Results*, we have not recalculated Toyo Kohan’s weighted-average dumping margin for these final results.

Final Results of Review

The Department determines that, for the period November 19, 2013, through April 30, 2015, the weighted-average dumping margin for Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd. is zero.

Duty Assessment

The Department shall determine and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.⁷ Because Toyo Kohan’s weighted-average dumping margin is zero for these final results of review, we will instruct CBP not to assess duties on any of its entries in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212 and the *Final Modification for Reviews*, *i.e.*, “{w}here the weighted-average margin of dumping for the exporter is determined to be zero or *de minimis*, no antidumping duties will be assessed.”⁸ The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of

Compliance entitled “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Administrative Review, 2013–2015: Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products from Japan,” dated concurrently with this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

⁷ In these final results, the Department 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*).

⁸ *Id.* at 8102.

merchandise covered by the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.

For entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by Toyo Kohan for which it did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. The all-others rate is 45.42 percent.⁹ We intend to issue assessment instructions directly 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 this notice for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of these final results, as provided by section 751(a)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (Act): (1) No cash deposit will be required for Toyo Kohan since the rate for Toyo Kohan in the final results of this administrative review is zero; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers 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 in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding for the manufacturer of the subject merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 45.42 percent, the all-others rate established in the antidumping investigation.¹⁰ These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers Regarding the Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant

⁹ See *Diffusion-Annealed, Nickel-Plated Flat-Rolled Steel Products from Japan: Antidumping Duty Order*, 79 FR 30816, 30817 (May 29, 2014) (*Order*).

¹⁰ *Id.*

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 doubled antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as a 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), 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.

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

Dated: December 9, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix—List of Topics Discussed in the Final Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. List of Issues
- III. Background
- IV. Scope of the Order
- V. Discussion of Interested Party Comments
 - Comment 1:* Whether Certain of Toyo Kohan's Home Market Transactions Were Made Outside the Ordinary Course of Trade and Should Be Excluded From Analysis
 - Comment 2:* U.S. Date of Sale
 - Comment 3:* Whether the Costs for a Certain Control Number Should Be Disregarded
- VI. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2016-30306 Filed 12-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed

circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from India to determine whether to reinstate the order with respect to Viraj Profiles Ltd. (Viraj) and Venus Wire Industries Pvt. Ltd. and its affiliates Hindustan Inox, Precision Metals and Sieves Manufacturers (India) Pvt. Ltd. (collectively, Venus).

DATES: Effective December 16, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Schauer, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0410.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 21, 1995, the Department published the antidumping duty (AD) order on SSB from India.¹ On September 14, 2004, the Department conditionally revoked the *Order* with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Viraj Alloys, Ltd., Viraj Forgings, Ltd., and Viraj Impoexpo, Ltd. (collectively, Viraj, and now known as Viraj Profiles Limited²), based on a finding of three years of no dumping.³ On September 13, 2011, the Department conditionally revoked the *Order* with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Venus, based on a finding of three years of no dumping.⁴

¹ See *Antidumping Duty Orders: Stainless Steel Bar from Brazil, India, and Japan*, 60 FR 9661 (February 21, 1995) (*Order*).

² In July 2006, Viraj Forgings Ltd. merged with Viraj Alloys Ltd.; in April 2007, Viraj Alloys and Viraj Impoexpo Ltd. merged into Viraj Profiles Ltd. See Letter from the petitioners, "Stainless Steel Bar From India—Petitioners' Request for Changed Circumstances Reviews," dated September 29, 2016 (CCR Request) at Exhibit GEN-1.

³ See *Stainless Steel Bar From India; Final Results, Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Part, and Determination To Revoke in Part*, 69 FR 55409 (September 14, 2004) (*Viraj Revocation*). The regulatory provision governing partial revocation at the time of Viraj's (and Venus's) revocation was 19 CFR 353.25 (1997). The relevant language remained substantively unchanged when 19 CFR 353.25 was superseded by 19 CFR 351.222 in 1997. See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 61 FR 7308 (February 27, 1996) (*1996 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*); see also *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27325-26, 27399-402 (May 19, 1997) (*Preamble*). The portion of 19 CFR 351.222 related to partial revocations of orders as to specific companies has been revoked for all reviews initiated on or after June 20, 2012. See *Modification to Regulation Concerning the Revocation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders: Final Rule*, 77 FR 29875 (May 21, 2012) (*Revocation Final Rule*).

⁴ See *Stainless Steel Bar from India: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation of the Order, in Part*, 76 FR 56401 (September 13, 2011) (*Venus Revocation*).

On September 29, 2016, the petitioners⁵ alleged that, since their conditional revocation from the *Order*, there is evidence that Viraj and Venus have both resumed sales to the United States at prices below normal value (NV). The petitioners note that Viraj and Venus agreed in writing to reinstatement into the AD order if either company were found to have resumed dumping, and alleges that, because Viraj and Venus violated this agreement, the Department should initiate a changed circumstances review (CCR) to determine whether to reinstate Viraj and Venus into the *Order*.⁶

In November 2016, Viraj and Venus objected to the petitioners' request for a CCR.⁷ On November 28, 2016, the petitioners submitted a rebuttal to Venus' objection to the request for a CCR.⁸ Also in November 2016, the Department extended the time period for determining whether to initiate the CCR by 45 days to December 28, 2016.⁹

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.216(b), and as discussed in further detail below, the Department finds the information submitted by the petitioners sufficient to warrant initiation of a CCR of the AD order on SSB from India with respect to Viraj and Venus. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

In this CCR, we intend to determine whether Viraj or Venus sold SSB from India at less than NV subsequent to their revocations from the *Order*. If we make an affirmative preliminary finding, we will direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend liquidation of all entries of SSB manufactured in India and exported by the company(ies) for which we made an affirmative finding.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is stainless steel bar. Stainless steel bar

⁵ Carpenter Technology Corporation, Crucible Industries LLC, Electralloy, a Division of G.O. Carlson, Inc., North American Stainless, Outokumpu Stainless Bar, LLC, Universal Stainless & Alloy Products, Inc., and Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc. (collectively, the petitioners)

⁶ See CCR Request.

⁷ See Letter from Viraj, "Stainless Steel Bar from India," dated November 14, 2016 (Viraj Rebuttal) and Letter from Venus, "Stainless Steel Bars ("SSB") from India—Response to Request for Changed Circumstances Review," dated November 4, 2016 (Venus Rebuttal).

⁸ See Letter from the petitioners, "Stainless Bar from India—Petitioners' Comments Concerning Venus' Rebuttal Comments to Petitioners' Changed Circumstances Review Request," dated November 29, 2016.

⁹ See Memorandum, "Extension of Deadline to Initiate Changed Circumstances Review," dated November 10, 2016.