administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

Revised Factual Information Requirements

On April 10, 2013, the Department published Definition of Factual Information and Time Limits for Submission of Factual Information: Final Rule, 78 FR 21246 (April 10, 2013), which modified two regulations related to antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings: The definition of factual information (19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), and the time limits for the submission of factual information (19 CFR 351.301). The final rule identifies five categories of factual information in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21), which are summarized as follows: (i) Evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)-(iv). The final rule requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. The final rule also modified 19 CFR 351.301 so that, rather than providing general time limits, there are specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the Final Rule. The Department intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

Revised Extension of Time Limits Regulation

On September 20, 2013, the Department modified its regulation concerning the extension of time limits for submissions in antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings: Final Rule, 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013). The modification clarifies that parties may request an extension of time limits before a time limit established under Part 351 expires, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the time limit established under Part 351 expires. For submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Examples include, but are not limited to: (1) Case and rebuttal briefs, filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309; (2) factual information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c), or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2), filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3) and rebuttal, clarification and correction filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(4); (3) comments concerning the selection of a surrogate country and surrogate values and rebuttal; (4) comments concerning U.S. Customs and Border Protection data; and (5) quantity and value questionnaires. Under certain circumstances, the Department may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, the Department will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. This modification also requires that an extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission, and clarifies the circumstances under which the Department will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after October 21, 2013. Please review the final rule, available at http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm, prior to submitting factual information in these segments. These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(ii).

Dated: January 9, 2017.

Gary Taverner,
Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2017–00674 Filed 1–12–17; 8:45 am]
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AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On August 11, 2016, the Department of Commerce (Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (TRBs) from the People’s Republic of China (PRC) for eight companies. Based on timely withdrawal of requests for review, we are now rescinding this administrative review with respect to two of these companies, Changshan Peer Bearing Co. Ltd. (CPZ/SKF) and GGB Bearing Technology (Suzhou) Co., Ltd. (GGB).


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Medley or Whitley Herndon, 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) 482–4987 or (202) 482–6274, respectively.

Background

In June 2016, the Department received multiple timely requests to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC. Based upon these requests, on August 11, 2016, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930,
as amended (the Act), the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review covering the period June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2016, with respect to eight companies. On September 29, 2016, and October 11, 2016, CPZ/SKF and GGB, respectively, withdrew their requests for an administrative review.

Partial Rescission

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review in whole or in part, if a party who requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. CPZ/SKF and GGB timely withdrew their requests for an administrative review of themselves; no other party requested a review of these companies. Accordingly, we are rescinding this review, in part, with respect to these companies, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For CPZ/SKF and GGB, the companies for which these reviews are rescinded, antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of this notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a 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 review 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 doubled antidumping duties.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

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, 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 terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751 and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).


Gary Taverman, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.
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Certain Magnesia Carbon Bricks From the People’s Republic of China: Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2014

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

SUMMARY: On September 13, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on certain chemically-bonded magnesia carbon bricks (MCBs) from the People’s Republic of China (PRC). The period of review (POR) is January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014. The Department preliminarily found no evidence of any reviewable entries and received no comments on the preliminary results. Therefore, the Department is rescinding the administrative review of the CVD order on MCBs from the PRC.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background

On September 13, 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. No parties submitted comments.

Rescission

It is the Department’s practice to rescind an administrative review of a CVD order, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), when there are no reviewable entries of subject merchandise during the POR for which liquidation is suspended. Normally, upon completion of an administrative review, the suspended entries are liquidated at the CVD assessment rate calculated for the review period. See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). Therefore, for an administrative review to be conducted, there must be a reviewable, suspended entry that the Department can order CBP to liquidate at the newly calculated CVD assessment rate. Accordingly, in the absence of suspended entries of subject merchandise during the period of this administrative review (January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014), we are rescinding this administrative review of the CVD order on MCBs from the PRC.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: January 9, 2017.

Gary Taverman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

1 See Certain Magnesia Carbon Bricks from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2014, 81 FR 62870 (September 13, 2016) (Preliminary Results).

2 See, e.g., Certain Welded Carbon Steel Standard Pipe and Tube from Turkey: Notice of Final Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, In Part, 77 FR 6542 (February 8, 2012). In the Preliminary Results the Department stated “As is our practice, the Department finds that it is not appropriate to rescind this review, but, rather, to complete this review and to issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of this review.” This sentence was included in error. The Department issues preliminary and final results in so-called “no shipment” reviews in antidumping proceedings only. See, e.g., Siliconmanganese from India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015, 81 FR 26826 (May 10, 2016) and accompanying Decision Memorandum at 3.