

Assessment Rates

Consistent with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(2), upon completion of the administrative review, Commerce shall determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, countervailing duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review. Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP no earlier than 35 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review in the **Federal Register**. If a timely summons is filed at the U.S. Court of International Trade, the assessment instructions will direct CBP not to liquidate relevant entries until the time for parties to file a request for a statutory injunction has expired (*i.e.*, within 90 days of publication).

Cash Deposit Requirements

In accordance with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act, Commerce also intends to instruct CBP to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties in the amount shown above, for the companies listed above, for shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review. For all non-reviewed firms, Commerce will instruct CBP to continue to collect cash deposits at the all-others rate or the most recent company-specific 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 an administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or 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 sanctionable violation.

Notification to Interested Parties

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

Dated: September 6, 2022.

Lisa W. Wang,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2022–19856 Filed 9–13–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–836]

Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Continuation of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (China) would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, Commerce is publishing a notice of continuation of the AD order.

DATES: Applicable September 14, 2022.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harrison Tanchuck, 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) 482–7421.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 29, 1995, Commerce published in the **Federal Register** the AD order on glycine from China.¹ On January 3, 2022, Commerce published a notice of initiation of the fifth sunset review of the *Order*, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).² Commerce conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the *Order*, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2).

As a result of its review, pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(c) of the Act, Commerce determined that revocation of the *Order* on glycine from China would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Commerce, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail should the *Order* be revoked.³

On September 2, 2022, the ITC published its determination, pursuant to

sections 751(c) and 752(a) of the Act, that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.⁴

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the *Order* is glycine, which is a free-flowing crystalline material, like salt or sugar. Glycine is produced at varying levels of purity and is used as a sweetener/taste enhancer, a buffering agent, reabsorbable amino acid, chemical intermediate, and a metal complexing agent. This proceeding includes glycine of all purity levels. Glycine is currently classified under subheading 2922.49.4020 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).⁵ Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the *Order* is dispositive.

Continuation of the Order

As a result of the determinations by Commerce and the ITC that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping as well as material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(a), Commerce hereby orders the continuation of the *Order*.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect AD cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of continuation of the *Order* will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2), Commerce intends to initiate the next five-year (sunset) review of the *Order* no later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation.

Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to an administrative protective order (APO) of

⁴ See *Glycine from the People's Republic of China*, 87 FR 54263 (September 2, 2022).

⁵ In separate scope rulings, Commerce determined that: (a) D(-)-Phenylglycine Ethyl Dane Salt is outside the scope of the *Order*; and (b) Chinese glycine exported from India remains the same class or kind of merchandise as the China-origin glycine imported into India. See *Notice of Scope Rulings and Anticircumvention Inquiries*, 62 FR 62288 (November 21, 1997); and *Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Final Partial Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 77 FR 73426 (December 10, 2012), respectively.

¹ See *Antidumping Duty Order: Glycine from the People's Republic of China*, 60 FR 16116 (March 29, 1995) (*Order*).

² See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 87 FR 76 (January 3, 2022).

³ See *Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 87 FR 25446 (April 25, 2022), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

their responsibility concerning the return, destruction, or conversion to judicial protective order of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO which may be subject to sanctions.

Notification to Interested Parties

This five-year sunset review and this notice are in accordance with section 751I and (d)(2) of the Act and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Dated: September 8, 2022.
Lisa W. Wang,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.
[FR Doc. 2022–19857 Filed 9–13–22; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration
[A–549–502]

Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes From Thailand: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review; 2017–2018

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.
SUMMARY: On September 17, 2021, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment in *Saha Thai Steel Pipe Public Company Ltd. v.*

United States, 538 F. Supp. 3d 1354 (CIT 2021) (*Saha Thai II*), sustaining the U.S. Department of Commerce’s (Commerce) final results of redetermination pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes (pipes and tubes) from Thailand covering the period of review (POR) March 1, 2017, through February 28, 2018. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT’s final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce’s final results of the administrative review, and that Commerce is amending the final results of review with respect to the weighted-average dumping margin assigned to Saha Thai Steel Pipe (Public) Company, Ltd. (*Saha Thai*).

DATES: Applicable September 27, 2021.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles DeFilippo, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3797.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background

On November 20, 2019, Commerce published its *Final Results* in the 2017–2018 antidumping duty administrative review of pipes and tubes from Thailand.¹ In the *Final Results*, Commerce determined that a particular market situation (PMS) existed in the Thai pipes and tubes market related to purchases of hot-rolled coil during the POR.²

Mandatory respondent Saha Thai challenged Commerce’s *Final Results* before the CIT. On October 19, 2020, the CIT remanded the *Final Results* and ordered Commerce to remove its cost-based PMS adjustment and recalculate Saha Thai’s weighted-average dumping margin without a PMS adjustment.³ In the *Final Redetermination*, issued in March 2021, Commerce, under respectful protest, recalculated Saha Thai’s weighted-average dumping margin without making a cost-based PMS adjustment.⁴ The CIT held that Commerce’s *Final Redetermination* was consistent with the CIT’s order in *Saha Thai II*.⁵

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,⁶ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,⁷ the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to sections 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s September 17, 2021, judgment constitutes a final decision of the CIT that is not in harmony with Commerce’s *Final Results*. Thus, this notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court judgment, Commerce is amending its *Final Results* with respect to Saha Thai. The revised dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/producer	Final results of review: weighted-average dumping margin (percent)	Final results of redetermination: weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Saha Thai Steel Pipe (Public) Company, Ltd	5.15	0.00

Cash Deposit Requirements

Because Saha Thai has a superseding cash deposit rate, *i.e.*, there have been final results published in a subsequent administrative review, we will not issue

revised cash deposit instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). These amended final results of review will not affect the current cash deposit rate.

Liquidation of Suspended Entries

Commerce intends to instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject merchandise, where appropriate,

¹ See *Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2017–2018*, 84 FR 64041 (November 20, 2019) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.
² *Id.*; see also *Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and*

Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2017–2018, 84 FR 22450 (May 17, 2019), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum, at 6–7.
³ See *Saha Thai Steel Pipe Pub. Co. Ltd. v. United States*, 476 F. Supp. 3d 1378, 1386 (CIT 2020) (*Saha Thai I*).
⁴ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Saha Thai Steel Pipe Pub. Co.,*

Ltd., et al. v. United States, Court No. 19–00208, Slip Op. 20–148, dated March 14, 2021 (*Final Redetermination*).
⁵ See *Saha Thai II*.
⁶ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).
⁷ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).