

the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will calculate importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratios based on estimated entered values.

We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review for each importer (or customer) for which the importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratio is above *de minimis* (i.e., at or above 0.50 percent). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the importer-specific (or customer-specific) *ad valorem* ratio is *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.50 percent).

The Department clarified its “automatic assessment” regulation on May 6, 2003. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the company included in the final results where the reviewed companies did not know the merchandise it sold to the intermediary (e.g., a reseller, trading company, or exporter) was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there was no rate calculated in this review for the intermediary involved in the transaction. *See id.*, 68 FR at 23954.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Taiwan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Yieh Phui will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if a rate is less than 0.50 percent, and therefore *de minimis*, the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash

deposit rate will be 9.70 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Antidumping Duty Order*.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 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 double antidumping duties.

These preliminary results of antidumping administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 31, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–14031 Filed 6–7–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–977]

High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 8, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy Lord, Emeka Chukwudebe, or Matthew Renkey, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, (202) 482–7425, (202) 482–0219, or (202) 482–2312, respectively; Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 11, 2011, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) received a petition concerning imports of high pressure steel cylinders (“steel cylinders”) from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) filed in proper form by Norris Cylinder Company¹ (“Petitioner”). *See* Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and

Countervailing Duties: High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People’s Republic of China dated May 11, 2011, (“Petition”). On May 13, 2011, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire requesting information and clarification of certain areas of the Petition. Petitioner timely filed additional information on May 20, 2011.²

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (“POI”) is October 2010 through March 2011. *See* 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1).

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), Petitioner alleges that imports of steel cylinders from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party, as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigation that Petitioner is requesting the Department to initiate (*see* “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below).

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by the scope of this investigation are steel cylinders from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of the investigation, *see* “Scope of Investigation,” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of Investigation

During our review of the Petition, we discussed the scope with Petitioner to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief. As a result, the “Scope of Investigation” language has been modified from the language in the Petition to reflect these clarifications. *See* Memo to the File from Meredith A.W. Rutherford regarding Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties and Countervailing Duties on High Pressure Steel Cylinders

¹ Norris Cylinder Company (“Norris”) identifies itself as the sole producer of the domestic like product based on its knowledge of the industry. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at Exhibit II–1.

² *See* Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties and Countervailing Duties on Imports of High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People’s Republic of China (the PRC): Supplemental Questions, dated May 20, 2011 (“Supplement to the AD/CVD Petition”).

from the People's Republic of China; Conference Call with Petitioner, May 24, 2011.

Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to the regulations (*see Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997)), we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages interested parties to submit such comments by Monday, June 20, 2011, which is twenty calendar days from the signature date of this notice. All comments must be filed on the records of both the PRC antidumping duty investigation as well as the PRC countervailing duty investigation. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide the Department with ample opportunity to consider all comments and to consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination.

Comments on Product Characteristics for Antidumping Duty Questionnaires

We are requesting comments from interested parties regarding the appropriate physical characteristics of steel cylinders to be reported in response to the Department's antidumping questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the merchandise under consideration in order to more accurately report the relevant factors and costs of production, as well as to develop appropriate product comparison criteria.

Interested parties may provide information or comments that they believe are relevant to the development of an accurate listing of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: (1) General product characteristics; and (2) the product comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product comparison criteria. We base product comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, while there may be some physical product characteristics utilized by manufacturers to describe steel cylinders, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the

order in which the physical characteristics should be used in product matching. Generally, the Department attempts to list the most important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

In order to consider the suggestions of interested parties in developing and issuing the antidumping duty questionnaires, we must receive comments at the above-referenced address by June 20, 2011. Additionally, rebuttal comments must be received by June 27, 2011.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the industry.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the "industry" as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission ("ITC"), which is responsible for determining whether "the domestic industry" has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (*see* section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the

like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law. *See USEC, Inc. v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *cert. denied* 492 U.S. 919 (1989)).

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this subtitle." Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is "the article subject to an investigation" (*i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioner does not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that steel cylinders constitute a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product. For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China ("Initiation Checklist"), at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Petition Covering High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China, on file in the Central Records Unit ("CRU"), Room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building.

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the "Scope of Investigation" section above. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its production of the domestic like product in 2010. *See* Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions, dated May 20, 2011 ("Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions"), at 4. Petitioner maintains that it was the sole remaining producer of the domestic like product in 2010, and, therefore, alleges that it represents the total production of the domestic like product in 2010. *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 3, and Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions, at 4. To demonstrate that it was the sole producer, Petitioner provided an affidavit from the President of Norris Cylinder Company, who has many years of professional experience in the steel cylinders industry. *See* Volume II of the AD Petitions, at Exhibit

II-1, and Supplement to the AD/CVD Petitions, at 4. We have relied upon data Petitioner provided for purposes of measuring industry support. For further discussion, *see* Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

Our review of the data provided in the Petition, supplemental submissions, and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioner has established industry support. First, the Petition established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, we find that the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.*, polling). *See* Section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act, and Initiation Checklist at Attachment II. Second, we find that the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product. *See* Initiation Checklist at Attachment II. Finally, we find that the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition. Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act. *Id.*

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the antidumping duty investigation that it is requesting the Department initiate. *Id.*

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than normal value ("NV"). In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.

Petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by

reduced market share, reduced shipments, reduced capacity, underselling and price depression or suppression, reduced employment, a decline in financial performance, lost sales and revenue, and an increase in import penetration. *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 11–22. We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See* Initiation Checklist at Attachment III, Injury.

Allegations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate this investigation of imports steel cylinders from the PRC. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to the U.S. price and the factors of production are also discussed in the Initiation Checklist. *See* Initiation Checklist, at 5–10.

U.S. Price

Petitioner calculated export price ("EP") based on the average unit customs value of U.S. imports of subject merchandise from China classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") subheading 7311.00.00.30, as compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau and obtained from the ITC's Dataweb. Petitioner utilized two methodologies to calculate EP, with one methodology adjusting average unit value to account for differences in steel cylinders model prices.³ Petitioner also made adjustments for domestic brokerage and handling and domestic inland freight. *See* Initiation Checklist; *see also* Volume II of the Petition, at 18–21 and Exhibit II–23.

Petitioner calculated constructed export price ("CEP") based on a proprietary source's pricing to unaffiliated U.S. end-users during the POI. Petitioner made adjustments for rebates, freight, value-added inputs, U.S. customs and duty fees, credit expense, domestic brokerage and handling, inland freight, and distributor markup. *See* Initiation Checklist; *see also* Volume II of the Petition, at 21–24 and Exhibits II–25 through II–28.

³ The EP margins listed *infra* are based on this methodology.

Normal Value

Petitioner claims the PRC is a non-market economy ("NME") country and that no determination to the contrary has been made by the Department. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 1. The presumption of NME status for the PRC has not been revoked by the Department and, therefore, in accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, remains in effect for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. Accordingly, the NV of the product for the PRC investigation is appropriately based on factors of production valued in a surrogate market-economy country in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. In the course of this investigation, all parties, including the public, will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issues of the PRC's NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters.

Petitioner contends that India is the appropriate surrogate country for the PRC because: (1) it is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and (2) it is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 1–2. Based on the information provided by Petitioner, we believe that it is appropriate to use India as a surrogate country for initiation purposes. After initiation of the investigation, interested parties will have the opportunity to submit comments regarding surrogate country selection and, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(i), will be provided an opportunity to submit publicly available information to value factors of production within 40 days after the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Petitioner calculated NV and the dumping margins using the Department's NME methodology as required by 19 CFR 351.202(b)(7)(i)(C) and 19 CFR 351.408. In calculating NV, Petitioner based the quantity of each of the inputs used to manufacture the domestic like product on its own consumption rates, modified where applicable. Petitioner states that it is not aware of publicly available information regarding the actual usage rates of Chinese producers to produce steel cylinders. However, Petitioner further notes that because Norris is one of a few producers worldwide, and there are only a few basic production methods used to produce steel cylinders, it is very familiar with the production process in the PRC. *See* Volume II of the Petition, at 4–18 and Exhibit II–7.

As noted above, Petitioner determined the consumption quantities of all raw materials based on its own production

experience. Petitioner valued most of the factors of production based on reasonably available, public surrogate country data, specifically, Indian import data from the Global Trade Atlas ("GTA"). See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 6–12 and Exhibit II–9. Where required, Petitioner inflated surrogate values to the POI by means of the Wholesale Price Index ("WPI") for India. Because WPI data were not yet available for February and March 2011, the final two months of the POI, Petitioner assumed these figures were the same as that for January 2011 and calculated an average WPI for the POI accordingly. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at Exhibit II–10. In addition, Petitioner made currency conversions, where necessary, based on the POI-average rupees/U.S. dollar exchange rate, as reported on the Department's Web site. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at Exhibit II–9. Petitioner determined labor costs using the labor consumption, in hours, derived from Petitioner's own experience. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 12 and Exhibit II–17. For purposes of initiation, the Department determines that the surrogate values used by Petitioner are reasonably available and, thus, acceptable for purposes of initiation.

Petitioner determined energy and utility costs using Petitioner's own usage rates. To account for manufacturing differences between the U.S. and the PRC, Petitioner made adjustments to electricity and natural gas. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 13–14 and Exhibit II–1.

Petitioner determined labor costs using the usage rates derived from Petitioner's own experience and valued labor using data from *Nails AR1*.⁴ See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 12 and Exhibit II–17.

Petitioner determined packing costs using consumption rates derived from Petitioner's own experience, and valued the relevant factors using data from GTA. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 17–18 and Exhibits II–9 and II–15.

Petitioner calculated factory overhead, selling, general and administrative expenses, and profit by averaging data from the 2009–2010 financial statements of four Indian producers of steel cylinders: (1) Everest Kanto ("Everest"); (2) Rama Cylinders

Private Limited ("Rama"); (3) Maruti Koatsu Cylinders Pvt. Limited ("Maruti"); and (4) Nitin Cylinders Limited ("NCL"). See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 14–17 and Exhibit II–22.

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by Petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of steel cylinders from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Based on a comparison of U.S. prices and NV calculated in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, as described above, the estimated EP dumping margins (adjusted according to model size), for steel cylinders from the PRC range from 85.10 percent to 176.25 percent, and the estimated CEP dumping margins range from 17.04 percent to 151.90 percent. See Initiation Checklist; see also Volume II of the Petition, at 24 and Exhibit II–7.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

Based upon the examination of the Petition on steel cylinders from the PRC, the Department finds the Petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of steel cylinders from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Targeted Dumping Allegations

On December 10, 2008, the Department issued an interim final rule for the purpose of withdrawing 19 CFR 351.414(f) and (g), the regulatory provisions governing the targeted dumping analysis in antidumping duty investigations, and the corresponding regulation governing the deadline for targeted dumping allegations, 19 CFR 351.301(d)(5). See *Withdrawal of the Regulatory Provisions Governing Targeted Dumping in Antidumping Duty Investigations*, 73 FR 74930 (December 10, 2008). The Department stated that "{w}ithdrawal will allow the Department to exercise the discretion intended by the statute and, thereby, develop a practice that will allow interested parties to pursue all statutory avenues of relief in this area." *Id.* at 74931.

In order to accomplish this objective, if any interested party wishes to make a targeted dumping allegation in this investigation pursuant to section

777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act, such allegation is due no later than 45 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination.

Respondent Selection

For this investigation, the Department will request quantity and value information from known exporters and producers identified with complete contact information in the Petition. The quantity and value data received from NME exporters/producers will be used as the basis to select the mandatory respondents.

The Department requires that the respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate-rate application by the respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status. See *Circular Welded Austenitic Stainless Pressure Pipe from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 73 FR 10221, 10225 (February 26, 2008); *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain Artist Canvas From the People's Republic of China*, 70 FR 21996, 21999 (April 28, 2005). On the date of the publication of this initiation notice in the **Federal Register**, the Department will post the quantity and value questionnaire along with the filing instructions on the Import Administration Web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html>, and a response to the quantity and value questionnaire is due no later than June 21, 2011. Also, the Department will send the quantity and value questionnaire to those PRC companies identified in Volume I of the Petition, at Exhibit I–1.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order ("APO") in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Department's Web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/apo>.

Separate-Rate Application

In order to obtain separate-rate status in NME investigations, exporters and producers must submit a separate-rate status application. See Policy Bulletin 05.1: Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigations Involving Non-Market Economy Countries, dated April 5, 2005 ("Policy Bulletin"), available on the Department's web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/policy/bull05-1.pdf>. Based on our experience in processing the separate-rate applications in previous antidumping duty investigations, we have modified the application for this investigation to

⁴ See *Certain Steel Nails From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the First Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 16379 (March 23, 2011) ("Nails AR1").

make it more administrable and easier for applicants to complete. *See, e.g., Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation: Certain New Pneumatic Off-the-Road Tires From the People's Republic of China*, 72 FR 43591, 43594–95 (August 6, 2007). The specific requirements for submitting the separate-rate application in this investigation are outlined in detail in the application itself, which will be available on the Department's Web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html> on the date of publication of this initiation notice in the **Federal Register**. The separate-rate application will be due 60 days after publication of this initiation notice. For exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate status application and subsequently are selected as mandatory respondents, these exporters and producers will no longer be eligible for consideration for separate rate status unless they respond to all parts of the questionnaire as mandatory respondents. As noted in the "Respondent Selection" section above, the Department requires that respondents submit a response to both the quantity and value questionnaire and the separate rate application by the respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status. The quantity and value questionnaire will be available on the Department's Web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/ia-highlights-and-news.html> on the date of the publication of this initiation notice in the **Federal Register**.

Use of Combination Rates in an NME Investigation

The Department will calculate combination rates for certain respondents that are eligible for a separate rate in this investigation. The Policy Bulletin states:

While continuing the practice of assigning separate rates only to exporters, all separate rates that the Department will now assign in its NME investigations will be specific to those producers that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation. Note, however, that one rate is calculated for the exporter and all of the producers which supplied subject merchandise to it during the period of investigation. This practice applies both to mandatory respondents receiving an individually calculated separate rate as well as the pool of non-investigated firms receiving the weighted-average of the individually calculated rates. This practice is referred to as the application of "combination rates" because such rates apply to specific combinations of exporters and one or more producers. The cash-deposit rate assigned to an exporter will apply only to merchandise both exported by the firm in question and produced by a firm that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation.

See Policy Bulletin at 6 (emphasis added).

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), copies of the public versions of the Petition have been provided to the representatives of the Government of the PRC. Because of the large number of producers/exporters identified in the Petition, the Department considers the service of the public version of the Petition to the foreign producers/exporters satisfied by the delivery of the public version to the Government of the PRC, consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, no later than June 27, 2011, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of steel cylinders from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures, 73 FR 3634. Parties wishing to participate in this investigation should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (*e.g.*, the filing of letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

Any party submitting factual information in an antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.⁵ Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials as well as their representatives in all segments of any antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceedings initiated on or after March 14, 2011.⁶ The formats for the

revised certifications are provided at the end of the Interim Final Rule. The Department intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments initiated on or after March 14, 2011, if the submitting party does not comply with the revised certification requirements.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: May 31, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise covered by the scope of the investigation is seamless steel cylinders designed for storage or transport of compressed or liquefied gas ("high pressure steel cylinders"). High pressure steel cylinders are fabricated of chrome alloy steel including, but not limited to, chromium-molybdenum steel or chromium magnesium steel, and have permanently impressed into the steel, either before or after importation, the symbol of a U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration ("DOT")-approved high pressure steel cylinder manufacturer, as well as an approved DOT type marking of DOT 3A, 3AX, 3AA, 3AAX, 3B, 3E, 3HT, 3T, or DOT-E (followed by a specific exemption number) in accordance with the requirements of sections 178.36 through 178.68 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or any subsequent amendments thereof. High pressure steel cylinders covered by the investigation have a water capacity up to 450 liters, and a gas capacity ranging from 8 to 702 cubic feet, regardless of corresponding service pressure levels and regardless of physical dimensions, finish or coatings.

Excluded from the scope of the investigation are high pressure steel cylinders manufactured to UN-ISO-9809-1 and 2 specifications and permanently impressed with ISO or UN symbols. Also excluded from the investigation are acetylene cylinders, with or without internal porous mass, and permanently impressed with 8A or 8AL in accordance with DOT regulations.

Merchandise covered by the investigation is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") under subheading 7311.00.00.30. Subject merchandise may also enter under

⁵ See section 782(b) of the Act.

⁶ See Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration During Antidumping and

Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Interim Final Rule, 76 FR 7491 (February 10, 2011) ("Interim Final Rule") amending 19 CFR 351.303(g)(1) and (2).

HTSUS subheadings 7311.00.00.60 or 7311.00.00.90. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the investigation is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2011-14029 Filed 6-7-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-830]

Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico: Initiation of Anti-Circumvention Inquiry of Antidumping Duty Order

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 8, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jolanta Lawska or Eric B. Greynolds, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-8362 and (202) 482-6071, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In separate submissions filed on February 11, 2011, ArcelorMittal USA LLC, Gerdau Ameristeel U.S. Inc., and Rocky Mountain Steel, a division of Evraz Inc. NA, (collectively ArcelorMittal USA, *et al.*) and Nucor Corporation and Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Inc. (collectively, Nucor/Cascade) requested that the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiate a scope inquiry, under 19 CFR 351.225(k)(2) to determine whether wire rod with an actual diameter between 4.75 and 5.00 millimeters (mm) is within the scope of the antidumping (AD) order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico.¹ See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 (October 29, 2002) (*Wire Rod Order*). Alternatively, petitioners argue that the Department should initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry with regard to two Mexican firms, Deacero S.A. de C.V. (Deacero) and Ternium Mexico S.A. de C.V. (Ternium), and find that wire rod with an actual diameter between 4.75 and 5.00 mm produced by these firms constitutes a “minor alteration” or a

“later developed product” thereby resulting in shipments of such wire rod from Deacero and Ternium falling within the scope of the *Wire Rod Order*. See 19 CFR 351.225(i) and (j); *see also* sections 781(c) and (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

On March 14 and 23, 2011, Deacero filed comments rebutting petitioners’ arguments. On March 24 and 25, 2011, petitioners responded to Deacero’s comments. On March 25, 2011, Illinois Tool Works Inc. (ITW) filed comments objecting to petitioners’ allegations. On March 28, 2011, the Department extended until May 16, 2011, the deadline for determining whether to initiate an inquiry into petitioners’ allegations. On April 18, 2011, petitioners responded to the comments of ITW. On May 3, 2011, Deacero responded to the comments made in petitioners’ March 24, and 25, 2011, submissions.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) Stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii)

containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no inclusions greater than 20 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

¹ The term petitioners refers collectively to ArcelorMittal USA, *et al.* and Nucor/Cascade.