

the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for the importer's examined sales and the total entered value of the sales in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). Where an importer-specific assessment rate is zero or *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to liquidate the appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties. If CCPC's weighted-average dumping margin continues to be zero or *de minimis* in the final results of review, we will instruct CBP not to assess duties on any of its entries in accordance with 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."⁴

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003.⁵ This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by CCPC for which it did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.

We intend to issue instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of PVA from Taiwan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication as provided by section 751(a)(2) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for CCPC will be the rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this 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 recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original 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) the cash deposit rate for all other

manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 3.08 percent, the all-others rate established in the *Antidumping Duty Order: Polyvinyl Alcohol From Taiwan*, 76 FR 13982 (March 15, 2011). These cash 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 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.

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

Dated: April 2, 2013.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I

List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

1. Scope of the Order
2. Comparisons to Normal Value
3. Determination of Comparison Method
4. Results of the Differential Pricing Analysis
5. Product Comparisons
6. Date of Sale
7. Export Price
8. Normal Value
9. Home Market Viability as Comparison Market
10. Level of Trade
11. Cost of Production
12. Calculation of Cost of Production
13. Test of Home Market Sales Prices
14. Results of the COP Test
15. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Home Market Prices
16. Currency Conversion

[FR Doc. 2013-08110 Filed 4-5-13; 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: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011–2012

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* April 8, 2013.

SUMMARY: On December 6, 2012, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (PRC)¹ in the **Federal Register**. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received by the parties we have not made any changes to the antidumping duty rate assigned to the PRC-wide entity, which includes the sole company subject to this review, Baoding Mantong Fine Chemistry Co. Ltd. (Baoding Mantong), and are rescinding the review with respect to companies for which this review was initiated but had not previously received a separate rate status, for the final results.²

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Davis or Ericka Ukrow, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-7924 or (202) 482-0405, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Period of Review

The period of review is March 1, 2011, through February 29, 2012.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the antidumping duty order is glycine, which is a free-flowing crystalline material, like salt or sugar.³ The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading: 2922.49.4020. The HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes only; the written

¹ See *Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011–2012*, 77 FR 72817 (December 6, 2012) (*Preliminary Results*), and accompanying Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Glycine From the People's Republic of China" from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated December 6, 2012 (*Preliminary Decision Memorandum*).

² We preliminarily rescinded this review with respect to 25 other companies after GEO Specialty Chemicals, Inc. (GEO) submitted a timely request to withdraw its request for review of these companies. See *Preliminary Results*, 77 FR at 72817.

³ See Preliminary Decision Memorandum for a complete description of the scope of the order.

⁴ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Proceedings: Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 80102 (February 14, 2012).

⁵ For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

product description of the scope of the order is dispositive.⁴

Background

On December 6, 2012, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* in the **Federal Register**. The Department provided interested parties with the opportunity to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On January 7, 2013, Glycine & More, Inc. (Glycine & More), an affiliate of Baoding Mantong and U.S. importer of glycine, timely submitted a case brief commenting on our *Preliminary Results*. Domestic interested party GEO timely submitted rebuttal comments on January 14, 2013. We have analyzed the comments received and made no revisions to the preliminary antidumping duty rate assigned to the PRC-wide entity, including Baoding Mantong.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs submitted by parties in this review are addressed in the Memorandum to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, from Edward C. Yang, Senior Director China/Non-Market Economy Unit, entitled, "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results in the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Glycine From the People's Republic of China" (Final Decision Memorandum), which is dated concurrently with, and adopted by, this notice. A list of the issues which parties raised, and to which we respond in the Final Decision Memorandum is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Final Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). Access to IA ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> and in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Final Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://www.trade.gov/ia/>. The signed Final Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Final Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Rescission of Review in Part and PRC-Wide Entity

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative

review, in whole or in part, if a party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the initiation notice of the requested review. As stated in the *Preliminary Results*, for 25 of the 26 companies for which the Department initiated this administrative review, GEO was the only party that requested the review. On July 30, 2012, GEO timely withdrew its review requests for all 26 companies. Therefore, with the exception of Baoding Mantong, which requested its own review and is the sole mandatory respondent in this proceeding, the Department preliminary rescinded the review for all other companies named in the *Initiation Notice*.⁵

For these final results, the Department is rescinding the review with respect to companies on which this review was initiated but had not previously received a separate rate status. As described above, GEO withdrew its review request covering these companies. While the review request was withdrawn in a timely manner, these companies have not previously received separate rate status and, as such, remain part of the PRC-wide entity. The Department did not rescind this review at the time of the preliminary results for those companies that had not timely withdrawn their request for review nor established their eligibility for a separate rate in this review, *i.e.*, Baoding Mantong, and are considered part of the PRC-wide entity which is under review.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on a review of the record and comments received from parties regarding our *Preliminary Results*, we have made no changes the antidumping duty rate assigned to the PRC-wide entity, including Baoding Mantong, in these final results of review.

Final Results of the Review

The Department has determined that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period March 1, 2011, through February 29, 2012:

Exporter	Margin
PRC-wide entity (including Baoding Mantong Fine Chemistry Co., Ltd.)	453.79%

Assessment Rates

Consistent with these final results, and pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the

Act), and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), the Department will direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review. We will instruct CBP to liquidate entries of subject merchandise exported by the PRC-wide entity at the *ad valorem* rate of 453.79 percent of entered value.

The Department previously announced a refinement to its assessment practice in non-market economy (NME) cases.⁶ Pursuant to this refinement in practice, for entries that were not reported in the U.S. sales databases submitted by companies individually examined during this review, the Department will instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the NME-wide rate. In addition, if the Department determines that an exporter under review had no shipments of the subject merchandise, any suspended entries that entered under that exporter's case number (*i.e.*, at that exporter's rate) will be liquidated at the NME-wide rate.⁷

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following cash-deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For the PRC-wide entity (including Baoding Mantong), the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise which 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 exporters that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

⁴ See *Antidumping Duty Order: Glycine From the People's Republic of China*, 60 FR 16116 (March 29, 1995).

⁵ See Appendix II for a list of these companies.

⁶ See *Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011).

⁷ *Id.* at 65694.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 of review. 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.

Administrative Protective Order

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, 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.

We are issuing and publishing this administrative review and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 1, 2013.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I

Comment 1: Baoding Mantong's Untimely Withdrawal of Review Request and Rescission of the Administrative Review with Respect to Baoding Mantong

Comment 2: The Department's Selection of the Adverse Facts Available Margin for Baoding Mantong

Appendix II

Companies Without Previous Separate Rates Status for Which the Review Request Was Withdrawn

1. A&A Pharmachem Inc.
2. Advance Exports
3. AICO Laboratories India Ltd.
4. Avid Organics Pvt. Ltd.
5. Chiyuen International Trading Ltd.
6. E-Heng Import and Export Co., Ltd.
7. General Ingredient Inc.
8. Hebei Donghua Chemical General Corporation
9. Hebei Donghua Jiheng Fine Chemical Co., Ltd.
10. Jiangsu Dongchang Chemical
11. Jizhou City Huayang Chemical Co., Ltd.
12. Kissner Milling Co. Ltd.
13. Nantong Dongchang Chemical Industrial Co. Ltd.

14. Ningbo Create-Bio Engineering Co. Ltd.
15. Nutracare International
16. Paras Intermediates Pvt. Ltd.
17. Qingdao Samin Chemical Co., Ltd.
18. Ravi Industries
19. Salvi Chemical Industries
20. Shanghai Waseta International Trading
21. Showa Denko K.K.
22. Tianjin Tiancheng Pharmaceutical Company
23. Wisent Pharma Inc.
24. XPAC Technologies Inc.
25. Yuki Gosei Kogyo Co., Ltd.

[FR Doc. 2013-08108 Filed 4-5-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Legal Services Trade Mission to China, September 16-18, 2013

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

Mission Description

The General Counsel of the United States Department of Commerce will lead a Legal Services Trade Mission to China, September 16-18, 2013. The purpose of the mission is to introduce U.S. law firms¹ without a presence in China to the Chinese market, to market U.S. legal services to Chinese companies and individuals, to raise awareness about the U.S. legal and business climate to Chinese companies interested in doing business in the U.S. market, and to further an ongoing dialogue with Chinese authorities on opening the Chinese legal services market to expanded practice by U.S. firms.

The trade mission will include stops in Beijing and Shanghai. In both cities, participants will receive market briefings to obtain key information from U.S. officials on the legal services environment in China. They will then participate in specially-tailored forums on U.S. legal services for audiences of Chinese persons seeking to do business in the United States and others seeking legal services in China and the United States. In addition, the trade mission will include opportunities for participants to have policy discussions with Chinese government officials in order to learn more about the regulatory landscape and present the benefits that U.S. law firms can provide to Chinese and U.S. companies. Joining the official

¹ For purposes of this trade mission, a "U.S. law firm" is defined as a law firm that is formed under the laws of a U.S. state or the District of Columbia and with its principal place of business in the United States.

U.S. Department of Commerce Trade Mission will enhance the participants' ability to engage in such meetings, which can be difficult to obtain when not accompanied by government officials. In addition to U.S. law firms, bar associations and other organizations that represent U.S. legal service providers are encouraged to apply.

Commercial Setting

As China seeks to transition from a manufacturing, export-based economy to a center of international business and finance, its need for sophisticated multinational legal and financial services is growing. Illustrating this trend, more than 200 foreign law firms currently have a presence in China.

In China, foreign lawyers are permitted to: provide clients with counsel with respect to the laws of the countries where they are qualified to practice and on international conventions and international practices; handle legal affairs in the country where the lawyers are qualified to practice law when entrusted to do so by their clients or Chinese law firms; entrust, on behalf of foreign clients, Chinese law firms to provide counsel on Chinese legal affairs; enter into contracts to maintain entrustment relationships with Chinese law firms; and provide their clients with information about the impact of the Chinese legal environment.

Within this rubric, opportunities exist for U.S. law firms providing legal services in China in a number of practice areas, including capital markets, mergers and acquisitions, international trade, inbound and outbound investment, shipping, intellectual property rights, arbitration,² life sciences, real estate, information technology and e-commerce, labor and employment, private equity, and venture capital.

The trade mission will also present opportunities for participants to engage with Chinese individuals, private companies, and state-owned enterprises, particularly those seeking to do business in the United States. Depending on the type of business, Chinese companies doing business in the United States could require legal services on United States laws for issues relating to taxation, employment, corporate finance, real estate, litigation, sale of goods, intellectual property rights,

² Generally, foreign lawyers may represent clients in international or foreign-relation arbitral proceedings before the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC) that do not involve Chinese legal affairs. Recent amendments to the rules that govern CIETAC permit arbitration before CIETAC to be held in languages other than Chinese.