

Results of Reviews section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 29, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Laurel LaCivita or Eugene Degnan, Office 8, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-4243 or (202) 482-0414.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 1, 2011, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the PRC.¹ On April 7, 2011, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from Nation Ford Chemical Company ("NFC"), the domestic interested party, within the deadline specified in section 315.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations. NFC claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a producer of the domestic-like product in the United States. On April 29, 2011, the Department received a complete substantive response from NFC within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(3)(i) of the Department's regulations. We did not receive responses from any respondent interested parties to these proceedings. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2) of the Department's regulations, the Department determined to conduct expedited reviews of these orders.

Scope of the Orders

Imports covered by the antidumping duty orders are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid, classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.22 of the

Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS"), contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid, also classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.22 of the HTS, contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt (sodium sulfanilate), classifiable under the HTS subheading 2921.42.90, is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content.

Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these proceedings is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in these reviews are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memorandum") from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated concurrently with this notice, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum which is on file in room 7046 of the main Commerce building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html>, under the heading "July 2011." The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/exporters/producers	Weighted average margin (percent)
India:	
All Indian Manufacturers and Exporters	≥ 114.80
The PRC	
China National Chemicals I&E Corporation, Hebei Branch	19.14
PRC-Wide Entity	85.20

This notice also serves as the only 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. Timely 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 violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 25, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011-19308 Filed 7-28-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-423-808]

Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

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

² The Department published its final affirmative determination of sales at less than fair value with respect to imports of sulfanilic acid from India on January 8, 1993. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfanilic Acid from India*, 58 FR 3251 (January 8, 1993). In this determination, the Department published a weighted-average dumping margin for all manufacturers/producers/exporters of 114.80 percent. However, consistent with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act, which prohibits assessing antidumping duties on the portion of the margin attributable to an export subsidy, we established an estimated antidumping duty deposit rate of 71.09 percent for duty deposit purposes. The Department issued its antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from India on March 2, 1993. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Sulfanilic Acid from India*, 58 FR 12025 (March 2, 1993). The Department has not conducted an administrative review of this order since its imposition.

¹ See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 76 FR 18163 (April 1, 2011) ("Initiation Notice").

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3), the Department of Commerce (the “Department”) is initiating a changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel plate in coils (“SSPC”) from Belgium with respect to Aperam Stainless Belgium N.V. (“Aperam”).

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 29, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George McMahon or Stephanie Moore, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482–1167 and (202) 482–3692, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 21, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on stainless steel plate in coils from Belgium; this order was amended in 2003.¹ On June 28, 2011, the Department initiated an administrative review of Aperam Stainless Belgium N.V. (“Aperam”), covering the period of review (“POR”), May 1, 2010, through April 30, 2011. Aperam’s request for review stated that Aperam was formerly known as ArcelorMittal Stainless Belgium N.V. (“AMSB”). *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part* 76 FR 37781 (June 28, 2011).²

¹ *See Antidumping Duty Orders; Certain Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, 64 FR 27756 (May 21, 1999); *Notice of Amended Antidumping Duty Orders; Certain Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, 68 FR 11520 (March 11, 2003); *Notice of Amended Antidumping Duty Orders; Certain Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, 68 FR 16117 (April 2, 2003); *Notice of Correction to the Amended Antidumping Duty Orders; Certain Stainless Steel Plate in Coils From Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, 68 FR 20114 (April 24, 2003) (“*Antidumping Order*”).

² On August 16, 2010, the Court of International Trade (“CIT”) issued an Order modifying a preliminary injunction in effect for entries of subject merchandise under the *Antidumping Order*. *See Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion to Modify the Preliminary Injunction Order, ArcelorMittal Stainless Belgium N.V. v. United States*, No. 08–434 (CIT August 16, 2010). In this Order, the CIT modified its January 16, 2009, Order granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, and enjoined liquidation of any unliquidated entries of SSPC from Belgium which contain merchandise that (i) is 4.75 mm or more in nominal thickness, but which has an actual thickness of less than 4.75 mm, and within the dimensional tolerances

With respect to AMSB, the Department determined in a prior administrative review covering the POR of May 1, 2007, to April 30, 2008, that AMSB was the successor-in-interest to Ugine & ALZ Belgium, after the merger of Arcelor S.A. with Mittal Steel, N.V.³ Aperam is the only respondent in the current administrative review.

On June 14, 2011, Aperam requested that the Department initiate and conduct an expedited changed circumstances review to determine that, for purposes of the antidumping law, Aperam is the successor-in-interest to AMSB. *See* June 14, 2011, letter from Aperam to the Department.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is certain stainless steel plate in coils. Stainless steel is an alloy steel containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with or without other elements. The subject plate products are flat-rolled products, 254 mm or over in width and 4.75 mm or more in thickness, in coils, and annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled. The subject plate may also be further processed (*e.g.*, cold-rolled, polished, *etc.*) provided that it maintains the specified dimensions of plate following such processing. Excluded from the scope of this order are the following: (1) Plate not in coils; (2) Plate that is not annealed or otherwise heat treated and pickled or otherwise descaled; (3) Sheet and strip; and (4) Flat bars.

The merchandise subject to this order is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheadings: 7219.11.00.30, 7219.11.00.60, 7219.12.00.06, 7219.12.00.21, 7219.12.00.26, 7219.12.00.51, 7219.12.00.56, 7219.12.00.66, 7219.12.00.71, 7219.12.00.81, 7219.31.00.10, 7219.90.00.10, 7219.90.00.20, 7219.90.00.25,

specified under ASTM standard A480/480M, (ii) was produced and exported by Ugine & ALZ Belgium N.V., any of its predecessors-in-interest, as determined by the Department, and/or any of its successors-in-interest, as determined by the Department, and (iii) is otherwise subject to the antidumping duty order and countervailing duty order on certain SSPC from Belgium. *See* 64 FR 27756 (May 21, 1999) and 64 FR 25288 (May 11, 1999), respectively. Because AMSB is the successor-in-interest to Ugine & ALZ Belgium N.V., the modified preliminary injunction may enjoin certain entries subject to this review.

³ *See Memorandum from G. McMahon to J. Terpstra*, titled “Successor-in-Interest Analysis for AMS Belgium,” dated June 1, 2009; *see also Stainless Steel Plate in Coils from Belgium: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 27097 (June 8, 2009).

7219.90.00.60, 7219.90.00.80, 7220.11.00.00, 7220.20.10.10, 7220.20.10.15, 7220.20.10.60, 7220.20.10.80, 7220.20.60.05, 7220.20.60.10, 7220.20.60.15, 7220.20.60.60, 7220.20.60.80, 7220.90.00.10, 7220.90.00.15, 7220.90.00.60, and 7220.90.00.80. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise subject to these orders is dispositive.

Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d), the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for a review of, an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. In antidumping duty changed circumstances reviews involving a successor-in-interest determination, the Department typically examines several factors including, but not limited to: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. *See Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) and *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 22847 (May 3, 2005) (*Plate from Romania*), unchanged in *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania* 70 FR 35624 (June 21, 2005).

Aperam requested that the Department conduct an expedited changed circumstances review; however, the Department requires additional information before issuing preliminary results for this review. For example, Aperam provided statements regarding its material and service providers and its customer base, but did not include lists that would allow the Department to compare such information before and after the reported spin-off and name change. As a result, the Department intends to obtain such information prior to issuing preliminary results in this changed circumstances review.

Based on the information Aperam submitted in its June 14, 2011, letter, we find that we have received information which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant initiation of such a

review in order to determine whether Aperam is the successor-in-interest to AMSB. *See* 19 CFR 351.216(d). Therefore, in accordance with the above-referenced statute and regulation, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review.

We intend to issue the preliminary results of the changed circumstances review within 90 days from the issuance of the instant initiation notice. We intend to issue the final results of the changed circumstances review within 270 days from the date of initiation of this changed circumstance review, or within 45 days if all parties to the proceeding agree to the outcome of the review. *See* 19 CFR 351.216(e). During the course of this review, we will not change the cash deposit requirements for the subject merchandise. The cash deposit rate will be altered, if warranted, pursuant only to the final results of the changed circumstances review.

This notice of initiation is in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1).

Dated: July 22, 2011.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011-19305 Filed 7-28-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-403-801]

Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway: Preliminary Results of Full Third Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On January 3, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon from Norway pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). *See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 76 FR 89 (January 3, 2011) (*Sunset Initiation*). On the basis of adequate substantive responses submitted by domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct a full sunset review of this AD order pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2). As a result of our analysis, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the AD order

would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of a dumping.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 29, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Conniff, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482-1009.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 3, 2011, the Department initiated the third sunset review of the AD order on fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon from Norway pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. *See Sunset Initiation*. On January 13, 2011, the Government of Norway (GON), Norwegian Seafood Federation (NSF), and Aquaculture Division of the Norwegian Seafood Association (ADNSA) (collectively, the respondents), filed letters of appearance in the review.¹ On January 18, 2011, Phoenix Salmon U.S., Inc. (Phoenix Salmon), a domestic producer of fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon, filed a notice of intent to participate in the review.²

On January 21, 2011, NSF and ADNSA supplemented their letter of appearance by submitting to the Department a list of their members. On February 2, 2011, the Department received a substantive response from Phoenix Salmon and a joint substantive response from the respondents within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department received rebuttal comments from Phoenix Salmon and the GON on February 14, 2011. On February 25, 2011, the GON submitted a surrebuttal to Phoenix Salmon's rebuttal responding to the company's claims that NSF and ADNSA are not interested parties.

On March 3, 2011, Department officials met with Phoenix Salmon, who reiterated statements made in its submissions regarding the interested party status of NSF and ADNSA. *See Memorandum to the File*, through Melissa Skinner, Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, from Kristen Johnson, Trade Analyst, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, regarding "Meeting with Counsel for the Domestic

Interested Party" (March 3, 2011). On March 4, 2011, the Department issued a letter to NSF and ADNSA requesting that each association identify their members that are producers or exporters of the subject merchandise. On March 11, 2011, NSF and ADNSA submitted annotated membership lists, which identify the members of each association that are producers or exporters of subject merchandise. On March 16, 2011, Phoenix Salmon submitted comments on the membership lists submitted by NSF and ADNSA.

On April 6, 2011, the Department issued its adequacy determination memorandum. The Department found that the domestic and respondent parties submitted adequate substantive responses and that NSF and ADNSA have standing as interested parties in this review. The Department, therefore, determined to conduct a full sunset review of this AD order. *See Memorandum to Gary Taverman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations*, from Melissa Skinner, Director, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Office 3, regarding "Adequacy Determination: Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway" (April 6, 2011). On April 12, 2011, the Department extended the deadline for the preliminary and final results of this sunset review. *See Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway: Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary and Final Results of Full Third Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Sunset Reviews*, 76 FR 20312 (April 12, 2011) (*Salmon Extension Notice*). The Department did not receive comments on the adequacy determination memorandum from any party to this review.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the order is the species Atlantic salmon (*Salmo Salar*) marketed as specified herein; the order excludes all other species of salmon: Danube salmon, Chinook (also called "king" or "quinnat"), Coho ("silver"), Sockeye ("redfish" or "blueback"), Humpback ("pink") and Chum ("dog").³ Atlantic salmon is a whole or nearly-whole fish, typically (but not necessarily) marketed gutted, bled, and cleaned, with the head on.

¹ These public documents and all other public documents and public versions of proprietary documents with regard to this third full sunset review are available on the public record located in the Department's Central Records Unit at room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building.

² Phoenix Salmon claimed to be the successor to the two domestic producers who participated in the prior sunset review—Atlantic Salmon of Maine and Heritage Salmon Company, Inc.

³ On August 5, 2009, the Department made a final scope ruling determining that whole salmon steaks are within the scope of the order. *See Notice of Scope Rulings*, 75 FR 14138 (March 24, 2010).