

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.**

Investigation Nos. 701-TA-471 and 731-TA-1170 (Final)

**Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from
Indonesia**

Denial of Request to Institute a Section 751(b) Review Concerning the Commission's Affirmative Determinations.

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has declined to institute a review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1675(b)) (the Act).

DATES: April 28, 2026

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Celia Feldpausch (202-205-2387), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this matter may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—In November 2010, the Commission determined that an industry in the United States was threatened with material injury by reason of imports of certain coated paper ("CCP") from China and Indonesia (75 FR 70289, November 17, 2010) that had been found by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), and that had been found by Commerce to be subsidized by the governments of China and Indonesia (75 FR 59209, 75 FR 59212, 75 FR 59217, and 75 FR 59223, September 27, 2010). Effective November 17, 2010, Commerce issued antidumping and countervailing duty orders (75 FR 70201, 75 FR 70203, 75 FR 70205, and 75 FR 70206, November 17, 2010).

Following affirmative determinations in the first five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective January 6, 2017, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia (82 FR 1692,

January 6, 2017). Following affirmative determinations in the second five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective June 13, 2022, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia (87 FR 35733, June 13, 2022).

On December 3, 2025, the Commission received a request to review its affirmative determinations in investigation Nos. 701-TA-471 and 731-TA-1170 (Final) pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1675(b)). The request was filed by PT. Pindo Deli Pulp and Paper Mills (“Pindo Deli”) and PT. Indah Kiat Pulp & Paper Tbk. (“Indah Kiat”) (for purposes of this notice, collectively “Requestors”). Requestors argue that structural changes sufficient to warrant a changed circumstances review have occurred within the Indonesian industry since the Commission determined that the domestic industry was threatened with material injury by reason of subject imports from Indonesia. Requestors contend that there has been a “significant” and “permanent” reduction in the capacity to produce the subject merchandise by the industry in Indonesia, which they assert has contracted to only two producers. Requestors further contend that there has been a “marked shift away from exports toward home market sales” such that, in their view, the Indonesian industry producing the subject merchandise “is no longer export oriented.” They argue that these changes have not been the “natural and direct result” of the subject orders but rather of market factors leading to the shifting of capacity and increasing focus on home market sales.

On January 14, 2026, the Commission published a Federal Register notice inviting comments from the public on whether changed circumstances exist sufficient to warrant the institution of a changed circumstances review (91 FR 1557, Jan. 14, 2026). Comments in response to this notice were filed on March 4, 2026. The Commission received comments in support of the request from Requestors and comments in opposition to the request from Billerud Americas Corporation and Sappi North America, a petitioner and a successor-in-interest to petitioner NewPage Corp.¹ Requestors also submitted a separate submission in favor of instituting a changed circumstances review.

Analysis

In considering whether to institute a review investigation under section 751(b), the Commission will not institute such an investigation unless it is persuaded there is sufficient information demonstrating:

- (1) that there are significant changed circumstances from those in existence at the time of the original investigation;
- (2) that those changed circumstances are not the natural and direct result of the imposition of the antidumping duty order; and
- (3) that the changed circumstances, allegedly indicating that revocation of the order would not be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic

¹ The original petitioner, NewPage Corp., was acquired by Verso Paper Corporation in January 2015, and in March 2022, Billerud Americas Corporation acquired Verso Corporation.

industry, warrant a full {review} investigation.²

After consideration of the request for review and the responses to the notice inviting comments, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act and Commission rule 207.45, that the information available to the Commission does not show significant changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an investigation to review the Commission's affirmative determinations in Investigation Nos. 701-TA-471 and 731-TA-1170: Certain Coated Paper Suitable for-Quality Printing Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from Indonesia.

The decision to undertake a review is "a threshold question . . . [which] may be made only when it reasonably appears that positive evidence adduced by the petitioner together with other evidence gathered by the Commission leads the ITC to believe that there are changed circumstances sufficient to warrant review."³ A party requesting a review must "present facts, which when weighed against the other facts presented, would convince a reasonable decision-maker that a full investigation is necessary to establish whether or not changed circumstances have obviated the need for the order in its present form."⁴

Requestors allege that CCP production in Indonesia has permanently and significantly declined since the original investigations and that the Indonesian industry is no longer export oriented. The statute calls upon the Commission to "determine whether revocation of the order or finding is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury."⁵ Requestors have failed to present evidence indicating that the alleged changes to the capacity and export orientation of Indonesian CCP producers are significant changed circumstances to warrant a review. First, with respect to an alleged decline in production, Requestors' assertions are largely unsubstantiated. Specifically, Requestors rely on: 1) a declaration containing unsubstantiated statements regarding one Indonesian firm's purported conversion to manufacturing other products; and 2) tables summarizing the sales and production data for the remaining Indonesian firms that contain no explanation of the methodology that Requestors followed in preparing the tables or any supporting information. Requestors also did not provide any information indicating whether the remaining two firms' alleged decline in CCP production and production capacity is permanent or whether the firms have converted their CCP production to other uses.

² *Gray Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Mexico*, 66 Fed. Reg. 65740, 65741 (Dec. 20, 2001). See, generally, *A. Hirsh, Inc. v. United States*, 737 F. Supp. 1186 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1990); *Avesta AB v. United States*, 724 F. Supp. 974 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1989), *aff'd*, 914 F.2d 232 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 111 S. Ct. 1308 (1991).

³ *Avesta AB v. United States*, 689 F. Supp. 1173, 1180-81 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1988); *A Hirsh, Inc. v. United States*, 729 F. Supp. 1360, 1363 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1990), *aff'd following remand*, 737 F. Supp. at 1188 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1990).

⁴ *A. Hirsh*, 729 F. Supp. at 1363.

⁵ 19 U.S.C. § 1675(b).

Second, with respect to Requestors' assertions that the Indonesian CCP industry is no longer export oriented, these too are largely unsubstantiated. As discussed above, the Indonesian Industry's tables summarizing producers' sales records from 2021 to the present do not contain any supporting documentation or a sufficient explanation of the methodology used to prepare them. Nor did Requestors submit any other evidence indicating that they would not resume exports to the United States if the orders were revoked or other evidence indicating that they have otherwise reoriented production towards domestic customers in a manner that would preclude export activity.⁶

In addition to not adequately substantiating their assertions, Requestors have not explained why any of the alleged reduction in capacity and/or their export orientation would even rise to the level of changed circumstances indicating that revocation of the orders would not be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry. For example, in prior reviews, the Commission has found the fact that subject Indonesian and Chinese producers demonstrated "a degree of export orientation," rather than a specific percentage, to be a sufficient basis for continuing the orders.⁷

In addition, Requestors have not adequately explained why the Commission should find that a firm's decision that it would be more beneficial to either shift focus to more home market sales or to shift production capacity to more profitable products after the antidumping and countervailing orders were imposed are not the natural consequence of the orders.⁸

In short, the Commission has determined that the petition does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of a review investigation and has, therefore, dismissed the petition. The Commission notes that the third five-year reviews of the orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia are scheduled to commence in May 2027. The Commission's denial of the instant request in no manner prejudices the upcoming five-year reviews.

AUTHORITY: This notice is published pursuant to section 207.45 of the Commission's rules.

⁶ In the first reviews, which were the last full reviews of the orders, relying on testimony from a respondent industry representative, the Commission noted that "{i}t is . . . undisputed that the Indonesian Industry intends to resume shipping free sheet CCP to the U.S. market if the orders are revoked." *Certain Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from China and Indonesia*, Inv. Nos. 701-TA-470-471 and 731-TA-1169-1170 (Review), USITC Pub. 4656 (Dec. 2016) ("*First Reviews*") at 17 & n.89.

⁷ *First Reviews*, USITC Pub. 4656 at 33-34.

⁸ *Avesta*, 689 F. Supp. at 1184.

By order of the Commission.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lisa R. Barton', enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

Lisa R. Barton
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: May 6, 2026