

Subject merchandise includes iron mechanical transfer drive components as defined above that have been finished or machined in a third country, including but not limited to finishing/machining processes such as cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering, or any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigations if performed in the country of manufacture of the iron mechanical transfer drive components.

Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigations regardless of width, design, or iron type (e.g., gray, white, or ductile iron). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigations regardless of whether they have non-iron attachments or parts and regardless of whether they are entered with other mechanical transfer drive components or as part of a mechanical transfer drive assembly (which typically includes one or more of the iron mechanical transfer drive components identified above, and which may also include other parts such as a belt, coupling and/or shaft). When entered as a mechanical transfer drive assembly, only the iron components that meet the physical description of covered merchandise are covered merchandise, not the other components in the mechanical transfer drive assembly (e.g., belt, coupling, shaft).

For purposes of these investigations, a covered product is of “iron” where the article has a carbon content of 1.7 percent by weight or above, regardless of the presence and amount of additional alloying elements.

The merchandise covered by these investigations is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) subheadings 8483.30.8090, 8483.50.6000, 8483.50.9040, 8483.50.9080, 8483.90.3000, 8483.90.8080. Covered merchandise may also enter under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7325.10.0080, 7325.99.1000, 7326.19.0010, 7326.19.0080, 8431.31.0040, 8431.31.0060, 8431.39.0010, 8431.39.0050, 8431.39.0070, 8431.39.0080, and 8483.50.4000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the investigations is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2015–29985 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–031]

Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components From the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Trisha Tran or Robert Galantucci at (202) 482–4852 or (202) 482–2923, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Petition

On October 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (Department) received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning certain iron mechanical transfer drive components (iron transfer drive components) from the People’s Republic of China (the PRC), filed in proper form on behalf of TB Wood’s Incorporated (Petitioner). The CVD petition was accompanied by an antidumping duty (AD) petition concerning imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC and Canada.¹ Petitioner is a domestic producer of iron transfer drive components.²

On November 3, 2015 and November 6, 2015, the Department requested information and clarification for certain areas of the Petition.³ Petitioner filed responses to these requests on November 5, 2015 and November 10, 2015.⁴

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended

¹ See “Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People’s Republic of China,” dated October 28, 2015 (Petition).

² See Volume I of the Petition, at 2, and Exhibits I–3 and I–4.

³ See Letter from the Department, “Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People’s Republic of China: Supplemental Questions,” dated November 3, 2015 (General Issues Questionnaire); see also Letter from the Department, “Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People’s Republic of China: Supplemental Questions,” dated November 3, 2015; see also Letter from the Department, “Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People’s Republic of China: Supplemental Questionnaire,” dated November 6, 2015.

⁴ See Letter from Petitioner, “Response to the Department’s November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,” dated November 5, 2015, covering volume I (General Issues Supplement); see also “Response to the Department’s November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume IV of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,” dated November 5, 2015, covering volume IV of the Petition (CVD Supplement); “Response to the Department’s November 6, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,” dated November 10, 2015, covering volume IV of the Petition (General Issues Second Supplement).

(the Act), Petitioner alleges that the Government of China (GOC) is providing countervailable subsidies (within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act) to imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, for those alleged programs in the PRC on which we have initiated a CVD investigation, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegation.

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. The Department also finds that Petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the CVD investigation that Petitioner is requesting.⁵

Period of Investigation

The period of the investigation is January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014.⁶

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is iron transfer drive components from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, see the “Scope of the Investigation” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, the Department issued questions to, and received responses from, Petitioner pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.⁷

As discussed in the preamble to the Department’s regulations,⁸ we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.*, scope). The Department will consider all comments received from interested parties, and if necessary, will consult with interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information (see 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), all such factual information should be limited to public

⁵ See the “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below.

⁶ See 19 CFR 351.204(b)(2).

⁷ See General Issues Questionnaire; see also General Issues Supplement.

⁸ See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997).

information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaire, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, which is the first business day after 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Friday, December 18, 2015, which is 10 calendar days after the initial comments deadline.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider relevant to the scope of the investigation be submitted during this time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigation may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must be filed on the record of the concurrent AD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).⁹ An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.*, in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act, the Department notified representatives of the GOC of the receipt of the Petition. Also, in accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department provided representatives of the GOC the opportunity for consultations with respect to the CVD petition. As the GOC did not request consultations prior to the initiation of

this investigation, the Department and the GOC did not hold consultations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(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 702(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,¹⁰ 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.¹¹

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 title." 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 the 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 iron transfer drive components constitute a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.¹²

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 702(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 the Investigation," in Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its production of the domestic like product in 2014, as well as estimated total production of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry.¹³ We relied on data Petitioner provided for purposes of measuring industry support.¹⁴

On November 12, 2015, we received comments on industry support from Baldor Electric Company (Baldor)¹⁵ and Caterpillar, Inc. (Caterpillar).¹⁶ Baldor also indicated that it opposes the Petition.¹⁷ Petitioner responded to the letters from Baldor and Caterpillar on November 16, 2015.¹⁸ Baldor filed two additional submissions regarding industry support on November 16,

¹² For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, see Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China (PRC CVD Checklist) at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China (Attachment II). This checklist is dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

¹³ See Volume I of the Petition, at 3–4 and Exhibits I–4 through I–7.

¹⁴ *Id.* For further discussion, see PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

¹⁵ See Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015.

¹⁶ See Letter from Caterpillar, Inc., filed on November 12, 2015. We note that this letter is dated November 11, 2015, but was received by the Department on November 12, 2015.

¹⁷ See Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015, at 15.

¹⁸ See Letter from Petitioner, dated November 16, 2015.

⁹ See 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements); *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011), for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at <https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx> and a handbook can be found at <https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filing%20Procedures.pdf>.

¹⁰ See section 771(10) of the Act.

¹¹ 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)).

2015.¹⁹ Petitioner provided additional responses to Baldor's arguments on November 17, 2015.²⁰ For further discussion of these comments, see the PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

Our review of the data provided in the Petition; General Issues Supplement; letters from Baldor, Caterpillar, and Petitioner; and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioner has established industry support.²¹ 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, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.*, polling).²² Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(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.²³ Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(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.²⁴ Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act.

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 CVD investigation that it is requesting the Department initiate.²⁵

Injury Test

Because the PRC is a "Subsidies Agreement Country" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, section 701(a)(2) of the Act applies to

this investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from the PRC materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that imports of the subject merchandise are benefitting from countervailable subsidies and that such imports are causing, or threaten to cause, material injury to the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.²⁶

Petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by eroded domestic output and shipments; underselling and price suppression or depression; declining financial performance; negative impacts to employment; and lost sales and revenues.²⁷ 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.²⁸

Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a CVD investigation whenever an interested party filed a CVD petition on behalf of an industry that: (1) Alleges elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a) of the Act; and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting the allegations.

Petitioner alleges that producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components in the PRC benefit from countervailable subsidies bestowed by the GOC. The Department examined the Petition and finds that it complies with the requirements of section 702(b)(1) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether manufacturers,

producers, or exporters of iron transfer drive components from the PRC receive countervailable subsidies from the GOC.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.²⁹ The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.³⁰ The amendments to sections 776 and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to this CVD investigation.³¹

Based on our review of the petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on 39 of the 40 alleged programs in the PRC.³² For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate or not initiate on each program, see the PRC CVD Initiation Checklist. A public version of the initiation checklist for this investigation is available on ACCESS.

In accordance with section 703(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

Respondent Selection

Petitioner named 36 companies as producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components from the PRC.³³ Following standard practice in CVD investigations, the Department would normally select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports of iron transfer drive components during the period of investigation under the appropriate HTSUS numbers listed in the scope in Appendix I, below. However, CBP data has been reported in

²⁹ See Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

³⁰ See *Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015*, 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*). The 2015 amendments may be found at <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl>.

³¹ *Id.* at 46794–95.

³² Petitioner initially alleged 39 subsidy programs. See Volume IV of the Petition, at 7–92. In response to a Department questionnaire, the final number of programs alleged increased to 40. See CVD Supplement at 9–12.

³³ See General Issues Second Supplement, at Exhibit 1; see also Volume I of the Petition, at Exhibit I–11.

¹⁹ See Letters from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 16, 2015.

²⁰ See Letter from Petitioner, dated November 17, 2015.

²¹ See PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

²² See section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act; see also PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

²³ See PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ See General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

²⁷ See Volume I of the Petition, at 16–17, 22–44 and Exhibits I–4, I–10 through I–13, and I–15 through I–23; see also General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

²⁸ See PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China.

mixed units of quantity and, thus, it is problematic for the Department use this data for respondent selection purposes. Accordingly, we intend to issue quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent and base respondent selection on the responses received. In addition, the Department will post the Q&V questionnaire along with filing instructions on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at <http://www.trade.gov/enforcement/news.asp>.

Exporters and producers of iron transfer drive components from the PRC that do not receive Q&V questionnaires by mail may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy from the Enforcement and Compliance Web site. The Q&V response must be submitted by all PRC exporters/producers no later than December 1, 2015, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS. An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by ACCESS, by 5 p.m. ET by the date noted above.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petition has been provided to the GOC via ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each known exporter (as named in the Petition), consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petition was filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.³⁴ A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated;³⁵ otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) Evidence

submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). The regulation requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Extension of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301 expires. For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Under certain circumstances, we may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. Review *Extension of Time Limits*; *Final Rule*, 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm>, prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD

proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.³⁶ Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.³⁷ The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable revised certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO 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 (January 22, 2008). 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)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 702 and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are iron mechanical transfer drive components, whether finished or unfinished (i.e., blanks or castings). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are in the form of wheels or cylinders with a center bore hole that may have one or more grooves or teeth in their outer circumference that guide or mesh with a flat or ribbed belt or like device and are often referred to as sheaves, pulleys, flywheels, flat pulleys, idlers, conveyer pulleys, synchronous sheaves, and timing pulleys. The products covered by this investigation also include bushings, which are iron mechanical transfer drive components in the form of a cylinder and which fit into the bore holes of other mechanical transfer drive components to lock them into drive shafts by means of elements such as teeth, bolts, or screws.

³⁶ See section 782(b) of the Act.

³⁷ See *Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (“*Final Rule*”); see also frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.

³⁴ See section 703(a)(2) of the Act.

³⁵ See section 703(a)(1) of the Act.

Iron mechanical transfer drive components subject to this investigation are those not less than 4.00 inches (101 mm) in the maximum nominal outer diameter.

Unfinished iron mechanical transfer drive components (*i.e.*, blanks or castings) possess the approximate shape of the finished iron mechanical transfer drive component and have not yet been machined to final specification after the initial casting, forging or like operations. These machining processes may include cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering.

Subject merchandise includes iron mechanical transfer drive components as defined above that have been finished or machined in a third country, including but not limited to finishing/machining processes such as cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering, or any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigation if performed in the country of manufacture of the iron mechanical transfer drive components.

Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigation regardless of width, design, or iron type (*e.g.*, gray, white, or ductile iron). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigation regardless of whether they have non-iron attachments or parts and regardless of whether they are entered with other mechanical transfer drive components or as part of a mechanical transfer drive assembly (which typically includes one or more of the iron mechanical transfer drive components identified above, and which may also include other parts such as a belt, coupling and/or shaft). When entered as a mechanical transfer drive assembly, only the iron components that meet the physical description of covered merchandise are covered merchandise, not the other components in the mechanical transfer drive assembly (*e.g.*, belt, coupling, shaft).

For purposes of this investigation, a covered product is of "iron" where the article has a carbon content of 1.7 percent by weight or above, regardless of the presence and amount of additional alloying elements.

The merchandise covered by this investigation is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS") subheadings 8483.30.8090, 8483.50.6000, 8483.50.9040, 8483.50.9080, 8483.90.3000, 8483.90.8080. Covered merchandise may also enter under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7325.10.0080, 7325.99.1000, 7326.19.0010, 7326.19.0080, 8431.31.0040, 8431.31.0060, 8431.39.0010, 8431.39.0050, 8431.39.0070, 8431.39.0080, and 8483.50.4000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the investigation is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2015-29945 Filed 11-24-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; First Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On November 18, 2015, Irving Paper Limited filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Also, on November 18, 2015, additional Requests for Panel Review were filed on behalf of Resolute FP Canada Inc., Port Hawkesbury Paper LP, the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces of British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Québec. Panel Review was requested of the U.S. Department of Commerce's final affirmative countervailing duty determination regarding Supercalendered Paper from Canada. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 63535), on October 20, 2015. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA-CDA-2015-1904-01 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Morris, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, (202)-482-5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free Trade Agreement ("Agreement") established a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms to the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada, and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* ("Rules"). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994

(59 FR 8685) and subsequently amended on April 10, 2008 (73 FR 19458).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on November 18, 2015, requesting a panel review of the determination and order described above.

The Rules provide that:

(a) A Party or interested person may challenge the final determination in whole or in part by filing a Complaint in accordance with Rule 39 within 30 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Complaint is December 18, 2015);

(b) a Party, investigating authority or interested person that does not file a Complaint but that intends to appear in support of any reviewable portion of the final determination may participate in the panel review by filing a Notice of Appearance in accordance with Rule 40 within 45 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Notice of Appearance is January 4, 2016); and

(c) the panel review shall be limited to the allegations of error of fact or law, including the jurisdiction of the investigating authority, that are set out in the Complaints filed in panel review and the procedural and substantive defenses raised in the panel review.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Paul Morris,

United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2015-29959 Filed 11-24-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-822]

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by Thai Union Group Public Co., Ltd. (Thai Union Group), a producer/exporter of certain frozen warmwater shrimp (shrimp) from Thailand, and pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), 19 CFR 351.216, and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances review (CCR) of the antidumping duty (AD) order on shrimp from Thailand with regard to Thai