subheadings. While the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.[7]

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised for the final results of this sunset review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at *https://access.trade.gov.* In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at *https://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html.* The signed and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content. A list of topics included in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is provided as an Appendix to this notice.

Final Results of Sunset Review

We determine that revocation of the *AD Order* on steel nails from Oman would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at weighted average margins up to 9.10 percent.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to an 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 final results of this full sunset review in accordance with sections 751(c)(5)(A), 752(c), and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(3).

Dated: January 22, 2021.

Christian Marsh,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum:

1. Summary
2. Background
3. Scope of the Order
4. Discussion of the Issues
   - Comment 1: Whether the Department of Commerce (Commerce) Should Consider the Dumping Margin Calculated for a Defunct Company
   - Comment 2: Whether Commerce Should Consider the ''All Others'' Rate
   - Comment 3: Whether Commerce Should Consider the Effect of Section 232 Steel Tariffs on Import Volumes
5. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2021–01910 Filed 1–27–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[7] For a complete description of the scope of the order, *see* Memorandum, ''Issues and Decision Memorandum for Final Results of the First Sunset Review of Certain Steel Nails from the Sultanate of Oman,'' dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–947]

Certain Steel Grating From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) order on certain steel grating from the People's Republic of China (China) would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, at the level indicated in the ''Final Results of Sunset Review'' section of this notice, *infra.*

DATES: Applicable January 28, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Ju, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3699.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

After publication of the notice of initiation of this sunset review of the AD order on certain steel grating from China,[1] pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Metal Grating Coalition (Coalition) consisting of Nucor Grating, IKG USA, LLC, Ohio Gratings, Inc., Interstate Gratings, LLC and Lichtgitter USA Inc. (collectively, the domestic interested parties) filed with Commerce a timely and complete notice of intent to participate in the sunset review,[2] and a timely and adequate substantive response.[3] Commerce did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(*2*), Commerce conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the *Order.*[4]

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are certain steel grating, consisting of two or more pieces of steel, including load-bearing pieces and cross pieces, joined by any assembly process, regardless of: (1) Size or shape; (2) method of manufacture; (3) metallurgy (carbon, alloy, or stainless); (4) the profile of the bars; and (5) whether or not they are galvanized, painted, coated, clad or plated.

Certain steel grating that is the subject of the order is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under subheading 7308.90.7000. While the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

For a full description of the scope of the order, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review, including the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping in the event of revocation of the *Order* and the magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail if the *Order* were to be

[1] *See Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews,* 85 FR 61928 (October 1, 2020); *see also Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order,* 75 FR 43143 (July 23, 2010), and *Certain Steel Grating From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Correction to the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order,* 75 FR 69626 (November 15, 2010) (collectively, *Order*).

[2] *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Letter, ''Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Intent to Participate in Sunset Review,'' dated October 16, 2020.

[3] *See* Domestic Interested Parties' Letter, ''Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China: Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation of Sunset Review,'' dated November 2, 2020 (Substantive Response).

[4] For a complete description of the background of this sunset review of the *Order, see* Memorandum, ''Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Steel Grating from the People's Republic of China,'' dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

revoked, is provided in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.[5] A list of the sections in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is attached as an appendix to this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at *http://access.trade.gov.* In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed on the internet at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/.* The signed and electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Sunset Review

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1), 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, Commerce determines that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail are weighted-average dumping margins up to 145.18 percent.

Administrative Protective Orders

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 the 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.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.218 and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(5)(ii).

Dated: January 22, 2021.

Christian Marsh,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix—Sections in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

I. Summary
II. Background
III. Scope of the *Order*
IV. History of the *Order*
V. Legal Framework
VI. Discussion of the Issues
1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping
2. Magnitude of the Margin of Dumping Likely to Prevail
VII. Final Results of Sunset Review
VIII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2021–01909 Filed 1–27–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[5] *Id.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–836]

Glycine From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2019–2020

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) continues to find that certain companies covered by this administrative review made no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR) March 1, 2019, through February 29, 2020. Commerce also continues to find that Avid Organics Private Limited (Avid) is part of the China-wide entity.

DATES: Applicable January 28, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yang Jin Chun, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 22, 2020, Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on glycine from the People's Republic of China (China) covering the POR.[1] We received comments from interested parties with respect the *Preliminary Results.* The deadline for these final results of review is February 19, 2021. We conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this antidumping duty order is glycine, which is a free-flowing crystalline material, like salt or sugar. Glycine is produced at varying levels of purity and is used as a sweetener/taste enhancer, a buffering agent, reabsorbable amino acid, chemical intermediate, and a metal complexing agent. This proceeding includes glycine of all purity levels. Glycine is currently classified under subheading 2922.49.4020 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).[2] Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

The sole issue raised with respect to the *Preliminary Results* by parties to this administrative review is addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.[3] The issue raised by parties and the other areas covered in the Issues and Decision Memroandum are identified in the appendix to this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at *https://access.trade.gov.* In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html.* The signed and electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes From the Preliminary Results

We made no revisions to the *Preliminary Results.*

Final Determination of No Shipments

We preliminarily determined that Studio Disrupt, Mulji Mehta Enterprises, Kumar Industries, and Baoding Mantong Fine Chemistry Co., Ltd., did not have shipments of subject merchandise during the POR.[4] After the *Preliminary Results,* we received no comments or additional information with respect to these four companies. Therefore, for the final results, we

[1] *See Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2019–2020,* 85 FR 67332 (October 22, 2020) (*Preliminary Results*).

[2] In separate scope rulings, Commerce determined that: (a) D(-) Phenylglycine Ethyl Dane Salt is outside the scope of the order and (b) Chinese-glycine exported from India remains the same class or kind of merchandise as the China-origin glycine imported into India. *See Notice of Scope Rulings and Anticircumvention Inquiries,* 62 FR 62288 (November 21, 1997) and *Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Final Partial Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order,* 77 FR 73426 (December 10, 2012), respectively.

[3] *See* Memorandum, ''Glycine from the People's Republic of China: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Administrative Review; 2019–2020,'' dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

[4] *See Preliminary Results,* 85 FR at 67322–23.