responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of 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 sanctionable violation.

Notification to Interested Parties

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 705(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.210(c).


Jeffrey I. Kessler,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I
Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise covered by the scope of this investigation is carbon and alloy steel threaded rod. Steel threaded rod is certain threaded rod, bar, or studs, of carbon or alloy steel, having a solid, circular cross section of any diameter, in any straight length. Steel threaded rod is normally drawn, cold-rolled, threaded, and straightened, or it may be hot-rolled. In addition, the steel threaded rod, bar, or studs subject to this investigation are non-headed and threaded along greater than 25 percent of their total actual length. A variety of finishes or coatings, such as plain oil finish as a temporary rust protectant, zinc coating (i.e., galvanized, whether by electroplating or hot-dipping), paint, and other similar finishes and coatings, may be applied to the merchandise.

Steel threaded rod is normally produced to American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) specifications ASTM A36, ASTM A193 B7/B7m, ASTM A193 B16, ASTM A307, ASTM A320 L7/L7m, ASTM A320 L43, ASTM A354 BC and BD, ASTM A449, ASTM F1554-36, ASTM F1554-55, ASTM F1554 Grade 105, American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) specification ASME B18.31.3, and American Petroleum Institute (API) specification API 20E. All steel threaded rod meeting the physical description set forth above is covered by the scope of this investigation, whether or not produced according to a particular standard.

Subject merchandise includes material matching the above description that has been finished, assembled, or packaged in a third country, including by cutting, chamfering, coating, or painting the threaded rod, by attaching the threaded rod to, or packaging it with, another product, or any other finishing, assembly, or packaging operation that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigation if performed in the country of manufacture of the threaded rod.

Carbon and alloy steel threaded rod are also included in the scope of this investigation whether or not imported attached to, or in conjunction with, other parts and accessories such as nuts and washers. If carbon and alloy steel threaded rod are imported attached to, or in conjunction with, such non-subject merchandise, only the threaded rod is included in the scope.

Excluded from the scope of this investigation are: (1) Threaded rod, bar, or studs which are threaded only on one or both ends and the threading covers 25 percent or less of the total actual length; and (2) stainless steel threaded rod, defined as steel threaded rod containing, by weight, 1.2 percent or less of carbon and 10.5 percent or more of chromium, with our without other elements. Excluded from the scope of the antidumping investigation on steel threaded rod from the People’s Republic of China is any merchandise covered by the existing antidumping order on Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People’s Republic of China. See Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Antidumping Duty Order, 74 FR 17154 (April 14, 2009). Specifically excluded from the scope of this investigation is threaded rod that is imported as part of a package of hardware in conjunction with a ready-to-assemble piece of furniture. Steel threaded rod is currently classifiable under subheadings 7318.15.5051, 7318.15.5056, and 7318.15.5090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Subject merchandise may also enter under subheading 7318.15.2005 and 7318.19.0000 of the HTSUS. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes only. The written description of the scope is dispositive.

Appendix II
List of Topics Discussed in the Final Decision Memorandum

I. Summary
II. Background
III. Scope of the Investigation
IV. Use of Facts Otherwise Available and Adverse Inference
V. Subsidies Valuation Information
VI. Analysis of Programs
VII. Analysis of Comments
   Comment 1: Whether the Provision of Steel Bar and Wire Rod at Less Than Adequate Remuneration (LTAR) Is Specific
   Comment 2: Whether The Chinese Market for Steel Bar and Wire Rod Is Distorted
   Comment 3: Whether Certain Chinese Producers of Steel Bar and Wire Rod Are Authorized
   Comment 4: Whether To Revise the Steel Bar and Wire Rod Rods
   Comment 5: Whether To Revise the Ocean Freight Benchmark
   Comment 6: Whether To Counteract Export Buyer’s Credit
   Comment 7: Whether To Apply Adverse Facts Available (AFA) to Junyue
   Comment 8: Whether To Counteract Electricity Junyue Purchased from a Private Supplier
   Comment 9: Whether To Treat One of Zhongjiag Bolt’s Self-Reported Subsidies as an Export Subsidy
   VIII. Recommendation
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issues. The petitioner filed responses to these requests on January 29, 2020.\(^5\)

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the petitioner alleges that the Government of China (GOC) is providing countervailable subsidies, within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(S) of the Act, to producers of vertical shaft engines in China, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the domestic industry producing vertical shaft engines in the United States. Consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(b), for those alleged programs on which we are initiating a CVD investigation, the Petition is supported by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting its allegations. Commerce finds that the petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because the petitioner is an interested party as defined in sections 771(9)(C) and (E) of the Act. Commerce also finds that the petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the requested CVD investigation.\(^6\)

Period of Investigation

Because the Petition was filed on January 15, 2020, the period of investigation (POI) is January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019.\(^7\)

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation is vertical shaft engines from China. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, see the appendix to this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

As discussed in the Preamble to Commerce’s regulations, we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (i.e., scope).\(^8\) Commerce 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,\(^9\) all such factual information should be limited to public information. To facilitate preparation of its questionnaires, Commerce requests that all interested parties submit scope comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on February 24, 2020, which is 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 March 5, 2020, which is 10 calendar days from the initial comment deadline.\(^10\)

Commerce 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 Commerce and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must also be filed on the record of the concurrent AD and CVD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to Commerce must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).\(^11\) An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due. Documents exempted 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, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Consultations

Pursuant to sections 702(b)(4)(A)(i) and (ii) of the Act, Commerce notified the GOC of the receipt of the Petition and provided it the opportunity for consultations with respect to the CVD Petition.\(^12\) The GOC did not request 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, Commerce 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 Commerce 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 Commerce and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,\(^13\) they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, Commerce’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.\(^14\)

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, the 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 vertical shaft engines, as defined in the scope, constitute a single domestic like product, and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.16

In determining whether the 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 the appendix to this notice. To establish industry support, the petitioner provided 2019 shipments of the domestic like product for members of the Coalition.17 The petitioner estimated the production of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry based on U.S. shipment data, export data, and its own knowledge of the industry, because shipments and production of vertical shaft engines correlate with one another and shipments are a reasonable proxy for production in the vertical shaft engines industry.18 The petitioner compared the 2019 shipments of the Coalition to the estimated total shipments of the domestic like product

---

15 See Volume I of the Petition, at 16–17; see also General Issues Supplement at 3–5.
16 For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis as applied to these cases and information regarding industry support, see Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Vertical Shaft Engines Between 225cc and 999cc, and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China (China AD Initiation Checklist) at Attachment II, “Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Vertical Shaft Engines Between 225cc and 999cc, and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China” (Attachment III), dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS.

The petitioner alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from China materially injure, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. In addition, the petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.26 In CVD petitions, section 771(24)(B) of the Act provides that imports of subject merchandise from developing and least developed countries must exceed the negligibility threshold of four percent.

The petitioner contends that the industry’s injured condition is illustrated by a significant and increasing volume of subject imports; reduced market share; underselling and price depression or suppression; lost sales and revenues; and a decline in the domestic industry’s financial performance and profitability.27 We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, causation, as well as cumulation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence, and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.28

Initiation of CVD Investigation

Based upon the examination of the Petition on vertical shaft engines from China, we find that the Petition meets the requirements of section 702 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether imports of vertical shaft engines from China benefit from countervailable subsidies conferred by the COC. Based on our review of the Petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on each of the alleged programs. For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate on each program, see China CVD Initiation Checklist.29 A public

---

20 See Volume I of the Petition, at 23–24.
23 See Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Vertical Shaft Engines Between 225cc and 999cc, and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China (China CVD Initiation Checklist), dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS, at 7. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also
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.

**Critical Circumstances**

The petitioner alleges, based on trade statistics, that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist with regard to imports of vertical shaft engines from China. Section 703(e)(1) of the Act provides that if the petitioner alleges critical circumstances, Commerce will find that such circumstances exist, at any time after the date of initiation, when there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect: (A) That “the alleged countervailable subsidy” is inconsistent with the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM Agreement) of the World Trade Organization, and (B) that “there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period.”

Section 351.206(h)(2) of the Commerce’s regulations provides that, generally, imports must increase by at least 15 percent during the “relatively short period” to be considered “massive,” and section 351.206(i) defines a “relatively short period” as normally being the period beginning on the date the petition becomes effective (i.e., the date the petition is filed) and ending at least three months later. The regulations also provide, however, that, if Commerce “finds that importers, or exporters or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely,” Commerce “may consider a period of not less than three months from that earlier time.”

The petitioner alleges that Chinese vertical shaft engine producers benefit from numerous Chinese government subsidies, which include subsidies that are contingent upon export performance, subsidies for inputs provided for less than adequate remuneration (LTAR), tax benefits, and export incentives. Specifically, the GOC supported vertical shaft engines producers and exporters through the provision of aluminum and pig iron for LTAR, GOC subsidies for the development of famous export brands and China world top brands, export credits granted under the catalogue of Chinese high-tech products for export, and the provision of land at LTAR.

The petitioner also asserts that there have been massive imports of vertical shaft engines over a relatively short period. Based on the petitioner’s calculation, the imports of engines in the classification that most closely approximates vertical shaft engines surged 35.7 percent between June 2019 through November 2019 against the same period in calendar year 2018. The petitioner chose these base and comparison periods in order to account for seasonality and the unusual circumstances caused by the imposition of 25 percent Section 301 duties, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.206(h)(1)(ii). The petitioner asserts that, because the surge in imports constituted more than a 15 percent change, import volumes of vertical shaft engines are massive, as defined in Commerce’s regulations.

The petitioner requests that the Commerce make a preliminary finding of critical circumstances within 45 days of the filing of the Petition. Section 702(e)(1) of the Act states that if “at any time after the initiation of an investigation under this subtitle, the administering authority finds a reasonable basis to suspect that the alleged countervailable subsidy is inconsistent with the {SCM} Agreement, the administering authority may request the Commissioner of Customs to compile information on an expedited basis regarding entries of the subject merchandise.”

Taking into consideration the foregoing, we will analyze this matter further. We will monitor imports of vertical shaft engines from China and may request that U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) compile information on an expedited basis regarding entries of subject merchandise. If, at any time, the criteria for a finding of critical circumstances are established, we will issue a critical circumstances determination at the earliest possible date.

**Respondent Selection**

The petitioner named 35 companies in China as producers/exporters of vertical shaft engines. Commerce intends to follow its standard practice in CVD investigations and calculate company-specific subsidy rates in this investigation. In the event Commerce determines that the number of companies is large and it cannot individually examine each company based upon Commerce’s resources, where appropriate, Commerce intends to select mandatory respondents based on CBP data for U.S. imports of vertical shaft engines from China during the POI under the appropriate Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States numbers listed in the “Scope of the Investigation,” in the appendix.

On February 3, 2020, Commerce released CBP data on imports of vertical shaft engines from China under administrative protective order (APO) to all parties with access to information protected by APO and indicated that interested parties wishing to comment on the CBP data must do so within three business days of the publication date of the notice of initiation of this investigation. We further stated that we will not accept rebuttal comments.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(b). Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Commerce website at http://enforcement.trade.gov/apo.

Comments must be filed electronically using ACCESS. An electronically filed document must be received successfully, in its entirety, by ACCESS no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on the date noted above. Commerce intends to finalize its decisions regarding respondent selection within 20 days of publication of this notice.

**Distribution of Copies of the Petition**

In accordance with section 702(b)(3)(A) 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.

Furthermore, to the extent practicable, Commerce will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each exporter named in the Petition, as provided under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).
ITC Notification

Commerce will notify the ITC of its 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 vertical shaft engines from China are materially injuring or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated. 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 Commerce; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). Any party, when submitting factual information, must 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. Please review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Extensions 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 Commerce. 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. 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. ET on the due date. Under certain circumstances, Commerce 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, Commerce will inform parties in a letter or memorandum of 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, standalone submission; under limited circumstances Commerce will grant untimely filed requests for the extension of time limits. Parties should 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 extension requests or 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. Parties must use the certification formats provided in 19 CFR 351.303(g). Commerce intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Commerce website at http://enforcement.trade.gov/apo.

On January 22, 2008, Commerce 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, and 19 CFR 351.203(c).

Appendix

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation consists of spark-ignited, non-road, vertical shaft engines, whether finished or unfinished, whether assembled or unassembled, primarily for riding lawn mowers and zero-turn radius lawn mowers. Engines meeting this physical description may also be for other non-hand-held outdoor power equipment such as, including but not limited to, tow-behind brush mowers, grinders, and vertical shaft generators. The subject engines are spark ignition, single or multiple cylinder, air cooled, internal combustion engines with vertical power take off shafts with a minimum displacement of 225 cubic centimeters (cc) and a maximum displacement of 900cc. Typically, engines with displacements of this size generate gross power of between 6.7 kilowatts (kw) to 42 kw.

Engines covered by this scope normally must comply with and be certified under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) air pollution controls title 40, chapter I, subchapter U, part 1054 of the Code of Federal Regulations standards for small non-road spark ignition engines and equipment. Engines that otherwise meet the physical description of the scope but are not certified under 40 CFR part 1054 and are not certified under other parts of subchapter U of the EPA air pollution controls are not excluded from the scope of this proceeding. Engines that may be certified under both 40 CFR part 1054 as well as other parts of subchapter U remain subject to the scope of this proceeding.

For purposes of this investigation, an unfinished engine covers at a minimum a sub-assembly comprised of, but not limited to, the following components: Crankcase, crankshaft, camshaft, piston(s), and connecting rod(s). Importation of these components together, whether assembled or unassembled, and whether or not accompanied by additional components such as an oil pan, manifold, cylinder head(s), valve train, or valve cover(s), constitutes an unfinished engine for purposes of this investigation. The inclusion of other products such as spark plugs fitted into the cylinder head or electrical devices (e.g., ignition modules, ignition coils) for synchronizing with the motor to supply tension current does not remove the product from the scope. The inclusion of any other components not identified as comprising the unfinished engine subassembly in a third-country does not remove the engine from the scope.

The engines subject to this investigation are typically classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheadings: 8407.90.1020, 8407.90.1060, and 8407.90.1080. The engine subassemblies that are subject to this investigation enter under HTSUS 8409.91.9990. Engines subject to this investigation may also enter under HTSUS 8407.90.9000 and 8407.90.9080. The
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From the People’s Republic of China: Negative Preliminary Determination of Circumvention Involving Guatemala

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that imports of certain corrosion-resistant steel products (CORE) completed in Guatemala are not circumventing the antidumping duty (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) orders on CORE from the People’s Republic of China (China) at this time.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 12, 2019, Commerce self-initiated country-wide anti-circumvention inquiries of the China CORE Orders covering Chinese-origin hot-rolled steel (HRS) and/or cold-rolled steel (CRS) exported to various countries, including Guatemala, for completion into CORE and subsequently exported to the United States. In the

Initiation Notice, Commerce initiated the instant anti-circumvention inquiries based on available information and an analysis pursuant to section 781(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.225(h), to determine whether the importation of the Chinese-origin HRS or CRS substrate for completion into CORE in Guatemala and subsequent exportation of that CORE to the United States constitutes circumvention of the China CORE Orders.

For a complete description of the record developed since the initiation of these inquiries, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum. A list of topics included in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum is included as Appendix I to this notice. The Preliminary 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, and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/. The signed and the electronic versions of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Scope of the Orders

The products covered by these orders are certain flat-rolled steel products, either clad, plated, or coated with corrosion-resistant metals such as zinc, aluminum, or zinc-, aluminum-, nickel- or iron-based alloys, whether or not corrugated or painted, varnished, laminated, or coated with plastics or other non-metallic substances in addition to the metallic coating. For a complete description of the scope of the orders, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Scope of the Anti-Circumvention Inquiries

These anti-circumvention inquiries cover CORE completed in Guatemala from HRS or CRS substrate input manufactured in China and subsequently exported from Guatemala to the United States.

Methodology

Commerce is conducting these anti-circumvention inquiries in accordance with section 781(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.225(h). For a full description of the methodology underlying Commerce’s preliminary determination, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Preliminary Finding

As detailed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum, we preliminarily determine that Ternium Internacional Guatemala S.A. is neither producing CORE from Chinese substrate in Guatemala nor exporting CORE incorporating Chinese substrate to the United States at present, or at any point recent enough to support the concerns which served as the basis for the initiation of these inquiries, and thus action is not appropriate to address circumvention of the China CORE Orders, at this time. Accordingly, Commerce is making a preliminary negative finding of circumvention of the China CORE Orders.

Verification

As provided in 19 CFR 351.307, Commerce intends to verify information relied upon in making its final determination.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance no later than seven days after the date on which the final verification report is issued in these anti-circumvention inquiries, unless the Secretary alters the time limit. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be submitted no later than five days after the deadline date for case briefs. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2), parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in these anti-circumvention inquiries are encouraged to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), interested parties who wish to request a hearing, limited to issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, within 30 days after the date

See Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products from India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Amended Final Affirmative Antidumping Duty Determination for India and Taiwan, and Antidumping Duty Orders, 81 FR 48390 (July 25, 2016); see also Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, Republic of Korea, and the People’s Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Order, 81 FR 48387 (July 25, 2016) (collectively, China CORE Orders).

See Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products from India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Amended Final Affirmative Antidumping Duty Determination for India and Taiwan, and Antidumping Duty Orders, 81 FR 48390 (July 25, 2016); see also Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, Republic of Korea, and the People’s Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Order, 81 FR 48387 (July 25, 2016) (collectively, China CORE Orders).

See Memorandum, “Preliminary Decision Memorandum for the Anti-Circumvention Inquiries Involving Guatemala of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from the People’s Republic of China,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

See Memorandum, “Preliminary Decision Memorandum for the Anti-Circumvention Inquiries Involving Guatemala of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from the People’s Republic of China,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

See Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products from India, Italy, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Amended Final Affirmative Antidumping Duty Determination for India and Taiwan, and Antidumping Duty Orders, 81 FR 48390 (July 25, 2016); see also Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, Republic of Korea, and the People’s Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Order, 81 FR 48387 (July 25, 2016) (collectively, China CORE Orders).

See Memorandum, “Preliminary Decision Memorandum for the Anti-Circumvention Inquiries Involving Guatemala of the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from the People’s Republic of China,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).