warrant an initiation of a formal anti-circumvention inquiry. In accordance with section 351.225(e) of the Department's regulations, if the Department finds that the issue of whether a product is included within the scope of an order cannot be determined based solely upon the application and the descriptions of the merchandise, the Department will notify by mail all parties on the Department's scope service list of the initiation of a scope inquiry, including an anti-circumvention inquiry. In addition, in accordance with section 351.225(f)(1)(ii) of the Department's regulations, a notice of the initiation of an anti-circumvention inquiry issued under paragraph (e) of this section includes a description of the product that is the subject of the anti-circumvention inquiry—drill pipe that contain the characteristics as provided in the scope of the *Drill Pipe Orders,* and an explanation of the reasons for the Department's decision to initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry, as provided below.

With regard to whether the merchandise from the UAE is of the same class or kind as the merchandise produced in the PRC, the Petitioners have presented information to the Department indicating that, pursuant to section 781(b)(1)(A) of the Act, the merchandise being exported from the UAE by Almansoori/Hilong may be of the same class or kind as drill pipe produced in the PRC, which is subject to the *Drill Pipe Orders.* Consequently, the Department finds that the Petitioners have provided sufficient information in their request regarding the class of kind of merchandise to support the initiation of an anti-circumvention inquiry.

With regard to completion or assembly of merchandise in a foreign country, pursuant to section 781(b)(1)(B) of the Act, the Petitioners have also presented information to the Department indicating that the drill pipe exported from the UAE to the United States is assembled by Almansoori/Hilong in the UAE from pipe and tool joints produced in the PRC. We find that the information presented by the Petitioners regarding this criterion supports their request to initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry.

The Department believes that the Petitioners sufficiently addressed the factors described in section 781(b)(2) of the Act regarding whether the friction welding of pipe to tool joints in the UAE is minor or insignificant. Specifically, in support of their argument, the Petitioners relied on their own experience and surrogate values from the less-than-fair-value investigation. Thus, we find that the information presented by the Petitioners supports their request to initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry. In particular, we find that the Petitioners' submissions suggest that (1) little investment has been made by Hilong in its drill pipe welding operations in the UAE, (2) Hilong has fully integrated production facilities in the PRC, and therefore, research and development presumably takes place in the PRC rather than the UAE, (3) the friction welding of pipe to tool joints in the UAE does not alter the fundamental characteristics of the drill pipe, nor does it remove it from the scope of the *Drill Pipe Orders,* (4) Almansoori/Hilong has a lower investment level than companies that manufacture pipe and tool joints and (5) friction welding pipe to tool joints adds little value to the merchandise imported to the United States. Our analysis will focus on Almansoori/Hilong's assembly operations in the UAE and, in the context of this proceeding, we will closely examine the manner in which this company's processing materials are obtained, whether those materials are considered subject to the scope of the *Drill Pipe Orders,* and the extent of processing in the UAE, as well as the manner in which production and sales relationships are conducted with the alleged PRC and U.S. affiliates.

With respect to the value of the merchandise produced in the PRC, pursuant to section 781(b)(1)(D) of the Act, the Petitioners relied on one of its member's information and arguments in the ''minor or insignificant process'' portion of its anti-circumvention request to indicate that the value of the pipe and tool joint may be significant relative to the total value of finished drill pipe exported to the United States. We find that the information adequately meets the requirements of this factor, as discussed above, for the purposes of initiating an anti-circumvention inquiry.

Finally, the Petitioners argue that pursuant to section 781(b)(3) of the Act the Department considers the pattern of trade, affiliation, and subsequent import volumes as factors in determining whether to initiate the anti-circumvention inquiry. Here, we find that imports of drill pipe from the PRC decreased after the initiation of the investigations, that the Almansoori/Hilong joint venture in the UAE is affiliated to Hilong, and that the U.S. import data submitted by the Petitioners suggests that imports of drill pipe have risen since the investigations.

Accordingly, based on the Petitioners' submissions, we have determined that we have a sufficient basis to initiate a formal anti-circumvention inquiry concerning the *Drill Pipe Orders,* pursuant to section 781(b) of the Act. In accordance with section 351.225(l)(2) of the Department's regulations, if the Department issues a preliminary affirmative determination, we will then instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend liquidation and require a cash deposit of estimated duties on the merchandise.

This anti-circumvention inquiry covers Hilong and its affiliated companies in the UAE and United States. If, within sufficient time, the Department receives a formal request from an interested party regarding potential circumvention of the *Drill Pipe Orders* by other UAE companies, we will consider conducting additional inquiries concurrently.

The Department will establish a schedule for questionnaires and comments on the issues. In accordance with section 351.225(f)(5), the Department intends to issue its final determination within 300 days of the date of publication of this initiation. This notice is published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 5, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–20570 Filed 8–11–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–840]

Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Determination Not To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part, and Final No Shipment Determination

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 12, 2011.

SUMMARY: On April 7, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain orange juice (OJ) from Brazil. This review covers four producers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 2009, through February 28, 2010.

After analyzing the comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. Therefore,

these final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of Review.''

Further, we have determined not to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to OJ from Brazil produced and exported by Sucocitrico Cutrale, S.A. (Cutrale).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hector Rodriguez or Blaine Wiltse, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482–0629 or (202) 482–6345, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 7, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the 2009–2010 administrative review of antidumping duty order on certain OJ from Brazil. *See Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part,* 76 FR 19315 (Apr. 7, 2011) (*Preliminary Results*). Also in April, after the issuance of the preliminary results, the Department issued, and Cutrale submitted responses to, two additional supplemental questionnaires.

We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. In May 2011, we received case briefs from the petitioners (*i.e.,* Florida Citrus Mutual and Citrus World Inc.), Cutrale, and Fischer S.A. Comercio, Industria, and Agricultura (Fischer). We received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners and Cutrale.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The scope of this order includes certain orange juice for transport and/or further manufacturing, produced in two different forms: (1) Frozen orange juice in a highly concentrated form, sometimes referred to as frozen concentrated orange juice for manufacture (FCOJM); and (2) pasteurized single-strength orange juice which has not been concentrated, referred to as not-from-concentrate (NFC). At the time of the filing of the petition, there was an existing antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil. *See Antidumping Duty Order; Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil,* 52 FR 16426 (May 5, 1987). Therefore, the scope of this order with regard to FCOJM covers only FCOJM produced and/or exported by those companies which were excluded or revoked from the pre-existing antidumping order on FCOJ from Brazil as of December 27, 2004. Those companies are Cargill Citrus Limitada, Coinbra-Frutesp (SA), Cutrale, Fischer, and Montecitrus Trading S.A.

Excluded from the scope of the order are reconstituted orange juice and frozen concentrated orange juice for retail (FCOJR). Reconstituted orange juice is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, by adding water, oils and essences to the orange juice concentrate. FCOJR is concentrated orange juice, typically at 42 Brix, in a frozen state, packed in retail-sized containers ready for sale to consumers. FCOJR, a finished consumer product, is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, a bulk manufacturer's product.

The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheadings 2009.11.00, 2009.12.25, 2009.12.45, and 2009.19.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only and are not dispositive. Rather, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Period of Review

The POR is March 1, 2009, through February 28, 2010.

Determination Not To Revoke Order, In Part

The Department may revoke, in whole or in part, an antidumping duty order upon completion of a review under section 751 of the Act. While Congress has not specified the procedures that the Department must follow in revoking an order, the Department has developed a procedure for revocation that is described in 19 CFR 351.222. This regulation requires, *inter alia,* that a company requesting revocation must submit the following: (1) A certification that the company has sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value (NV) in the current review period and that the company will not sell subject merchandise at less than NV in the future; (2) a certification that the company sold commercial quantities of the subject merchandise to the United States in each of the three years forming the basis of the request; and (3) an agreement to immediate reinstatement of the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1). Upon receipt of such a request, the Department will consider whether: (1) The company in question has sold subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the company has agreed in writing to its immediate reinstatement in the order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to the revocation, sold the subject merchandise at less than NV; and (3) the continued application of the antidumping duty order is otherwise necessary to offset dumping. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2)(i).

As we noted in the *Preliminary Results,* on March 31, 2010, Cutrale requested revocation of the antidumping duty order with respect to its sales of subject merchandise, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b). This request was accompanied by certification that: (1) Cutrale sold the subject merchandise at not less than NV during the current POR and will not sell the merchandise at less than NV in the future; and (2) it sold subject merchandise to the United States in commercial quantities for a period of at least three consecutive years. Cutrale also agreed to immediate reinstatement of the antidumping duty order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that, subsequent to the revocation, it sold the subject merchandise at less than NV. *See Preliminary Results,* 76 FR at 19315.

After analyzing Cutrale's request for revocation (as more fully explained in the Issues and Decision Memorandum accompanying this notice (the Decision Memo)), we find that it does not meet all of the criteria under 19 CFR 351.222(b). In the second and third administrative reviews, we found that Cutrale sold subject merchandise at less than NV. *See Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 74 FR 40167 (Aug. 11, 2009); and *Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in* Part, 75 FR 50999 (Aug. 18, 2010). Accordingly, Cutrale did not demonstrate that it did not sell the subject merchandise at less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years.

Therefore, we determine that Cutrale does not qualify for revocation of the order on certain orange juice pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2), and as a result

we have not revoked the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Cutrale. For further discussion of this issue, see the Decision Memo at Comment 3.

Determination of No Shipments

As noted in the *Preliminary Results,* we received no-shipment claims from two companies named in the notice of initiation of this review, Coinbra-Frutesp (SA) (Coinbra-Frutesp) and Montecitrus Trading S.A. (Montecitrus), and we confirmed their claims with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). Because we find that the record indicates that Coinbra-Frutesp and Montecitrus did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the POR, we determine that they had no reviewable transactions during the POR.

As we stated in the *Preliminary Results,* our former practice concerning respondents submitting timely no-shipment certifications was to rescind the administrative review with respect to those companies if we were able to confirm the no-shipment certifications through a no-shipment inquiry with CBP. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final rule,* 62 FR 27296, 27393 (May 19, 1997); *see also Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Taiwan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 75 FR 76700, 76701 (Dec. 9, 2010). As a result, in such circumstances, we normally instructed CBP to liquidate any entries from the no-shipment company at the deposit rate in effect on the date of entry.

In our May 6, 2003, clarification of the ''automatic assessment'' regulation, we explained that, where respondents in an administrative review demonstrate that they had no knowledge of sales through resellers to the United States, we would instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the all-others rate applicable to the proceeding. *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties,* 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment Policy Notice*).

As noted in the *Preliminary Results,* because ''as entered'' liquidation instructions do not alleviate the concerns which the May 2003 clarification was intended to address, we find it appropriate in this case to instruct CBP to liquidate any existing entries of merchandise produced by Coinbra-Futesp or Montecitrus and exported by other parties at the all-others rate. In addition, we continue to find that it is more consistent with the May 2003 clarification not to rescind the review in part in these circumstances but, rather, to complete the review with respect to these two companies and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of this administrative review. *See* the ''Assessment Rates'' section of this notice below.

Cost of Production

As discussed in the preliminary results, we conducted an investigation to determine whether Cutrale and Fischer made home market sales of the foreign like product during the POR at prices below their costs of production (COP) within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. *See Preliminary Results.* For these final results, we performed the cost test following the same methodology as in the *Preliminary Results,* except as discussed in the Decision Memo.

We found 20 percent or more of each respondent's sales of a given product during the reporting period were at prices less than the weighted-average COP for this period. Thus, we determined that these below-cost sales were made in ''substantial quantities'' within an extended period of time and at prices which did not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. *See* sections 773(b)(1) and (2) of the Act.

For purposes of these final results, we continue to find that Cutrale and Fischer made below-cost sales not in the ordinary course of trade. Consequently, we disregarded these sales for each respondent and used the remaining sales (if any) as the basis for determining NV, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act. Where there were no home market sales made in the ordinary course of trade, we based NV on constructed value.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case briefs by parties to this administrative review, and to which we have responded, are listed in the Appendix to this notice and addressed in the Decision Memo, which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room 7046, of the main Department building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at *http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn.* The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes to the margin calculations. These changes are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following weighted-average margin percentages exist for the period March 1, 2009, through February 28, 2010:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Coinbra-Frutesp (SA)	*
Fischer S.A. Comercio, Industria, and Agricultura	3.97
Montecitrus Trading S.A.	*
Sucocitrico Cutrale, S.A.	0.42 (*de minimis*)

* No shipments or sales subject to this review.

Assessment

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

We have calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the sales. We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review if any importer-specific assessment rate is above *de minimis* (*i.e.,* less than 0.50 percent). The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these final results of review.

The Department clarified its ''automatic assessment'' regulation on May 6, 2003. *See Assessment Policy Notice,* 68 FR 23954. This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in these final

results of review for which the reviewed companies did not know their merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of OJ from Brazil entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates shown above, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 16.51 percent, the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Orange Juice from Brazil,* 72 FR 12183 (Mar. 9, 2006). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility, under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2), to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results of review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: August 5, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—Issues in Decision Memorandum

1. Offsetting of Negative Margins.
2. Capping Interest Revenue by Credit Expenses.
3. Request for Revocation by Cutrale.
4. U.S. Brix Level.
5. Inventory Carrying Costs for Cutrale's U.S. Sales.
6. Calculation of Cutrale's U.S. Indirect Selling Expense Rate.
7. Calculation of Cutrale's General and Administrative Expense Rate.
8. Calculation of Fischer's International Freight Expenses.
9. Use of Fischer's Home Market Sample Sales in Calculating Normal Value and Constructed Value Profit.

[FR Doc. 2011–20563 Filed 8–11–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of an opportunity to apply for membership on the U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is currently seeking applications for membership on the U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board (Board). The purpose of the Board is to advise the Secretary of Commerce on matters relating to the travel and tourism industry.

DATES: All applications must be received by the Office of Advisory Committees by 5 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on September 16, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Please submit application information by mail to Jennifer Pilat, Office of Advisory Committees, U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board Executive Secretariat, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4043, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 or via e-mail to *oacie@trade.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Pilat, U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board Executive Secretariat, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4043, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, *telephone:* 202–482–5896, *e-mail: jennifer.pilat@trade.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Travel and Tourism Advisory Board (Board) is established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. (FACA), and advises the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) on matters relating to the U.S. travel and tourism industry pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1512. The Board provides a means of ensuring regular contact between the U.S. Government and the travel and tourism industry. The Board advises the Secretary on government policies and programs that affect United States travel and tourism, and the Board serves as a forum for discussing and proposing solutions to industry-related problems. The Board acts as a liaison among the stakeholders represented by the membership and provides a forum for those stakeholders on current and emerging issues in the travel and tourism sector. The Board recommends ways to ensure that the United States remains the preeminent destination for international visitation and tourism throughout the world.

The Office of Advisory Committees is accepting applications for Board members. Members shall represent companies and organizations in the travel and tourism sector from a broad range of products and services, company sizes, and geographic locations and shall be drawn from large, medium, and small travel and tourism companies, private-sector organizations involved in the export of travel and tourism-related products and services, and other tourism-related entities.

Each Board member shall serve as the representative of a U.S. company in the travel and tourism industry, a U.S. organization involved in the export of travel and tourism-related products and services, or a tourism-related U.S. entity. For eligibility purposes, a ''U.S. company'' is a for-profit firm that is incorporated in the United States (or an unincorporated U.S. firm with its principal place of business in the United States) that is controlled by U.S. citizens or by other U.S. companies. A company is not a U.S. company if 50 percent plus one share of its stock (if a corporation, or a similar ownership interest of an unincorporated entity) is known to be controlled, directly or