

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“Act”), and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1) require the Department to issue the preliminary results in a new shipper review of an antidumping duty order 180 days after the date on which the review is initiated. The Department may, however, extend the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of a new shipper review to 300 days if it determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated. See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2).

The Department finds that this new shipper review is extraordinarily complicated and, therefore, it requires additional time to complete the preliminary results. Specifically, the Department requires additional time to examine factors of production data that were only fully provided this month and then issue supplemental questionnaires for any additional information that may be needed. Accordingly, we are extending the time for the completion of the preliminary results of this review by 120 days, until May 22, 2012.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 5, 2012.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2012-585 Filed 1-12-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-836]

Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by an interested party, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate products (steel plate) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). This review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd. (DSM). The period of review (POR)

is February 1, 2010, through January 31, 2011.

The Department has preliminarily determined that DSM made U.S. sales at prices less than normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results of review. We intend to issue the final results of review no later than 120 days from the publication date of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 13, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Yang Jin Chun, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-5760.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 10, 2000, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order on steel plate from Korea. See *Notice of Amendment of Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan and the Republic of Korea*, 65 FR 6585 (February 10, 2000). On February 1, 2011, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request administrative review of the order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 76 FR 5559 (February 1, 2011).

On February 25, 2011, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), DSM requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of its sales and entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR. On March 31, 2011, the Department initiated an administrative review of DSM. See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Requests for Revocation in Part, and Deferral of Administrative Review*, 76 FR 17825 (March 31, 2011).

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

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the antidumping duty order are certain hot-rolled carbon-quality steel: (1) Universal

mill plates (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a nominal or actual thickness of not less than 4 mm, which are cut-to length (not in coils) and without patterns in relief), of iron or non-alloy quality steel; and (2) flat-rolled products, hot-rolled, of a nominal or actual thickness of 4.75 mm or more and of a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness, and which are cut-to-length (not in coils). Steel products included in the scope of the order are of rectangular, square, circular, or other shape and of rectangular or non-rectangular cross section where such non-rectangular cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been “worked after rolling”)—for example, products which have been beveled or rounded at the edges. Steel products that meet the noted physical characteristics that are painted, varnished, or coated with plastic or other non-metallic substances are included within the scope. Also, specifically included in the scope of the order are high strength, low alloy (HSLA) steels. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, titanium, vanadium, and molybdenum. Steel products included in the scope, regardless of Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions, are products in which: (1) Iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements, (2) the carbon content is two percent or less, by weight, and (3) none of the elements listed below is equal to or exceeds the quantity, by weight, respectively indicated: 1.80 percent of manganese, or 1.50 percent of silicon, or 1.00 percent of copper, or 0.50 percent of aluminum, or 1.25 percent of chromium, or 0.30 percent of cobalt, or 0.40 percent of lead, or 1.25 percent of nickel, or 0.30 percent of tungsten, or 0.10 percent of molybdenum, or 0.10 percent of niobium, or 0.41 percent of titanium, or 0.15 percent of vanadium, or 0.15 percent zirconium. All products that meet the written physical description, and in which the chemistry quantities do not equal or exceed any one of the levels listed above, are within the scope of the order unless otherwise specifically excluded. The following products are specifically excluded from the order: (1) Products clad, plated, or coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastic or other non-metallic substances; (2) SAE grades (formerly AISI grades) of

series 2300 and above; (3) products made to ASTM A710 and A736 or their proprietary equivalents; (4) abrasion-resistant steels (*i.e.*, USS AR 400, USS AR 500); (5) products made to ASTM A202, A225, A514 grade S, A517 grade S, or their proprietary equivalents; (6) ball bearing steels; (7) tool steels; and (8) silicon manganese steel or silicon electric steel.

Imports of steel plate are currently classified in the HTSUS under subheadings 7208.40.30.30, 7208.40.30.60, 7208.51.00.30, 7208.51.00.45, 7208.51.00.60, 7208.52.00.00, 7208.53.00.00, 7208.90.00.00, 7210.70.30.00, 7210.90.90.00, 7211.13.00.00, 7211.14.00.30, 7211.14.00.45, 7211.90.00.00, 7212.40.10.00, 7212.40.50.00, 7212.50.00.00, 7225.40.30.50, 7225.40.70.00, 7225.50.60.00, 7225.99.00.90, 7226.91.50.00, 7226.91.70.00, 7226.91.80.00, and 7226.99.00.00. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the merchandise covered by the order is dispositive.

Fair-Value Comparison

To determine whether DSM's sales of the subject merchandise from Korea to the United States were at prices below normal value, we compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the normal value as described in the "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the CEP of individual U.S. transactions to the monthly weighted-average normal value of the foreign like product where there were sales made in the ordinary course of trade.

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products covered by the "scope of the order" section above produced and sold by DSM in the comparison market during the POR to be foreign like product for the purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales of subject merchandise. Specifically, we made comparisons to weighted-average comparison market prices that were based on all sales which passed the cost-of-production (COP) test of the identical product during the relevant or contemporary month. We calculated the weighted-average comparison market prices on a level of trade-specific basis.

Constructed Export Price

The Department based the price of DSM's U.S. sales of subject merchandise

on CEP, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold, before importation, by a U.S.-based seller affiliated with the producer to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, which includes direct selling expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we also deducted those indirect selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States and the profit allocated to expenses deducted under section 772(d)(1) in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we computed profit based on the total revenues realized on sales in both the U.S. and comparison markets, less all expenses associated with those sales. We then allocated profit to expenses incurred with respect to U.S. economic activity based on the ratio of total U.S. expenses to total expenses for both the U.S. and comparison markets.

Normal Value

A. Affiliation

DSM made home market sales to Dongkuk S&C (DSC), which is a subsidiary of Dongkuk Industries Co., Ltd. (DKI). DKI owns 60 percent of DSC. DSM's Chairperson, Sae Joo Chang, and President, Sae Wook Chang, are brothers. DKI's Chairperson, Sang Kuhn Chang, is the father of DSC's President/Director, Sae Hee Chang. DKI's Chairperson, Sang Kuhn Chang, is also an uncle of DSM's Chairperson, Sae Joo Chang, and President, Sae Wook Chang. Together the Chang family grouping owns the largest block of the outstanding shares of DSM and DKI.

Members of a family are affiliates pursuant to section 771(33)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(3). The definition of family includes uncle-nephew relationships under section 771(33)(A) of the Act. *See Ferro Union, Inc. v. United States*, 44 F. Supp. 2d 1310, 1325–26 (CIT 1999). Two or more persons directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any person are affiliates under section 771(33)(F) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(3). In past reviews, the Department has found that DSM and DKI are affiliated. *See, e.g., Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 77614, 77615–16 (December 19, 2008) (*2007–08 Prelim*),

unchanged in *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 19046 (April 27, 2009) (*2007–08 Final*). The U.S. Court of International Trade has upheld the Department's decision to find DSM and DKI affiliates in a separate review. *See Dongkuk Steel Mill Co. v. United States*, 29 CIT 724 (2005).

Therefore, we preliminarily find that DKI's Chairperson, Sang Kuhn Chang, and DSM's Chairperson, Sae Joo Chang, and President, Sae Wook Chang, are affiliated under section 771(33)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(3) because of their uncle-nephew relationship. We also preliminarily find that DSM, DKI, and DSC are affiliated under section 771(33)(F) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(3) because DSM, DKI, and DSC are under common control of the Chang family grouping. *See the memorandum entitled "Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products from the Republic of Korea: Affiliation of Dongkuk Steel Mill Co., Ltd., and Dongkuk Industries Co., Ltd.," dated January 9, 2012, for more details which contain DSM's business-proprietary information. Accordingly, we preliminarily treated DSM's home market sales to DSC as sales to an affiliated party and performed the arm's-length test for these sales. See the "Arm's-Length Test" section, infra.*

B. Home Market Viability

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(c) of the Act, in order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales of steel plate in the comparison market to serve as a viable basis for calculating the normal value, we compared the volume of the respondent's home market sales of the foreign like product to its volume of the U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. DSM's quantity of sales in the home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market. Based on this comparison of the aggregate quantities sold in the comparison market, *i.e.*, Korea, and to the United States and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country did not permit a proper comparison, we preliminarily determine that the quantity of the foreign like product sold by the respondent in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States. *See* section 773(a)(1) of the Act. Thus, we determine that DSM's home market was viable during the POR. *Id.* Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i)

of the Act, we based normal value for the respondent on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the exporting country in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales.

C. Overrun Sales

Section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act provides that normal value shall be based on the price at which the foreign like product is first sold, *inter alia*, in the ordinary course of trade. Section 771(15) of the Act defines “ordinary course of trade” as the “conditions and practices which, for a reasonable time prior to the exportation of the subject merchandise, have been normal in the trade under consideration with respect to merchandise of the same class or kind.”

DSM reported home market sales of “overrun” merchandise, *i.e.*, sales of products that failed to meet the original customer’s order specifications because of differences in size, chemical components, and/or strength. In the past, the Department has examined various factors to determine whether “overrun” sales are in the ordinary course of trade. See *China Steel Corp. v. United States*, 264 F. Supp. 2d. 1339, 1364–65 (CIT May 14, 2003). See also, *e.g.*, 2007–08 Prelim, 73 FR at 77616, unchanged in 2007–08 Final. The Department has the discretion to choose how best to analyze the many factors involved in determining whether sales are made within the ordinary course of trade. See *Laclede Steel Co. v. United States*, 19 CIT 1076, 1078 (1995). These factors include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) Whether the merchandise is “off-quality” or produced according to unusual specifications; (2) the comparative volume of sales and the number of buyers in the home market; (3) the average quantity of an overrun sale compared to the average quantity of a commercial sale; and (4) price and profit differentials in the home market.

Based on our analysis of these factors and the terms of sale, we preliminarily determine that DSM’s overrun sales are outside the ordinary course of trade. Because our analysis includes business-proprietary information, the analysis is available in a separate decision memorandum. See the memorandum entitled “Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon-Quality Steel Plate Products from the Republic of Korea: Home Market Overruns” dated January 9, 2012.

D. Cost-of-Production Analysis

In the most recently completed administrative review, the Department determined that DSM sold the foreign like product at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise and, as a result, excluded such sales from the calculation of normal value. See 2007–08 Prelim, 73 FR at 77616–17, unchanged in 2007–08 Final. Therefore, in this review, we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that DSM’s sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of normal value may have been made at prices below COP as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we have conducted a COP investigation of DSM’s sales in the comparison market.

1. Calculation of Cost of Production

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and labor employed in producing the foreign like product, the selling, general, and administrative expenses, and all costs and expenses incidental to packing the merchandise. In our COP analysis, we used the comparison market sales and COP information provided by DSM in its questionnaire response.

We analyzed DSM’s affiliated transactions in accordance with sections 773(f)(2) and (3) of the Act. During the POR, DSM purchased slabs, which are a major input in the production of steel plate, from its affiliates. Section 773(f)(3) of the Act (the major input rule) states:

If, in the case of a transaction between affiliated persons involving the production by one of such persons of a major input to the merchandise, the administering authority has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that an amount represented as the value of such input is less than the cost of production of such input, then the administering authority may determine the value of the major input on the basis of the information available regarding such cost of production, if such cost is greater than the amount that would be determined for such input under paragraph (2).

Paragraph 2 of section 773(f) of the Act (transactions disregarded) states:

A transaction directly or indirectly between affiliated persons may be disregarded if, in the case of any element of value required to be considered, the amount representing that element does not fairly reflect the amount usually reflected in sales of merchandise under consideration in the market under consideration. If a transaction is disregarded under the preceding sentence and no other transactions are available for consideration, the determination of the amount shall be based on the information

available as to what the amount would have been if the transaction had occurred between persons who are not affiliated.

In accordance with the major input rule, and as stated in *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 45708, 45714 (August 6, 2008), unchanged in *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 6365 (February 9, 2009), it is the Department’s normal practice to use all three elements of the major input rule, *i.e.*, transfer price, COP, and market price, where available. See, *e.g.*, *Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 36519, 36521–22 (June 22, 2011), unchanged in *Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From the Netherlands: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 66687 (October 27, 2011). We adjusted DSM’s cost of manufacturing to reflect the results of our analysis. See the DSM preliminary analysis memorandum dated January 9, 2012, for more details which contain DSM’s business proprietary information.

Based on our review of the record evidence, DSM did not appear to experience significant changes in the cost of manufacturing during the POR. Therefore, we followed our normal methodology of calculating an annual weighted-average cost.

2. Test of Comparison Market Prices

After calculating the COP, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we tested whether comparison market sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and whether such prices permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. See section 773(b)(2) of the Act. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported comparison market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

3. Results of the COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, when less than 20 percent of DSM’s sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. When 20 percent or more of DSM’s sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales

because they were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time pursuant to sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act and because, based on comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the POR, we determined that these sales were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

In this review, we found that, for certain products, more than 20 percent of DSM's home market sales were at prices less than COP and, in addition, such sales did not provide for the recovery of cost within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, we excluded these sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

E. Arm's-Length Test

The Department may calculate normal value based on a sale to an affiliated party only if it is satisfied that the price to the affiliated party is comparable to the price at which sales are made to parties not affiliated with the exporter or producer, *i.e.*, sales at arm's-length prices. See 19 CFR 351.403(c). For affiliated-party sales, we excluded from our analysis sales to affiliated customers for consumption in the comparison market that we determined not to have been made at arm's-length prices. To test whether these sales were made at arm's-length prices, we compared the prices of sales of comparable merchandise to affiliated and unaffiliated customers, net of all rebates, movement charges, and direct selling expenses. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.403(c) and in accordance with our practice, when the prices charged to an affiliated party were, on average, between 98 and 102 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated parties for merchandise comparable to that sold to the affiliated party, we determined that the sales to the affiliated party were at arm's-length prices. See *Antidumping Proceedings: Affiliated Party Sales in the Ordinary Course of Trade*, 67 FR 69186 (November 15, 2002). We included in our calculations of normal value those sales to affiliated parties that were made at arm's-length prices.

F. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We based normal value on comparison market sales to unaffiliated purchasers and sales to affiliated customers that passed the arm's-length test. DSM's comparison market prices were based on the ex-factory or delivered prices. When applicable, we made adjustments for differences for

movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act.

We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411 and for differences in circumstances of sale in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments by deducting comparison market direct selling expenses from normal value.

Level of Trade

To the extent practicable, we determine normal value for sales at the same level of trade as CEP sales. See section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412. When there are no sales at the same level of trade, we compare CEP sales to comparison market sales at a different level of trade. The normal value level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market.

To determine whether comparison market sales are at a different level of trade than DSM's U.S. sales in this review, we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. Based on our analysis, we have preliminarily determined that there is one level of trade in the United States and one level of trade in the home market and that the U.S. level of trade is at a less advanced stage than the home market level of trade. Therefore, we have compared U.S. sales to home market sales at different levels of trade.

Because there is only one level of trade in the home market, we were unable to calculate a level-of-trade adjustment based on DSM's home market sales of the foreign like product and we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For DSM's CEP sales, to the extent possible, we determined normal value at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP-offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. The CEP-offset adjustment to normal value is subject to the so-called offset cap, which is calculated as the sum of home market indirect selling expenses up to the amount of U.S. indirect selling expenses deducted from CEP.

For a detailed description of our level-of-trade analysis for DSM in these preliminary results, see the DSM preliminary analysis memorandum dated January 9, 2012.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.415 based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the relevant U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. These exchange rates are available on the Import Administration Web site at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/exchange/index.html>.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the weighted-average dumping margin for DSM is 1.64 percent for the period February 1, 2010, through January 31, 2011.

Disclosure and Public Comment

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties in this review within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties, who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, filed electronically using Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the Department's electronic records system, IA ACCESS, by 5 p.m. Eastern Time within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Requests should contain the party's name, address, and telephone number, the number of participants, and a list of the issues to be discussed. If a request for a hearing is made, we will inform parties of the scheduled date for the hearing which will be held at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a time and location to be determined. See 19 CFR 351.310. Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing.

Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results of this review. The Department will consider case briefs filed by interested parties within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Interested parties may file rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs. The Department will consider rebuttal briefs filed not later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue,

a brief summary of the argument, and a table of authorities cited. Further, we request that parties submitting written comments provide the Department with a diskette containing an electronic copy of the public version of such comments.

We intend to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of issues raised in the written comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results in the **Federal Register**.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate for these preliminary results of review. We divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for the importer. We will instruct CBP to assess the importer-specific rate uniformly, as appropriate, on all entries of subject merchandise made by the relevant importer during the POR. See 19 CFR 351.212(b). The Department intends to issue instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003) (*Assessment of Antidumping Duties*). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by DSM for which DSM did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries of DSM-produced merchandise at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. See *Assessment of Antidumping Duties* for a full discussion of this clarification.

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of steel plate from Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash-deposit rate for DSM will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or 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, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value 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; (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer has its own rate, the cash-deposit rate will be 0.98 percent,¹ the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation, adjusted for the export-subsidy rate in the companion countervailing duty investigation. This deposit requirement, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

These preliminary results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 9, 2012.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 2012-613 Filed 1-12-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[Application No. 92-10A001]

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of issuance of an Export Trade Certificate of Review to Aerospace Industries of America ("AIA") (Application No. 92-10A001).

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Commerce issued an amended Export Trade Certificate of Review to Aerospace Industries of America on September 27, 2011. The Certificate has been amended ten times. The previous amendment was issued to AIA on November 29, 2010, and a notice of its issuance was published in the **Federal Register** on December 7, 2010 (75 FR 75963). The original Export Trade

Certificate of Review No. 92-0001 was issued on April 10, 1992, and published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 1992 (57 FR 13707).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph E. Flynn, Director, Office of Competition and Economic Analysis, International Trade Administration, by telephone at (202) 482-5131 (this is not a toll-free number) or email at etca@trade.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. Sections 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. The regulations implementing Title III are found at 15 CFR Part 325 (2010). The U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, Office of Competition and Economic Analysis ("OCEA") is issuing this notice pursuant to 15 CFR 325.6(b), which requires the Secretary of Commerce to publish a summary of the issuance in the **Federal Register**. Under Section 305(a) of the Export Trading Company Act (15 U.S.C. 4012(b)(1)) and 15 CFR 325.11(a), any person aggrieved by the Secretary's determination may, within 30 days of the date of this notice, bring an action in any appropriate district court of the United States to set aside the determination on the ground that the determination is erroneous.

Description of Certified Conduct

AIA's Export Trade Certificate of Review has been amended to:

1. Add the following new "Members" of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(1) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(1)):

Aero-Mark, LLC (Ontario, CA); Aero Vironment, Inc (Monrovia, CA); AGC Aerospace & Defense (Oklahoma City, OK); AlliedBarton Security Services LLC (Conshohocken, PA); Castle Metals Aerospace (Oakbrook, IL); CERTON Software, Inc (Melbourne, FL); CIRCOR International, Inc. (Burlington, MA); Colt Defense, LLC (West Hartford, CT); Comtech AeroAstro, Inc. (Ashburn, VA); Crown Consulting, Inc. (Arlington, VA); Cubic Defense Applications, Inc. (San Diego, CA); DigitalGlobe, Inc. (Longmont, CO); Galactic Venutres, LLC (Las Cruces, NM); Gentex Corporation (Zeeland, MI); HCL America Inc. (Sunnyvale, VA); Hi-Shear Technology Corporation (Torrance, CA); Hydra Electric Company (Burbank, CA); IEC Electronics Corporation (Newark, NJ); Infotech Enterprises America Inc. (East Hartford, CT); Kemet Electronics Corporation (Simpsonville, SC);

¹ See 2007-08 Final, 74 FR at 19048.