

is not zero or *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent), we will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* antidumping duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for each importer's examined sales to the total entered value of those same sales in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).¹⁸ Where the respondent did not report entered value, we will calculate the entered value in order to calculate the assessment rate. If the weighted-average dumping margin for the respondents listed above is zero or *de minimis* in the final results, or an importer-specific assessment rate is zero or *de minimis* in the final results, we will instruct CBP not to assess antidumping duties on any of their entries in accordance with the *Final Modification for Reviews*.¹⁹

For the companies that were not selected for individual review, we intend to assign an assessment rate based on the methodology described in the "Rate for Non-Examined Companies" section. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.²⁰

Commerce's "automatic assessment" practice 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 that the merchandise they sold to the intermediary (*e.g.*, a reseller, trading company, or exporter) was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.²¹

Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP no earlier than 35 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review in the **Federal Register**. If a timely summons is filed at the U.S. Court of International Trade, the assessment instructions will direct CBP

¹⁸ In these preliminary results, Commerce applied the assessment rate calculation adopted in *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Proceedings: Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 8102.

²⁰ See section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act.

²¹ For a full discussion of this practice, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

not to liquidate relevant entries until the time for parties to file a request for a statutory injunction has expired (*i.e.*, within 90 days of publication).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the exporters listed above will be that established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not participating in this review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recently-completed segment of this proceeding in which the company was reviewed; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or previous segment, but the manufacturer is, then the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently-completed segment for the producer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers or exporters will continue to be 5.95 percent, the all-others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation.²² These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice 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 Commerce's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

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

Dated: December 30, 2021.

Ryan Majerus,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the *Order*
- IV. Successor-in-Interest
- V. Companies Not Selected for Individual Examination
- VI. Discussion of the Methodology
- VII. Currency Conversion
- VIII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2022-00081 Filed 1-6-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-845]

Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar From Mexico; Preliminary Results of the 2019-2020 Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that the respondents selected for individual examination, respectively, Impulsora Azucarera Del Trópico, S.A. de C.V. (Impulsora Del Tropic) and its affiliate and Ingenio Huixtla SA de C.V. (Ingenio Huixtla) and its affiliates are in compliance with the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar from Mexico, as amended (AD Agreement). Commerce also preliminarily determines that the AD Agreement continues to meet its statutory requirements under sections 734(c) and (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). However, Commerce intends to address certain issues identified in this review by further discussing these issues with the signatory Mexican producers/exporters and the Government of Mexico (GOM), as appropriate. We may request consultations pursuant to the AD Agreement, as necessary, to resolve these issues.

DATES: Applicable January 7, 2022.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally C. Gannon or Jesse Montoya, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401

²² See *Order*.

Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0162 or (202) 482-8211, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 19, 2014, Commerce signed the AD Agreement with a representative of Mexican producers/exporters accounting for substantially all imports of sugar from Mexico, under section 734(c) of the Act, which suspended the antidumping duty (AD) investigation on sugar from Mexico.¹ On January 15, 2020, the AD Agreement was amended.²

On December 17, 2020, the American Sugar Coalition (ASC) and its members (petitioners)³ filed a timely request for an administrative review of the AD Agreement.⁴ On February 4, 2021, Commerce initiated an administrative review for the period December 1, 2019, through November 30, 2020.⁵

On March 23, 2021, Commerce selected two companies as mandatory respondents, listed in alphabetical order: Impulsora Del Tropico and Ingenio Huixtla.⁶

Scope of the AD Agreement

The product covered by this AD Agreement is raw and refined sugar of all polarimeter readings derived from sugar cane or sugar beets. Merchandise covered by this AD Agreement is typically imported under the following headings of the HTSUS: 1701.12.1000, 1701.12.5000, 1701.13.1000, 1701.13.5000, 1701.14.1020, 1701.14.1040, 1701.14.5000, 1701.91.1000, 1701.91.3000, 1701.99.1015, 1701.99.1017, 1701.99.1025, 1701.99.1050, 1701.99.5015, 1701.99.5017, 1701.99.5025, 1701.99.5050, and

1702.90.4000.⁷ The tariff classification is provided for convenience and customs purposes; however, the written description of the scope of this AD Agreement is dispositive.⁸

Methodology and Preliminary Results

Commerce has conducted this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(C) of the Act, which specifies that Commerce shall “review the current status of, and compliance with, any agreement by reason of which an investigation was suspended.” In this case, Commerce and Mexican producers/exporters accounting for substantially all imports of sugar from Mexico, signed the AD Agreement, which suspended the underlying antidumping duty investigation, on December 19, 2014, and was subsequently amended on January 15, 2020. Pursuant to the AD Agreement, each signatory producer/exporter individually agrees that it will not sell subject merchandise at prices less than the reference prices established in Appendix I to the AD Agreement.⁹ Each signatory producer/exporter also individually agrees that for each entry the amount by which the estimated normal value exceeds the export price (or the constructed export price) will not exceed 15 percent of the weighted average amount by which the estimated normal value exceeded the export price (or constructed export price) for all less-than-fair-value entries of the producer/exporter examined during the course of the investigation.¹⁰ The signatory producers/exporters also individually agree to provide documentation upon request from Commerce¹¹ and provide certifications each quarter¹² to allow Commerce to monitor the AD Agreement. In addition, the signatory producers/exporters agree to incorporate into their sales contracts with Intermediary Customers¹³ the obligation that such customers will

abide by the terms of the AD Agreement.¹⁴ Lastly, the signatory producers/exporters agree to ensure that Other Sugar¹⁵ is tested for polarity by a laboratory approved by CBP upon entry into the United States and that the importers of record report the polarity test results for each entry to Commerce within 30 days of entry.¹⁶

After reviewing the information received to date from the respondent companies in their questionnaire and supplemental questionnaire responses, we preliminarily determine that the respondents have adhered to the terms of the AD Agreement and that the AD Agreement is functioning as intended. Further, we preliminarily determine that the AD Agreement continues to meet the statutory requirements under sections 734(c) and (d) of the Act. However, Commerce is exploring additional measures to help prevent reporting and recordkeeping issues with regard to certain transactions that may serve to diminish the effective monitoring and enforcement of the AD Agreement. Commerce intends to address certain issues identified in this review by discussing these issues with the signatory Mexican producers/exporters and the GOM, as appropriate. We may request consultations pursuant to the AD Agreement, as necessary, to resolve these issues.

For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum. 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>. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <https://access.trade.gov/public/FRNoticesListLayout.aspx>. Commerce is also addressing proprietary issues concerning each of the respondents in separate memoranda which we incorporate into the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.¹⁷

Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(3)(a) of the Act, Commerce verified the information relied upon in making its preliminary results. Normally, Commerce verifies information using

¹ See *Sugar from Mexico: Suspension of Antidumping Investigation*, 79 FR 78039 (December 29, 2014) (AD Agreement).

² See *Sugar from Mexico: Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 85 FR 3620 (January 22, 2020) (AD Amendment) (collectively, as integrated into the AD Agreement, amended AD Agreement).

³ The members of the American Sugar Coalition are as follows: American Sugar Cane League; American Sugarbeet Growers Association; American Sugar Refining, Inc.; Florida Sugar Cane League; Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Inc.; Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida; and the United States Beet Sugar Association.

⁴ See Petitioners’ Letter, “Sugar from Mexico: Request for Administrative Review,” dated December 17, 2020.

⁵ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 86 FR 8166 (February 4, 2021).

⁶ See Memorandum, “2019–2020 Administrative Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar from Mexico As Amended; Respondent Selection,” dated March 23, 2021.

⁷ Prior to July 1, 2016, merchandise covered by the AD Agreement was classified in the HTSUS under subheading 1701.99.1010. Prior to January 1, 2020, merchandise covered by the AD Agreement was classified in the HTSUS under subheadings 1701.14.1000 and 1701.99.5010.

⁸ For a complete description of the Scope of the AD Agreement, see Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the 2019–2020 Administrative Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar from Mexico, as Amended,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

⁹ See amended AD Agreement at Section VI and Appendix I.

¹⁰ *Id.* at Section VI.

¹¹ *Id.* at Sections VII.B.1, VII.B.2, and VII.B.4.

¹² *Id.* at Section VII.C.4.

¹³ “Intermediary Customer” is defined in Section II.N of the AD Agreement.

¹⁴ See AD Amendment at Section VII.C.5.

¹⁵ “Other Sugar” is defined Section II.F of the AD Amendment.

¹⁶ See AD Amendment at Section VII.C.6.

¹⁷ See Preliminary Decision Memorandum at 6 and footnote 47.

standard procedures, including an on-site examination of original accounting, financial, and sales documentation. However, due to current travel restrictions in response to the global COVID-19 pandemic, Commerce is unable to conduct on-site verification in this review. Accordingly, we chose to verify the information relied upon in making the preliminary results through alternative means in lieu of an on-site verification. Commerce issued a questionnaire in lieu of on-site verification to each of the respondents in the review.¹⁸ Any issues that arose are addressed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum and in the accompanying proprietary memorandum for each respondent.

Public Comment

Case briefs are due 30 days from the publication of these preliminary results in the **Federal Register**. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be submitted no later than seven days after the deadline date for case briefs.

Note that Commerce has temporarily modified certain of its requirements for serving documents containing business proprietary information, until further notice.¹⁹ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2), parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this investigation 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.²⁰

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, filed electronically via Commerce's electronic records system, ACCESS. An electronically filed request must be received successfully in its entirety by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice.²¹ Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. If a request for a hearing is made, Commerce intends to hold the hearing at a time and date to

¹⁸ See Commerce's Letter, "Administrative Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar from Mexico: In Lieu of On-Site Verification Questionnaire," dated November 23, 2021.

¹⁹ See *Temporary Rule Modifying AD/CVD Service Requirements Due to COVID-19*, 85 FR 17006 (March 26, 2020); and *Temporary Rule Modifying AD/CVD Service Requirements Due to COVID-19; Extension of Effective Period*, 85 FR 41363 (July 10, 2020).

²⁰ See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2).

²¹ See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

be determined.²² Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing two days before the scheduled date.

Commerce intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of the issues raised in any written briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, unless extended.

Notification to Interested Parties

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

Dated: December 30, 2021.

Ryan Majerus,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2022-00074 Filed 1-6-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-489-829]

Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar From the Republic of Turkey: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Amended Final Determination in the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation; Notice of Amended Final Determination

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

SUMMARY: On September 4, 2020, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the Department of Commerce's (Commerce) third remand redetermination pertaining to the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of steel concrete reinforcing bar (rebar) from the Republic of Turkey (Turkey). Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce's *Amended Final Determination* in the LTFV investigation of rebar from Turkey. Pursuant to the CIT's final judgment, Commerce is amending the estimated weighted-average dumping margins for respondents Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas) and Icdas Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi A.S. (Icdas), and all other producers and exporters of subject merchandise.

DATES: Applicable September 14, 2020.

²² See 19 CFR 351.310(d).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Myrna Lobo, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2371.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 22, 2017, Commerce published its *Final Determination* in the LTFV investigation of rebar from Turkey.¹ Subsequently, on July 14, 2017, Commerce published its *Amended Final Determination* and *Order*.² As reflected in Commerce's *Amended Final Determination*, Commerce calculated estimated weighted-average dumping margins of 5.39 percent for Habas, 9.06 percent for Icdas, and 7.43 percent for all other producers and exporters of subject merchandise.³

Habas and Icdas appealed Commerce's *Final Determination*, as amended by the *Amended Final Determination*, to the CIT. On January 23, 2019, the CIT remanded the *Amended Final Determination* for Commerce to: (1) Reconsider its calculation of the plaintiffs' duty drawback adjustment; and (2) reconsider the application of partial adverse facts available (AFA) to Icdas.⁴ On May 17, 2019, Commerce issued its first results of redetermination, in which it determined to: (1) Grant Habas and Icdas the full amount of duties that were drawn back or forgiven to U.S. price, and add the same per unit duty amount to normal value (NV) as a circumstance-of-sale (COS) adjustment; and (2) continue to find that the application of partial AFA to Icdas, concerning its failure to provide the manufacturer information for certain sales in the home market, was appropriate.⁵ As a result of the changes in the *First*

¹ See *Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar from the Republic of Turkey: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 82 FR 23192 (May 22, 2017) (*Final Determination*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

² See *Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar from the Republic of Turkey and Japan: Amended Final Affirmative Antidumping Duty Determination for the Republic of Turkey and Antidumping Duty Orders*, 82 FR 32532 (July 14, 2017) (*Amended Final Determination and Order*).

³ *Id.*, 82 FR at 32533.

⁴ See *Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi, A.S., and Icdas Celik Enerji Tersane ve Ulasim Sanayi, A.S. v. United States*, 361 F. Supp. 3d 1314 (CIT 2019).

⁵ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi, A.S., et al., v. United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 17-00204, Slip Op. 19-10, dated May 17, 2019 (*First Redetermination*), available at <https://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/19-10.pdf>.