

### Gap Period Liquidation

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures “gap” period, of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the POR.

### Administrative Protective Orders and Letters of Appearance

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures*, 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Those procedures apply to administrative reviews included in this notice of initiation. Parties wishing to participate in any of these administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

### Revised Factual Information Requirements

On April 10, 2013, the Department published *Definition of Factual Information and Time Limits for Submission of Factual Information: Final Rule*, 78 FR 21246 (April 10, 2013), which modified two regulations related to antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings: The definition of factual information (19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), and the time limits for the submission of factual information (19 CFR 351.301). The final rule identifies five categories of factual information in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21), which are summarized as follows: (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 the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). The final rule requires any party, when submitting factual information, to 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. The final rule also modified 19 CFR 351.301 so that, rather than providing general time limits, there are specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after May 10, 2013. Please review the final rule, available at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/2013/1304frn/2013-08227.txt>, prior to submitting factual information in this segment.

Any party submitting factual information in an antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.<sup>5</sup> Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials as well as their representatives. All segments of any antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.<sup>6</sup> The Department intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

### Revised Extension of Time Limits Regulation

On September 20, 2013, the Department modified its regulation concerning the extension of time limits for submissions in antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings: *Final Rule*, 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013). The modification clarifies that parties may request an extension of time limits before a time limit established under Part 351 expires, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the time limit established under Part 351 expires. For submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Examples include, but are not limited to: (1) Case and rebuttal briefs, filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309; (2) factual information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c), or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2), filed pursuant to 19

CFR 351.301(c)(3) and rebuttal, clarification and correction filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(iv); (3) comments concerning the selection of a surrogate country and surrogate values and rebuttal; (4) comments concerning U.S. Customs and Border Protection data; and (5) quantity and value questionnaires. Under certain circumstances, the Department 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, the Department will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. This modification also requires that an extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission, and clarifies the circumstances under which the Department will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after October 21, 2013. Please review the final rule, available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm>, prior to submitting factual information in these segments.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: December 29, 2015.

**Christian Marsh,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2016–00080 Filed 1–6–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–001]

### Potassium Permanganate From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Fourth Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** As a result of this fourth sunset review, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the People's Republic of China

<sup>5</sup> See section 782(b) of the Act.

<sup>6</sup> See *Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (“*Final Rule*”); see also the frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at [http://enforcement.trade.gov/lei/notices/factual\\_info\\_final\\_rule\\_FAQ\\_07172013.pdf](http://enforcement.trade.gov/lei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf).

(“PRC”)<sup>1</sup> would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the “Final Results of Review” section of this notice.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* January 7, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul Walker, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0413.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department published the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the PRC on January 31, 1984.<sup>2</sup> On September 1, 2015, the Department published a notice of initiation of the fourth sunset review of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the PRC pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the “Act”).<sup>3</sup> On September 9, 2015, Carus Corporation (“Carus”), a U.S. producer of potassium permanganate, claiming interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, submitted its notice of intent to participate in this sunset review.<sup>4</sup> On September 29, 2015, Carus submitted its Substantive Response within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the PRC.

##### Scope of the Order

Imports covered by this order are shipments of potassium permanganate, an inorganic chemical produced in free-flowing, technical, and pharmaceutical grades. Potassium permanganate is currently classifiable under item 2841.61.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). Although the HTSUS item number is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise remains dispositive.

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping Duty Order; Potassium Permanganate from The People's Republic of China*, 49 FR 3897 (January 31, 1984).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> See *Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 80 FR 52743 (September 1, 2015).

<sup>4</sup> See Letter from the domestic interested party (September 9, 2015).

#### Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review is available in the Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Fourth Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Potassium Permanganate from the PRC (“Decision Memorandum”), dated concurrently with this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. The Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via the Enforcement and Compliance Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Services System (“ACCESS”). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

#### Final Results of Review

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, the Department determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the PRC would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail is up to 128.94 percent.<sup>5</sup>

#### Administrative Protective Order

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

<sup>5</sup> See *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Potassium Permanganate from the People's Republic of China*; 64 FR 16907 (April 7, 1999); see also *Potassium Permanganate from the People's Republic of China; Five-year (“Sunset”) Review of Antidumping Duty Order; Final Results*, 70 FR 24520 (May 10, 2005); see also *Potassium Permanganate from the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 75 FR 52509 (August 26, 2010).

APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

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

Dated: December 30, 2015.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2016-00079 Filed 1-6-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-580-810]

#### **Welded ASTM A-312 Stainless Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014**

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

**SUMMARY:** In response to requests from Petitioners and SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH), the Department of Commerce (Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on welded ASTM A-312 stainless steel pipe from Republic of Korea (Korea).<sup>1</sup> The period of review (POR) is December 1, 2013, through November 30, 2014. The review covers two exporters and/or producers of the subject merchandise, SeAH and LS Metal Co., Ltd. (LS Metal). The Department preliminarily finds that SeAH and LS Metal sold subject merchandise at less than normal value during the POR. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* January 7, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lingjun Wang, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2316.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the antidumping duty order is welded austenitic stainless steel pipe that meets

<sup>1</sup> Petitioners are Bristol Metals LLC, Felker Brothers Corporation, and Outokumpu Stainless Pipe, Inc.