



A-201-843
AR: 12/12/2013-05/31/2015
Public Document
AD/CVDII/AR/RT

March 2, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: Christian Marsh 
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Decision Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Antidumping
Duty Administrative Review: Prestressed Concrete Steel Rail
Tie Wire from Mexico; 2013-2015

I. SUMMARY

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on prestressed concrete steel rail tie wire (PC tie wire) from Mexico. This review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Aceros Camesa S.A. de C.V. (Camesa). The period of review (POR) is December 12, 2013, through May 31, 2015. We preliminarily determine that Camesa made sales below normal value (NV) during the POR.

II. BACKGROUND

In June 2014, the Department published in the Federal Register an AD order on PC tie wire from Mexico.¹ Subsequently, on June 1, 2015, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the AD order on PC tie wire from Mexico for the POR.² Pursuant to section 751(a)(1)(B) and (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), in response to the Department's notice of opportunity to request an administrative review, on June 25, 2015, Camesa requested an administrative review of the AD order on PC tie wire from Mexico with respect to its exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.³ Accordingly, on August 3, 2015, in

¹ See Prestressed Concrete Steel Rail Tie Wire From Mexico and the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Orders, 79 FR 35727 (June 24, 2014).

² See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review, 80 FR 31017-31019 (June 1, 2015).

³ See Letter from Camesa entitled, "Prestressed Concrete Steel Rail Tie Wire from Mexico: Request for Administrative Review," dated June 25, 2015.

accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the AD order on PC tie wire from Mexico.⁴

On August 17, 2015, we issued the AD questionnaire to Camesa. On September 22, 2015, Camesa timely submitted its response to our questionnaire. On November 2, 2015, November 9, 2015, and December 18, 2015, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Camesa, to which it timely responded on November 24, 2015, December 1, 2015, and January 11, 2016, respectively. As explained in the memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement & Compliance, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll all administrative deadlines due to the recent closure of the Federal Government.⁵ All deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by four business days. The revised deadline for the preliminary results of this administrative review is now March 7, 2016.

III. SCOPE OF THE ORDER

The products covered by this order are high carbon steel wire; stress relieved or low relaxation; indented or otherwise deformed; meeting at a minimum the physical, mechanical, and chemical requirements of the American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) A881/A881M specification; regardless of shape, size or alloy element levels; suitable for use as prestressed tendons in concrete railroad ties (PC tie wire). High carbon steel is defined as steel that contains 0.6 percent or more of carbon by weight.

PC tie wire is classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 7217.10.8045, but may also be classified under subheadings 7217.10.7000, 7217.10.8025, 7217.10.8030, 7217.10.8090, 7217.10.9000, 7229.90.1000, 7229.90.5016, 7229.90.5031, 7229.90.5051, 7229.90.9000, and 7312.10.3012. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE METHODOLOGY

We are conducting this administrative review of the order in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.

A. Fair Value Comparisons

Pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and (d), in order to determine whether Camesa's sales of the subject merchandise from Mexico to the United States were made at less than NV, the Department compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the NV as described in the "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this memorandum.

⁴ See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 80 FR 45947-45951 (August 3, 2015) (Initiation Notice).

⁵ See Memorandum to the Record from Ron Lorentzen, Acting A/S for Enforcement & Compliance, regarding "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During Snowstorm Jonas," dated January 27, 2016.

1. Determination of Comparison Method

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1), the Department calculates weighted-average dumping margins by comparing weighted-average NVs to weighted-average export prices (EPs) (or CEPs) (*i.e.*, the average-to-average method) unless the Secretary determines that another method is appropriate in a particular situation. In less-than-fair-value investigations, the Department examines whether to compare weighted-average NVs with the EPs (or CEPs) of individual sales (*i.e.*, the average-to-transaction method) as an alternative comparison method using an analysis consistent with section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act. Although section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act does not strictly govern the Department's examination of this question in the context of administrative reviews, the Department nevertheless finds that the issue arising under 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) in administrative reviews is, in fact, analogous to the issue in less-than-fair-value investigations.⁶

In recent investigations, the Department applied a “differential pricing” analysis for determining whether application of the average-to-transaction method is appropriate in a particular situation pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act.⁷ The Department finds that the differential pricing analysis used in recent investigations may be instructive for purposes of examining whether to apply an alternative comparison method in this administrative review. The Department will continue to develop its approach in this area based on comments received in this and other proceedings, and on the Department's additional experience with addressing the potential masking of dumping that can occur when the Department uses the average-to-average method in calculating a respondent's weighted-average dumping margin.

The differential pricing analysis used in these preliminary results examines whether there exists a pattern of EPs (or CEPs) for comparable merchandise that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. The analysis evaluates all export sales by purchaser, region and time period to determine whether a pattern of prices that differ significantly exists. If such a pattern is found, then the differential pricing analysis evaluates whether such differences can be taken into account when using the average-to-average method to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin. The analysis incorporates default group definitions for purchasers, regions, time periods, and comparable merchandise. Purchasers are based on the reported consolidated customer codes. Regions are defined using the reported destination code (*i.e.*, zip code) and are grouped into regions based upon standard definitions published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Time periods are defined by the quarter within the period of review based upon the reported date of sale. For purposes of analyzing sales transactions by purchaser, region and time period, comparable merchandise is defined using the product control number and all characteristics of

⁶ See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, and Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; 2010–2011, 77 FR 73415 (December 10, 2012) and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1; see also JBF RAK LLC v. United States, 790 F.3d 1358, 1363-65 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“{t}he fact that the statute is silent with regard to administrative reviews does not preclude Commerce from filling gaps in the statute to properly calculate and assign antidumping duties”) (citations omitted).

⁷ See, e.g., Xanthan Gum From the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair, 78 FR 33351 (June 4, 2013); Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar From Mexico: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, 79 FR 54967 (September 15, 2014); and Welded Line Pipe From the Republic of Turkey: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 80 FR 61362 (October 13, 2015).

the U.S. sales, other than purchaser, region and time period, that the Department uses in making comparisons between EP (or CEP) and NV for the individual dumping margins.

In the first stage of the differential pricing analysis used here, the “Cohen’s *d* test” is applied. The Cohen’s *d* coefficient is a generally recognized statistical measure of the extent of the difference between the mean (i.e., weighted-average price) of a test group and the mean (i.e., weighted-average price) of a comparison group. First, for comparable merchandise, the Cohen’s *d* coefficient is calculated when the test and comparison groups of data for a particular purchaser, region or time period each have at least two observations, and when the sales quantity for the comparison group accounts for at least five percent of the total sales quantity of the comparable merchandise. Then, the Cohen’s *d* coefficient is used to evaluate the extent to which the prices to the particular purchaser, region or time period differ significantly from the prices of all other sales of comparable merchandise. The extent of these differences can be quantified by one of three fixed thresholds defined by the Cohen’s *d* test: small, medium or large (0.2, 0.5 and 0.8, respectively). Of these thresholds, the large threshold provides the strongest indication that there is a significant difference between the mean of the test and comparison groups, while the small threshold provides the weakest indication that such a difference exists. For this analysis, the difference is considered significant, and the sales in the test group are found to pass the Cohen’s *d* test, if the calculated Cohen’s *d* coefficient is equal to or exceeds the large (i.e., 0.8) threshold.

Next, the “ratio test” assesses the extent of the significant price differences for all sales as measured by the Cohen’s *d* test. If the value of sales to purchasers, regions, and time periods that pass the Cohen’s *d* test account for 66 percent or more of the value of total sales, then the identified pattern of prices that differ significantly supports the consideration of the application of the average-to-transaction method to all sales as an alternative to the average-to-average method. If the value of sales to purchasers, regions, and time periods that pass the Cohen’s *d* test accounts for more than 33 percent and less than 66 percent of the value of total sales, then the results support consideration of the application of an average-to-transaction method to those sales identified as passing the Cohen’s *d* test as an alternative to the average-to-average method, and application of the average-to-average method to those sales identified as not passing the Cohen’s *d* test. If 33 percent or less of the value of total sales passes the Cohen’s *d* test, then the results of the Cohen’s *d* test do not support consideration of an alternative to the average-to-average method.

If both tests in the first stage (i.e., the Cohen’s *d* test and the ratio test) demonstrate the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly such that an alternative comparison method should be considered, then in the second stage of the differential pricing analysis, the Department examines whether using only the average-to-average method can appropriately account for such differences. In considering this question, the Department tests whether using an alternative comparison method, based on the results of the Cohen’s *d* and ratio tests described above, yields a meaningful difference in the weighted-average dumping margin as compared to that resulting from the use of the average-to-average method only. If the difference between the two calculations is meaningful, then this demonstrates that the average-to-average method cannot account for differences such as those observed in this analysis, and, therefore, an alternative comparison method would be appropriate. A difference in the weighted-average dumping margins is considered meaningful if 1) there is a 25 percent relative change in the weighted-

average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method where both rates are above the de minimis threshold, or 2) the resulting weighted-average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method move across the de minimis threshold.

Interested parties may present arguments and justifications in relation to the above-described differential pricing approach used in these preliminary results, including arguments for modifying the group definitions used in this proceeding.

2. Results of the Differential Pricing Analysis

For Camesa, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, the Department preliminarily finds that 100 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen's *d* test,⁸ and confirms the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. Further, the Department preliminarily determines that there is no meaningful difference between the weighted-average dumping margin calculated using the average-to-average method and the weighted-average dumping margin calculated using an alternative comparison method based on applying the average-to-transaction method to all U.S. sales. Thus, for these preliminary results, the Department is applying the average-to-average method for all U.S. sales to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for Camesa.

B. Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced and sold by Camesa in Mexico during the POR that meet the description in the "Scope of the Order" section, above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(f), we compared U.S. sales of PC tie wire to home market sales of PC tie wire made in the ordinary course of trade within the contemporaneous window period, which extends from three months prior to the month of the first U.S. sale until two months after the month of the last U.S. sale.

In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by Camesa in the following order of importance: diameter, tensile strength, and carbon content. Camesa reported that, within the meaning of section 771(16)(A) of the Act, all of its U.S. sales during the POR were identical based on the above product matching criteria to contemporaneous sales in the home market. Accordingly, in calculating Camesa's NV, we made product comparisons without having to account for cost differences associated with differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

C. Constructed Export Price

In accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, we calculated CEP for those sales where the subject merchandise was first sold or agreed to be sold in the United States before or after the

⁸ See Memorandum to The File entitled, "Preliminary Results Margin Calculation for Aceros Camesa S.A. de C.V.," dated concurrently with this memorandum (Preliminary Results Calculation Memo).

date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter. While Camesa classified its U.S. sales as EP sales, we preliminarily determine that these sales are more appropriately classified as CEP sales because the information Camesa reported indicates that the sales were executed in the United States. Specifically, record evidence establishes that Camesa's U.S. subsidiary took title to the subject merchandise and issued the commercial invoice to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer.⁹

We based CEP on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, which included, where appropriate, inland freight, inland insurance, and U. S. brokerage and handling expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.402(b), we deducted selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (i.e., imputed credit expenses) and indirect selling expenses (including inventory carrying costs). We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by WireCo WorldGroup, Inc. (WireCo), Camesa's U.S. affiliate, on its sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the profit associated with those sales.

D. Normal Value

1. Home Market Viability and Selection of Comparison Market

To determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of Camesa's home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404. Based on this comparison, we determined that, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.404(b), Camesa had a viable home market during the POR because the volume of its home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Consequently, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404(c)(1)(i), we based NV on home market sales.

2. Level of Trade (LOT)

Section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act states that, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales of the foreign like product at the same level of trade (LOT) as U.S. sales. Sales are made at different LOTs if they are made at different marketing stages (or their equivalent).¹⁰ Substantial differences in selling activities are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for determining that there is a difference in the stages of marketing.¹¹ To determine

⁹ See Camesa's November 24, 2015, Supplemental Questionnaire Response at 2. See also Certain Orange Juice From Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final No Shipment Determination, 77 FR 63291 (October 16, 2012), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 13; and AK Steel Corp. v. United States, 226 F.3d 1361, 1371, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

¹⁰ See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2).

¹¹ Id.; see also Certain Orange Juice From Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative

whether the comparison market sales were at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales, we reviewed the distribution system in each market (*i.e.*, the chain of distribution), including selling functions, class of customer (customer category), and the level of selling expenses for each type of sale.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412(c)(1), in identifying LOTs for EP and comparison market sales (*i.e.*, where NV is based on either home market or third country prices),¹² we consider the starting prices before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and profit under section 772(d) of the Act.¹³

When the Department is unable to match sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP or CEP sale, the Department may compare the U.S. sales to sales at a different LOT in the comparison market. In comparing EP or CEP sales at a different LOT in the comparison market, where available data make it possible, we make an LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales only, if the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the LOT of the CEP sale and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in LOTs between NV and CEP affects price comparability (*i.e.*, no LOT adjustment is possible), the Department shall grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.¹⁴

In this administrative review, we obtained information from Camesa regarding the marketing stages involved in making its reported home market and U.S. sales, including a description of the selling activities performed for each channel of distribution. Generally, if the reported LOTs are the same, the functions and activities of the seller at each level should be similar. Conversely, if a party reports that levels of trade are different for different groups of sales, the selling functions and activities of the seller for each group should be dissimilar.

We preliminarily determine that there is one LOT in the home market because all home market sales are made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities do not vary within the channel.¹⁵ Similarly, we preliminarily determine that there is only one LOT in the U.S. market because all U.S. sales were made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities to the affiliate (*i.e.*, WireCo) do not vary within the channel.¹⁶

Review and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part, 75 FR 50999, 51001 (August 18, 2010), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 7 (OJ from Brazil).

¹² Where NV is based on constructed value (CV), we determine the NV LOT based on the LOT of the sales from which we derive selling expenses, general and administrative expenses, and profit for CV, where possible. See, e.g., Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, 69 FR 47081(August 4, 2004), NV LOT unchanged in Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, 69 FR 76910 (December 23, 2004).

¹³ See Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314-16 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

¹⁴ See, e.g., OJ from Brazil, at Comment 7.

¹⁵ See Camesa's September 22, 2015, Section A questionnaire response (QR-A) at Exhibit A-11; and Camesa's October 8, 2015, Sections B, C and D questionnaire response (QR-BCD) at B-8.

¹⁶ See QR-A at Exhibit A-11, and QR-BCD at C-15.

We compared the NV LOT (based on the selling activities associated with the transactions between Camesa and its home market customer) to the CEP LOT (based on the selling activities associated with the transactions between Camesa and its affiliated importer, WireCo). Based on our review of the selling functions described in Camesa's questionnaire responses, we determined that the selling functions Camesa performed for its home market customers are identical to the selling functions performed for sales to WireCo. Therefore, we preliminarily conclude that Camesa made home market and CEP sales at the same LOT. Accordingly, all comparisons of CEP to NV are at the same LOT, and neither a LOT adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act nor a CEP offset pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412(f) is warranted.¹⁷

E. Cost of Production (COP) Analysis

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (TPEA), which made numerous amendments to the AD and countervailing duty (CVD) law, including amendments to section 773(b)(2) of the Act, regarding the Department's requests for information on sales at less than COP.¹⁸ The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment of the Act, except for amendments contained to section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the International Trade Commission.¹⁹ Section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act controls all determinations in which the complete initial questionnaire has not been issued as of August 6, 2015. It requires the Department to request CV and COP information from respondent companies in all AD proceedings.²⁰ Accordingly, the Department requested this information from Camesa.²¹ We examined Camesa's cost data and determined that our quarterly cost methodology is not warranted and, therefore, we applied our standard methodology of using annual costs based on the reported data.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated Camesa's COP based on the sum of its costs of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for general and administrative (G&A) expenses and interest expenses (see "Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices" section below, for treatment of home market selling expenses). We adjusted Camesa's G&A expenses to include a revenue item, as described in the Preliminary Results Calculation Memo.

¹⁷ See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule, 62 FR 27296, 27372 (May 19, 1997) ("the Department will not make a CEP offset where the Department bases normal value on home market sales at the same LOT as the CEP").

¹⁸ See Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-27, 129 Stat. (2015).

¹⁹ See Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) ("Applicability Notice").

²⁰ Id., 80 FR at 46794-95.

²¹ The 2015 amendments may be found at <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl..>

2. Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices

On a product-specific basis, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we compared the adjusted weighted-average COP to the home market sales prices of the foreign like product, in order to determine whether the sales prices were below the COP. For purposes of this comparison, we used COP exclusive of selling and packing expenses. The prices (inclusive of billing adjustments, where appropriate) were exclusive of any applicable movement charges, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses.

3. Results of the COP Test

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined, in accordance with sections 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act whether: 1) within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities; and 2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. In accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of the respondent's comparison market sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determine that in such instances the below-cost sales were not made within an extended period of time and in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we disregard the below-cost sales when: 1) they were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, and 2) based on our comparison of prices to the weighted-average COPs for the POR, they were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

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

F. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

We based NV for Camesa on packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the home market. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for billing adjustments, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We also made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for movement expenses, including inland freight and inland insurance, under section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410(c), we made deductions for direct selling expenses (i.e., imputed credit). We also deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act.

G. Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A of the Act and 19 CFR 351.415, based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

V. RECOMMENDATION

We recommend applying the above methodology for these preliminary results.

✓
Agree

Disagree

Paul Piquado
Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

2 MARCH 2016
(Date)