




A-570-967
Sunset Review
Public Document
AD/CVD Operations, OVI: DS

July 29, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Ronald K. Lorentzen
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

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

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the
Expedited First Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on
Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China

I. Summary

We analyzed the response of the domestic interested parties in the first sunset review of the antidumping duty order covering aluminum extrusions from the People's Republic of China (PRC). No respondent interested party submitted a substantive response. Accordingly, we conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of this order. We recommend that you approve the positions described in the "Discussion of the Issues" section of this memorandum. Below is a complete list of the issues in this sunset review for which we received substantive responses:

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping
2. Magnitude of the Margins Likely to Prevail

II. Background

On May 26, 2011, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the notice of the antidumping duty order on aluminum extrusions from the PRC.¹ On April 1, 2016, the Department published the notice of initiation of the first sunset review of the *AD Order*, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act 1930, as amended (the Act).² On April 18, 2016, the Department received a notice of intent to participate in this review from the Aluminum Extrusions Fair Trade Committee (Petitioner or Committee) within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i).³ Petitioner claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(E) of the

¹ See *Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order*, 76 FR 30650 (May 26, 2011) (*AD Order*).

² See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 81 FR 18829 (April 1, 2016).

³ See Letter from Petitioner to the Department, "Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Notice



Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(29)(vii) as a coalition of U.S. producers of the domestic like product, and the individual Committee members claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.102(b)(29)(v) as U.S. producers of the domestic like product. On May 2, 2016, the Department received a complete substantive response from Petitioner within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).⁴ We received no substantive responses from respondent interested parties with respect to the *AD Order*. 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 *AD Order*.

III. Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order is aluminum extrusions which are shapes and forms, produced by an extrusion process, made from aluminum alloys having metallic elements corresponding to the alloy series designations published by The Aluminum Association commencing with the numbers 1, 3, and 6 (or proprietary equivalents or other certifying body equivalents). Specifically, the subject merchandise made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 1 contains not less than 99 percent aluminum by weight. The subject merchandise made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 3 contains manganese as the major alloying element, with manganese accounting for not more than 3.0 percent of total materials by weight. The subject merchandise is made from an aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 6 contains magnesium and silicon as the major alloying elements, with magnesium accounting for at least 0.1 percent but not more than 2.0 percent of total materials by weight, and silicon accounting for at least 0.1 percent but not more than 3.0 percent of total materials by weight. The subject aluminum extrusions are properly identified by a four-digit alloy series without either a decimal point or leading letter. Illustrative examples from among the approximately 160 registered alloys that may characterize the subject merchandise are as follows: 1350, 3003, and 6060.

Aluminum extrusions are produced and imported in a wide variety of shapes and forms, including, but not limited to, hollow profiles, other solid profiles, pipes, tubes, bars, and rods. Aluminum extrusions that are drawn subsequent to extrusion (drawn aluminum) are also included in the scope.

Aluminum extrusions are produced and imported with a variety of finishes (both coatings and surface treatments), and types of fabrication. The types of coatings and treatments applied to subject aluminum extrusions include, but are not limited to, extrusions that are mill finished (*i.e.*, without any coating or further finishing), brushed, buffed, polished, anodized (including brightdip anodized), liquid painted, or powder coated. Aluminum extrusions may also be fabricated, *i.e.*, prepared for assembly. Such operations would include, but are not limited to, extrusions that are cut-to-length, machined, drilled, punched, notched, bent, stretched, knurled,

of Intent to Participate in Review,” dated April 18, 2016.

⁴ See Letter from Petitioner to the Department, “Aluminum Extrusions from the People’s Republic of China: AEFTC’s Substantive Response to the Department’s Notice of Initiation of its Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review,” dated May 2, 2016 (Substantive Response).

swedged, mitered, chamfered, threaded, and spun. The subject merchandise includes aluminum extrusions that are finished (coated, painted, *etc.*), fabricated, or any combination thereof.

Subject aluminum extrusions may be described at the time of importation as parts for final finished products that are assembled after importation, including, but not limited to, window frames, door frames, solar panels, curtain walls, or furniture. Such parts that otherwise meet the definition of aluminum extrusions are included in the scope. The scope includes the aluminum extrusion components that are attached (*e.g.*, by welding or fasteners) to form subassemblies, *i.e.*, partially assembled merchandise unless imported as part of the finished goods ‘kit’ defined further below. The scope does not include the non-aluminum extrusion components of subassemblies or subject kits.

Subject extrusions may be identified with reference to their end use, such as fence posts, electrical conduits, door thresholds, carpet trim, or heat sinks (that do not meet the finished heat sink exclusionary language below). Such goods are subject merchandise if they otherwise meet the scope definition, regardless of whether they are ready for use at the time of importation. The following aluminum extrusion products are excluded: aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designations commencing with the number 2 and containing in excess of 1.5 percent copper by weight; aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 5 and containing in excess of 1.0 percent magnesium by weight; and aluminum extrusions made from aluminum alloy with an Aluminum Association series designation commencing with the number 7 and containing in excess of 2.0 percent zinc by weight.

The scope also excludes finished merchandise containing aluminum extrusions as parts that are fully and permanently assembled and completed at the time of entry, such as finished windows with glass, doors with glass or vinyl, picture frames with glass pane and backing material, and solar panels. The scope also excludes finished goods containing aluminum extrusions that are entered unassembled in a “finished goods kit.” A finished goods kit is understood to mean a packaged combination of parts that contains, at the time of importation, all of the necessary parts to fully assemble a final finished good and requires no further finishing or fabrication, such as cutting or punching, and is assembled “as is” into a finished product. An imported product will not be considered a “finished goods kit” and therefore excluded from the scope of the investigation merely by including fasteners such as screws, bolts, *etc.* in the packaging with an aluminum extrusion product.

The scope also excludes aluminum alloy sheet or plates produced by other than the extrusion process, such as aluminum products produced by a method of casting. Cast aluminum products are properly identified by four digits with a decimal point between the third and fourth digit. A letter may also precede the four digits. The following Aluminum Association designations are representative of aluminum alloys for casting: 208.0, 295.0, 308.0, 355.0, C355.0, 356.0, A356.0, A357.0, 360.0, 366.0, 380.0, A380.0, 413.0, 443.0, 514.0, 518.1, and 712.0. The scope also excludes pure, unwrought aluminum in any form.

The scope also excludes collapsible tubular containers composed of metallic elements corresponding to alloy code 1080A as designated by the Aluminum Association where the

tubular container (excluding the nozzle) meets each of the following dimensional characteristics: (1) length of 37 millimeters (“mm”) or 62 mm, (2) outer diameter of 11.0 mm or 12.7 mm, and (3) wall thickness not exceeding 0.13 mm.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are finished heat sinks. Finished heat sinks are fabricated heat sinks made from aluminum extrusions the design and production of which are organized around meeting certain specified thermal performance requirements and which have been fully, albeit not necessarily individually, tested to comply with such requirements.

Imports of the subject merchandise are provided for under the following categories of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS): 8424.90.9080, 9405.99.4020, 9031.90.90.95, 7616.10.90.90, 7609.00.00, 7610.10.00, 7610.90.00, 7615.10.30, 7615.10.71, 7615.10.91, 7615.19.10, 7615.19.30, 7615.19.50, 7615.19.70, 7615.19.90, 7615.20.00, 7616.99.10, 7616.99.50, 8479.89.98, 8479.90.94, 8513.90.20, 9403.10.00, 9403.20.00, 7604.21.00.00, 7604.29.10.00, 7604.29.30.10, 7604.29.30.50, 7604.29.50.30, 7604.29.50.60, 7608.20.00.30, 7608.20.00.90, 8302.10.30.00, 8302.10.60.30, 8302.10.60.60, 8302.10.60.90, 8302.20.00.00, 8302.30.30.10, 8302.30.30.60, 8302.41.30.00, 8302.41.60.15, 8302.41.60.45, 8302.41.60.50, 8302.41.60.80, 8302.42.30.10, 8302.42.30.15, 8302.42.30.65, 8302.49.60.35, 8302.49.60.45, 8302.49.60.55, 8302.49.60.85, 8302.50.00.00, 8302.60.90.00, 8305.10.00.50, 8306.30.00.00, 8414.59.60.90, 8415.90.80.45, 8418.99.80.05, 8418.99.80.50, 8418.99.80.60, 8419.90.10.00, 8422.90.06.40, 8473.30.20.00, 8473.30.51.00, 8479.90.85.00, 8486.90.00.00, 8487.90.00.80, 8503.00.95.20, 8508.70.00.00, 8515.90.20.00, 8516.90.50.00, 8516.90.80.50, 8517.70.00.00, 8529.90.73.00, 8529.90.97.60, 8536.90.80.85, 8538.10.00.00, 8543.90.88.80, 8708.29.50.60, 8708.80.65.90, 8803.30.00.60, 9013.90.50.00, 9013.90.90.00, 9401.90.50.81, 9403.90.10.40, 9403.90.10.50, 9403.90.10.85, 9403.90.25.40, 9403.90.25.80, 9403.90.40.05, 9403.90.40.10, 9403.90.40.60, 9403.90.50.05, 9403.90.50.10, 9403.90.50.80, 9403.90.60.05, 9403.90.60.10, 9403.90.60.80, 9403.90.70.05, 9403.90.70.10, 9403.90.70.80, 9403.90.80.10, 9403.90.80.15, 9403.90.80.20, 9403.90.80.41, 9403.90.80.51, 9403.90.80.61, 9506.11.40.80, 9506.51.40.00, 9506.51.60.00, 9506.59.40.40, 9506.70.20.90, 9506.91.00.10, 9506.91.00.20, 9506.91.00.30, 9506.99.05.10, 9506.99.05.20, 9506.99.05.30, 9506.99.15.00, 9506.99.20.00, 9506.99.25.80, 9506.99.28.00, 9506.99.55.00, 9506.99.60.80, 9507.30.20.00, 9507.30.40.00, 9507.30.60.00, 9507.90.60.00, and 9603.90.80.50.

The subject merchandise entered as parts of other aluminum products may be classifiable under the following additional Chapter 76 subheadings: 7610.10, 7610.90, 7615.19, 7615.20, and 7616.99, as well as under other HTSUS chapters. In addition, fin evaporator coils may be classifiable under HTSUS numbers: 8418.99.80.50 and 8418.99.80.60. While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this *AD Order* is dispositive.

IV. History of the Order

This is the first sunset review of the *AD Order*. On April 4, 2011, the Department published its final determination in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of aluminum extrusions from

the PRC.⁵ On May 26, 2011, the Department published the notice of the antidumping duty order on aluminum extrusions from the PRC.⁶ The Department found the following dumping margins:

Exporter	Producer	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (Percent)
Guang Ya Aluminium Industries Co., Ltd.; Foshan Guangcheng Aluminium Co., Ltd.; Kong Ah International Company Limited; Guang Ya Aluminium Industries (Hong Kong) Limited	Guang Ya Aluminium Industries Co., Ltd.; Foshan Guangcheng Aluminium Co., Ltd.; Kong Ah International Company Limited; Guang Ya Aluminium Industries (Hong Kong) Limited; Zhaoqing New Zhongya Aluminum Co., Ltd.; Zhongya Shaped Aluminium (HK) Holding Limited; Karlton Aluminum Company Ltd.; Xinya Aluminum & Stainless Steel Product Co., Ltd. (A.K.A. New Asia Aluminum & Stainless Steel Product Co., Ltd.)	33.28
Zhaoqing New Zhongya Aluminum Co., Ltd.; Zhongya Shaped Aluminium (HK) Holding Limited; Karlton Aluminum Company Ltd.	Guang Ya Aluminium Industries Co., Ltd.; Foshan Guangcheng Aluminium Co., Ltd.; Kong Ah International Company Limited; Guang Ya Aluminium Industries (Hong Kong) Limited; Zhaoqing New Zhongya Aluminum Co., Ltd.; Zhongya Shaped Aluminium (HK) Holding Limited; Karlton Aluminum Company Ltd.; Xinya Aluminum & Stainless Steel Product Co., Ltd. (A.K.A. New Asia Aluminum & Stainless Steel Product Co., Ltd.)	33.28
Alnan Aluminium Co., Ltd	Alnan Aluminium Co., Ltd	32.79
Changshu Changsheng Aluminium Products Co., Ltd	Changshu Changsheng Aluminium Products Co., Ltd	32.79
China Square Industrial Limited	Zhaoqing China Square Industrial Limited	32.79
Cosco (J.M) Aluminium Co., Ltd	Cosco (J.M) Aluminium Co., Ltd; Jiangmen Qunxing Hardware Diecasting Co., Ltd	32.79
First Union Property Limited	Top-Wok Metal Co., Ltd	32.79
Foshan Jinlan Non-ferrous Metal Product Co. Ltd.	Foshan Jinlan Aluminium Co. Ltd	32.79
Foshan Sanshui Fenglu Aluminium Co., Ltd	Foshan Sanshui Fenglu Aluminium Co., Ltd	32.79

⁵ See *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 76 FR 18524 (April 4, 2011) (*Final Determination*); see also *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Correction to the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 76 FR 20627 (April 13, 2011).

⁶ See *AD Order*.

Guangdong Hao Mei Aluminium Co., Ltd	Guangdong Hao Mei Aluminium Co., Ltd	32.79
Guangdong Weiye Aluminium Factory Co., Ltd	Guangdong Weiye Aluminium Factory Co., Ltd	32.79
Guangdong Xingfa Aluminium Co., Ltd	Guangdong Xingfa Aluminium Co., Ltd	32.79
Hanwood Enterprises Limited	Pingguo Aluminium Company Limited	32.79
Honsense Development Company	Kanal Precision Aluminium Product Co., Ltd	32.79
Innovative Aluminium (Hong Kong) Limited	Taishan Golden Gain Aluminium Products Limited	32.79
Jiangyin Trust International Inc	Jiangyin Xinhong Doors and Windows Co., Ltd	32.79
JMA (HK) Company Limited	Guangdong Jianmei Aluminum Profile Company Limited; Foshan JMA Aluminium Company Limited	32.79
Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn Bhd	Tai Shan City Kam Kiu Products Sdn Bhd Aluminium Extrusion Co., Ltd	32.79
Longkou Donghai Trade Co., Ltd	Shandong Nanshan Aluminum Co., Ltd	32.79
Ningbo Yili Import and Export Co., Ltd	Zhejiang Anji Xinxiang Aluminum Co., Ltd	32.79
North China Aluminum Co., Ltd	North China Aluminum Co., Ltd	32.79
PanAsia Aluminium (China) Limited	PanAsia Aluminium (China) Limited	32.79
Pingguo Asia Aluminum Co., Ltd	Pingguo Asia Aluminum Co., Ltd	32.79
Popular Plastics Co., Ltd	Hoi Tat Plastic Mould & Metal Factory	32.79
Press Metal International Ltd	Press Metal International Ltd	32.79
Shenyang Yuanda Aluminium Industry Engineering Co. Ltd	Zhaoqing Asia Aluminum Factory Company Limited; Guang Ya Aluminum Industries Co., Ltd	32.79
Tai-Ao Aluminium (Taishan) Co., Ltd	Tai-Ao Aluminium (Taishan) Co., Ltd	32.79
Tianjin Ruixin Electric Heat Transmission Technology Co., Ltd.	Tianjin Ruixin Electric Heat Transmission Technology Co., Ltd	32.79
USA Worldwide Door Components (Pinghu) Co., Ltd.; Worldwide Door Components (Pinghu) Co	USA Worldwide Door Components (Pinghu) Co., Ltd	32.79
Zhejiang Yongkang Listar Aluminium Industry Co., Ltd	Zhejiang Yongkang Listar Aluminium Industry Co., Ltd	32.79
Zhongshan Gold Mountain Aluminium Factory Ltd	Zhongshan Gold Mountain Aluminium Factory Ltd	32.79
PRC-wide Entity		33.28

Since the issuance of the *AD Order*, the Department completed three administrative reviews covering the following periods: November 12, 2010 through April 30, 2012,⁷ May 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013,⁸ and May 1, 2013 through April 30, 2014.⁹ The weighted-average

⁷ See *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Rescission, in Part, 2010/12*, 79 FR 96 (January 2, 2014) (*2010-2012 Final Results*); see also *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Correction of the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Rescission, in Part, 2010/12*, 79 FR 7643 (February 10, 2014).

⁸ See *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty*

dumping margins found in each of these reviews are listed in Attachment 1. The Department is currently conducting an administrative review of the *AD Order* for the period May 1, 2014 through April 30, 2015,¹⁰ and recently initiated an administrative review of the *AD Order* covering the period May 1, 2015 through April 30, 2016.¹¹ The Department has not conducted any new shipper reviews of the *AD Order*.

Since the issuance of the *AD Order*, the Department conducted one changed circumstances review.¹² The Department has completed over ninety scope rulings, and is currently conducting several others. For a list of scope rulings which the Department has completed, and the disposition of those scope reviews, *see* Attachment 2.¹³ There have been no findings with respect to duty absorption. The Department has not completed any anti-circumvention determinations, but recently initiated an anti-circumvention inquiry with respect to 5050-grade aluminum alloy exported by China Zhongwang Holdings Ltd. and its affiliates.¹⁴

V. Legal Framework

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the *AD Order* would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the periods before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order.

In accordance with the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically the Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994) (SAA), the House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) (House Report), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (Senate Report), the Department's likelihood determinations will be made on an order-wide, rather than company-specific, basis.¹⁵ In addition, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order; (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after issuance of the order; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.¹⁶

Administrative Review; 2012-2013, 79 FR 78784 (December 31, 2014) (*2012-2013 Final Results*).

⁹ *See Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 80 FR 75060 (December 1, 2015) (*2013-2014 Final Results*).

¹⁰ *See Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Rescission of Review in Part; 2014-2015*, 81 FR 38664 (June 14, 2016).

¹¹ *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 44260 (July 7, 2016).

¹² *See Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Reviews; Partial Revocation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 79 FR 634 (January 6, 2014).

¹³ The memoranda for these scope rulings are available at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/download/prc-ae/scope/prc-ae-scope-index.html>.

¹⁴ *See Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Anti-Circumvention Inquiry*, 81 FR 15039 (March 21, 2016).

¹⁵ *See* SAA at 879 and House Report at 56.

¹⁶ *See* SAA at 889-90, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52 for a description of our practice; *see also Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*;

In addition, as a base period of import volume comparison, it is the Department's practice to use the one-year period immediately preceding the initiation of the investigation, rather than the level of pre-order import volumes, as the initiation of an investigation may dampen import volumes and, thus, skew the comparison.¹⁷

Further, section 752(c)(3) of the Act states that the Department shall provide to the International Trade Commission (ITC) the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Generally, the Department selects the dumping margins from the final determination in the original investigation, as these rates are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order in place.¹⁸ However, in certain circumstances, a more recently calculated rate may be more appropriate (*e.g.*, "if dumping margins have declined over the life of an order and imports have remained steady or increased, {the Department} may conclude that exporters are likely to continue dumping at the lower rates found in a more recent review.").¹⁹

In February 2012, the Department announced it was modifying its practice in sunset reviews such that it will not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology found to be World Trade Organization (WTO)-inconsistent.²⁰ In the *Final Modification for Reviews*, the Department stated that "only in the most extraordinary circumstances" would it rely on margins other than those calculated and published in prior determinations.²¹ The Department further stated that apart from the "most extraordinary circumstances," it would "limit its reliance to margins determined or applied during the five-year sunset period that were not determined in a manner found to be WTO-inconsistent" and that it "may also rely on past dumping margins that were not affected by the WTO-inconsistent methodology, such as dumping margins recalculated pursuant to Section 129 proceedings, dumping margins determined based on the use of total adverse facts available, and dumping margins where no offsets were denied because all comparison results were positive."²²

Finally, pursuant to section 752(c)(4)(A) of the Act, a dumping margin of zero or *de minimis* shall not by itself require the Department to determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order would not be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of sales at LTFV.²³

Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871, 18872 (April 16, 1998) (*Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

¹⁷ See, *e.g.*, *Stainless Steel Bar from Germany: Final Results of the Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 56985 (October 5, 2007) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

¹⁸ See SAA at 890; see also *Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 11868 (March 5, 2008) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

¹⁹ See SAA at 890-91.

²⁰ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

²¹ *Id.*, 77 FR at 8103.

²² *Id.*

²³ See *Folding Gift Boxes from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 16765 (April 5, 2007) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

VI. Discussion of the Issues

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Petitioner argues that revocation of the *AD Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping based on continued dumping by Chinese respondents and a significant decline in import volumes since the imposition of the *AD Order*. Petitioner asserts that throughout this proceeding, more than half of the mandatory respondents selected by the Department refused to participate, opting to pay the 33.28 percent PRC-wide rate rather than subjecting themselves to the Department's examination.²⁴ According to Petitioner, this is an obvious indication that the actual margin of dumping for these companies is much greater than the PRC-wide rate. In fact, Petitioner contends, when the Department examined Union Industry (Asia) Co., Ltd. (Union) in the third administrative review, the Department computed a margin of 86.01 percent, which clearly shows that absent the *AD Order*, dumping is likely to continue or recur on a large scale.²⁵

Petitioner further argues that in the investigation, the Department calculated margins ranging from 32.79 to 33.28 percent for various respondents, which in itself indicates a high degree of dumping.²⁶ Where dumping continues at levels above *de minimis* after imposition of an order, Petitioner maintains the Department generally finds that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping. Petitioner asserts the Department found that dumping has continued in each of the administrative reviews conducted since the imposition of the *AD Order*. In particular, Petitioner contends that in the third administrative review, the Department determined the separate rate companies were dumping at rates nearly three times higher than the rate previously calculated for the separate rate applicants.²⁷ Similarly, Petitioner asserts that one respondent which received a zero percent margin in the first two administrative reviews, Kromet International, Inc. (Kromet), received an 86.01 percent margin in the third administrative review.²⁸ Petitioner argues that respondents' persistent dumping implies that revocation of the *AD Order* would lead to renewed and even increased dumping.²⁹

In addition, Petitioner contends, where the Department finds that import volumes for subject merchandise declined significantly after the issuance of an order, the Department will determine that dumping is likely to continue or recur. According to Petitioner, the Department stated that where there are no dumping margins on which to rely, diminished import volumes alone may establish that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order is revoked.³⁰ In the instant proceeding, Petitioner argues, imports of subject merchandise declined significantly after imposition of the *AD Order*.³¹ Specifically, Petitioner states that in 2009 (the year preceding the

²⁴ See Substantive Response at 16 (citing *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 18526-28; *2010-2012 Final Results*, 79 FR at 97; *2012-2013 Final Results*, 79 FR at 78784; *2013-2014 Final Results*, 80 FR at 75060; and each of these determinations generally).

²⁵ *Id.* at 16.

²⁶ *Id.* (citing *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 18530).

²⁷ *Id.* at 17 (citing *2013-2014 Final Results*, 80 FR at 75063).

²⁸ *Id.* (citing *2010-2012 Final Results*, *2012-2013 Final Results*, and *2013-2014 Final Results*, 80 FR at 75063).

²⁹ *Id.* (citing *Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18872).

³⁰ *Id.* at 17-18 (citing *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8109).

³¹ *Id.* at 18 and Exhibit 2 (U.S. Imports for Consumption). We note that to determine yearly import totals, Petitioner

initiation of the investigation), U.S. imports of subject merchandise totaled 208,967 metric tons (MT), then fell to 198,133 MT in 2010, the year in which the petition was filed, and dropped even further to 21,121 MT in 2011, the year in which the order was issued. Petitioner points out that the volume of imports of subject merchandise in 2011 equaled only 10 percent of the total volume imported into the United States in 2009. Petitioner further contends that while import volumes have been rising steadily since 2011, totaling 28,964 MT in 2012, 35,883 MT in 2013, 42,183 MT in 2014, and 47,104 MT in 2015, the increase in volumes likely is due to the recent circumvention associated with 5xxx-series aluminum alloy product, and the volumes are but a shadow of those in 2009.³² According to Petitioner, “[t]his movement not only indicates the determination with which Chinese respondents are pursuing the U.S. market, but it also suggests a strong likelihood of a recurrence of dumping should the order be revoked.”³³

Department’s Position:

As explained in the “Legal Framework” section above, the Department’s determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis.³⁴ In addition, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order; (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.³⁵

Additionally, when determining whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation of dumping, sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act instruct the Department to consider: (1) the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews; and (2) the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order. According to the SAA, “[d]eclining import volumes accompanied by the continued existence of dumping margins after the issuance of an order may provide a strong indication that, absent an order, dumping would be likely to continue, because the evidence would indicate that the exporter needs to dump to sell at pre-order volumes.”³⁶

In this sunset review, the Department has relied on weighted-average dumping margins that were not affected by the methodology (*i.e.*, “zeroing”) addressed in the *Final Modification for Reviews*. In this case, the investigation was conducted after the Department ceased zeroing in investigations,³⁷ and the margins calculated in the investigation were based on petition rates

relied on data from the USITC Trade Dataweb for the following HTS codes: 7604.21, 7604.29, 7608.20, 7610.10, and 7610.90 where quantities are collected in kilograms.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.* at 18.

³⁴ See SAA at 879 and House Report at 56.

³⁵ See SAA at 889-90, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52; see also *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18872.

³⁶ See SAA at 889.

³⁷ See *Antidumping Proceedings; Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin During an Antidumping Investigation; Final Modification*, 71 FR 77722 (December 27, 2006) (*Final Modification for Investigations*) and *Antidumping Proceedings; Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margins in Antidumping Investigations*;

which did not involve the denial of offsets. Specifically, the 33.28 percent margin assigned as adverse facts available to Guang Ya Group/New Zhongya/Xinya³⁸ and the PRC-wide entity in the investigation was based on the highest calculated rate in the petition, and the 32.79 percent margin assigned to the companies eligible for a separate rate in the investigation was based on the simple average of the margins alleged in the petition.³⁹ Since the issuance of the *AD Order*, none of the margins calculated in administrative reviews, including the 86.01 percent margin calculated for Union in the *2013-2014 Final Results* and applied to the companies eligible for a separate rate in that segment of the proceeding,⁴⁰ was calculated in a WTO-inconsistent manner.⁴¹ The 33.28 percent margin determined in the investigation for the PRC-wide entity has not changed as a result of administrative reviews and thus continues to be in effect.

Thus, dumping margins and cash deposit rates above *de minimis* levels remain in effect for PRC companies. These margins provide the best evidence of dumping behavior of these companies and there is no evidence that indicates dumping has ceased. Accordingly, revocation of the *AD Order* is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping.

Separately, pursuant to section 752(c)(1)(B) of the Act, the Department considered the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the *AD Order*. We reviewed the import data that Petitioner placed on the record of this sunset review and note that import volumes after the imposition of the *AD Orders* were significantly below the volume of imports in the year preceding the initiation of the investigation (*i.e.*, 2009). In 2011, the year in which the *AD Order* was imposed, imports were only 10 percent of pre-initiation levels. Although import volumes have risen since 2011, import volumes have only reached 23 percent of pre-initiation levels. Thus, we agree with Petitioner that import volumes have remained at levels well below pre-order volumes over the sunset review period (*i.e.*, 2011 – 2015).⁴²

Change in Effective Date of Final Modification, 72 FR 3783 (January 26, 2007) (*Effective Date of Final Modification for Investigations*).

³⁸ In the *Final Determination*, the Department found that Guang Ya Group, New Zhongya, and Xinya were affiliated with each other and should be treated as a single entity. See *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 18527. As stated in the *Final Determination*, Guang Ya Group includes Guang Ya Aluminium Industries Co., Ltd., Foshan Guangcheng Aluminium Co., Ltd., Kong Ah International Company Limited, and Guang Ya Aluminium Industries (Hong Kong) Ltd.; New Zhongya includes Zhaoqing New Zhongya Aluminum Co., Ltd., Zhongya Shaped Aluminium (HK) Holding Limited, and Karlton Aluminum Company Ltd.; and Xinya is Xinya Aluminum & Stainless Steel Product Co., Ltd. (Xinya). Subsequent to the *Final Determination*, the Department determined that Guangdong Zhongya Aluminium Company Limited was the successor-in-interest to Zhaoqing New Zhongya Aluminum Co., Ltd. in a changed circumstances review. See *Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 77 FR 54900 (September 6, 2012). In each of the administrative reviews completed since the issuance of the *AD Order*, the Department continued to find that Guang Ya Group, Zhongya (consisting of Guangdong Zhongya Aluminium Company Limited, Zhongya Shaped Aluminium (HK) Holding Limited, and Karlton Aluminum Company Ltd.), and Xinya were affiliated and should be treated as a single entity. See *2010-2012 Final Results*, 79 FR at 96; *2012-2013 Final Results*, 79 FR at 78784; and *2013-2014 Final Results*, 80 FR at 75060.

³⁹ See *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 18528-29.

⁴⁰ See *2013-2014 Final Results*, 80 FR at 75062-63. The only other margins calculated in this proceeding were zero percent margins for Kromet in the *2010-2012 Final Results* and *2012-2013 Final Results*. However, as one of the companies eligible for a separate rate in the *2013-2014 Final Results*, Kromet received the 86.01 percent margin.

⁴¹ We note that all of the administrative reviews conducted by the Department of the *AD Order* occurred after the effective date specified in the *Final Modification for Reviews*.

⁴² See Substantive Response at 18 and Exhibit 2.

With regard to the decrease in imports since the imposition of the *AD Order*, it is reasonable to assume that the decrease in imports accompanied by continued existence of dumping margins indicates that Chinese exporters must dump in order to sell subject merchandise in the U.S. market.⁴³ If companies continue to dump with the discipline of an order in place, it is also reasonable to assume that dumping would continue if that discipline were removed.⁴⁴ Accordingly, pursuant to section 752(c)(1) of the Act, the Department determines that dumping would likely continue or recur if the *AD Order* were revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Margins Likely to Prevail

Petitioner argues that where margins have increased over the course of an order, as is the case here, the Department may provide to the ITC “a more recently calculated margin for a particular company where, for that particular company, dumping margins increased after the issuance of the order, even if the increase was as a result of the application of best information available or facts available.”⁴⁵ Petitioner states the Department modified its practice in sunset reviews such that it only relies upon “margins determined or applied during the five-year sunset period that were not determined in a manner found to be WTO-inconsistent” (*i.e.*, not calculated using the zeroing methodology).⁴⁶ Petitioner contends that, in light of this practice, the Department should rely on the dumping margin calculated for the separate rate companies in the third administrative review (the most-recently completed segment of this proceeding), 86.01 percent.

According to Petitioner, the more recent 86.01 percent margin proves that Chinese respondents continue to sell at LTFV and more precisely illustrates the increased elevated levels at which they are doing so.⁴⁷ Petitioner maintains this margin was computed for the only respondent that actively participated in this proceeding other than Kromet, which Petitioner claims may have transshipped product through Canada⁴⁸ and thus its margin does not reflect the shipments and sales of Chinese products. Petitioner argues the 86.01 percent margin is more indicative than the 33.28 percent PRC-wide rate from the investigation of the magnitude of the dumping margin likely to prevail if the *AD Order* is revoked because this margin is more recent and, particularly in view of steadily rising imports, “a more blatant statement of the extremity of the dumping respondents are willing to pursue in order to preserve their share of the U.S. market.”⁴⁹

Alternatively, Petitioner asserts the Department should select the 33.28 percent margin determined for the PRC-wide entity rate in the investigation as the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail if the *AD Order* is revoked. Petitioner notes that no selected respondent fully participated in the investigation, and all received AFA.⁵⁰ Petitioner claims the Department’s preference is to rely on margins calculated in the investigation because those are the only

⁴³ See SAA at 889.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 890.

⁴⁵ See Substantive Response at 20 (citing *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873).

⁴⁶ *Id.* (citing *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8103).

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 20-21 (citing *2010-2012 Final Results* and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2).

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 21.

⁵⁰ *Id.* at 21-22 (citing *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 18528-29).

calculated rates that reflect the behavior of respondents without the discipline of the order.⁵¹ Petitioner contends the 33.28 percent margin from the investigation is indicative of the behavior of Chinese exporters without the *AD Order* in place.

Department's Position:

Pursuant to section 752(c)(3) of the Act, the administering authority shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Normally, the Department will select a weighted-average dumping margin from the investigation to report to the ITC.⁵² In non-market-economy (NME) cases, for companies not investigated specifically and which were not found to be eligible for a separate rate, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the NME-entity rate from the investigation.⁵³ The Department's preference for selecting a margin from the LTFV investigation is based on the fact that it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place. Under certain circumstances, however, the Department may select a more recently calculated margin to report to the ITC.

As indicated in the "Legal Framework" section above, the Department's current practice is not to rely on weighted-average dumping margins calculated using the zeroing methodology, consistent with the *Final Modification for Reviews*. Instead, we may rely on other rates that may be available, or we may recalculate weighted-average dumping margins using our current offsetting methodology in extraordinary circumstances.⁵⁴ In addition, the rate assigned to the PRC-wide entity, if it is based on the margin from the petition and does not involve the denial of offsets, is another available rate that we may report to the ITC.

Citing the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, Petitioner contends that the Department may report to the ITC "a more recently calculated margin for a particular company where, for that particular company, dumping margins increased after the issuance of the order, even if the increase was as a result of the application of best information available or facts available."⁵⁵ Petitioner first advocates that the Department should rely on the 86.01 percent margin calculated in the third administrative review in light of the Department's current practice in sunset reviews not to rely upon margins determined in a WTO-inconsistent manner. However, we note that no margins in this proceeding were determined in a WTO-inconsistent manner, but, rather, all margins in this proceeding were determined consistent with the practice described in the *Final Modification for Reviews*. The Department conducted the investigation of this proceeding after the Department

⁵¹ *Id.* at 21 (citing SAA at 890, *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873, and *Silicomanganese From India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 78 FR 9034 (February 7, 2013) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2).

⁵² See SAA at 890; see also, e.g., *Persulfates from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 11868 (March 5, 2008), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

⁵³ See, e.g., *Non-Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 39656 (July 10, 2008) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

⁵⁴ See *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8103.

⁵⁵ See Substantive Response at 20 (citing *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873).

discontinued the use of zeroing in investigations,⁵⁶ and the margins determined in the investigation were based on petition rates which did not involve the denial of offsets. Moreover, all of the administrative reviews of the *AD Order* occurred after the Department ceased the use of zeroing in reviews when using the weighted-average to weighted-average comparison method.⁵⁷ Because all margins in this proceeding have been determined without zeroing, the fact that the 86.01 percent margin was calculated in a WTO-consistent manner has no bearing on our determination of which margin to rely upon.

Regarding Petitioner's argument that we should rely on the 86.01 percent margin because it is more recent than the 33.28 percent margin from the investigation, and shows the increased levels at which respondents are dumping "to preserve their share of the U.S. market," especially in view of steadily rising imports,⁵⁸ we disagree. With respect to the use of a more recently calculated margin where dumping margins have increased, the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* states in full:

In addition, a company may choose to increase dumping in order to maintain or increase market share. As a result, increasing margins may be more representative of a company's behavior in the absence of an order. Therefore, unless the Department finds no likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping, the Department may, in response to argument from an interested party, provide to the Commission a more recently calculated margin for a particular company where, for that particular company, dumping margins increased after the issuance of the order, even if the increase was as a result of the application of best information available or facts available.⁵⁹

The *Sunset Policy Bulletin* also states that information regarding "the company's relative market share ... should be provided to the Department by the parties."⁶⁰

In this sunset review, Petitioner did not provide any information showing that Union, the particular respondent for which the Department calculated the 86.01 percent margin in the third administrative review, increased its level of dumping in order to maintain or gain market share. Similarly, Petitioner did not provide any evidence that any of the particular companies eligible for a separate rate in the third administrative review and to which the Department applied the 86.01 percent margin increased their level of dumping in order to maintain or gain market share. Thus, the record contains no information that would enable the Department to determine that Union or any of the companies eligible for a separate rate in the third administrative review increased their level of dumping so as to maintain or increase market share.

⁵⁶ See *Final Modification for Investigations and Effective Date of Final Modification for Investigations*.

⁵⁷ See *Final Modification for Reviews*.

⁵⁸ See Substantive Response at 20-21.

⁵⁹ See *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

In addition, as the Department has noted previously, steady or increasing imports alone is not sufficient to demonstrate steady or increasing market share.⁶¹ For example, domestic consumption may have increased and, as a result, an increase in import volumes for certain exporters would not necessarily indicate a corresponding increase in market share. Moreover, as the import data show, in the period since the imposition of the *AD Order* (i.e., 2011 – 2015), overall import volumes have remained at levels significantly below pre-order volumes.⁶² The Department’s practice establishes that the onus is on the party requesting that a more recent rate be reported to the ITC to provide the Department with the necessary data to support such a request and in this case we find that Petitioner has failed to do so.

Based on the foregoing, we disagree with Petitioner that the Department should report dumping margins to the ITC of up to 86.01 percent. Instead, we find that it is appropriate to provide the ITC with the margins determined in the investigation as the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the *AD Order* were revoked because these margins best reflect the behavior of Chinese producers/exporters without the discipline of the *AD Order* in place. As noted above, the margins calculated in the investigation were not affected by the denial of offsets because the *AD Order* occurred after the Department ceased zeroing in investigations, and the margins determined in the investigation were based on rates from the petition which did not involve the denial of offsets. As a result, we will report to the ITC the margins of dumping likely to prevail listed in the “Final Results of Review” section below.

VII. Final Results of Sunset Review

We determine that revocation of the *AD Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. We also determine that the magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail would be weighted-average dumping margins up to 33.28 percent.

⁶¹ See *Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 75 FR 19364 (April 14, 2010), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

⁶² See Substantive Response at 18 and Exhibit 2.

VIII. Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the substantive response received, we recommend adopting all of the above positions. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the final results of the sunset review in the *Federal Register*.

Agree ✓

Disagree _____

Ronald K Lorentzen

Ronald K. Lorentzen
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

July 29, 2016
(Date)

Attachment 1a**Weighted Average Dumping Margins - 2010-2012 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review
Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China**

Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (Percent)
Kromet International, Inc.	0.00
Sincere Profit Limited	32.79
Skyline Exhibit Systems (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.	32.79
Gold Mountain International Development Limited	32.79
Shenzhen Jiuyuan Co., Ltd.	32.79
Dynamic Technologies China Ltd.	32.79
Zhejiang Xinlong Industry Co., Ltd.	32.79
Changzhou Tenglong Auto Parts Co., Ltd.	32.79
Xin Wei Aluminum Company Limited	32.79
Zhongshan Gold Mountain Aluminium Factory Ltd.	32.79
PRC-wide Entity	33.28

Attachment 1b**Weighted Average Dumping Margins - 2012-2013 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review
Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China**

Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (Percent)
Kromet International, Inc.	0.00
Allied Maker Limited	32.79
Changzhou Changzheng Evaporator Co., Ltd.	32.79
Classic & Contemporary Inc.	32.79
Dynabright Int'l Group (HK) Limited	32.79
Hanyung Metal (Suzhou) Co., Ltd.	32.79
Global Point Technology (Far East) Limited ¹	32.79
Jiangsu Changfa Refrigeration Co., Ltd.	32.79
Jiaxing Jackson Travel Products Co., Ltd.	32.79
Justhere Co., Ltd.	32.79
Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn. Bhd ²	32.79
Metaltek Group Co., Ltd.	32.79
Midea International Trading Co., Ltd.	32.79
Permasteelisa Hong Kong Limited ³	32.79
Shanghai Tongtai Precise Aluminum Alloy	32.79
Sincere Profit Limited	32.79
tenKsolar (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.	32.79
Tianjin Jinmao Import & Export Corp., Ltd.	32.79
Union Industry (Asia) Co., Ltd.	32.79
PRC-wide Entity	33.28

¹ Hoff Associates Mfg Reps Inc. (dba Global PointTechnology, Inc.) is the U.S. importer.

² Taishan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusions Co., Ltd. is the producer.

³ Permasteelisa South China Factory (Permasteelisa China) is the producer.

Attachment 1c

Weighted Average Dumping Margins - 2013-2014 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China

Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (Percent)
Allied Maker Limited	86.01
Changzhou Changzheng Evaporator Co., Ltd.	86.01
Dongguan Aoda Aluminum Co., Ltd.	86.01
Justhere Co., Ltd.	86.01
Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn Bhd ¹	86.01
Kromet International Inc.	86.01
Metaltek Group Co., Ltd.	86.01
Permasteelisa Hong Kong Limited ²	86.01
tenKsolar (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.	86.01
Union Industry (Asia) Co., Ltd.	86.01

NOTE: Under the Department's change in policy regarding conditional review of the PRC-wide entity, the PRC-wide entity is not under review unless a party specifically requests, or the Department self-initiates, a review of the entity. *See Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963, 65970 (November 4, 2013). Because no party requested a review of the PRC-wide entity in the 2013-2014 administrative review, the PRC-wide entity's rate from the previous administrative review (*i.e.*, 33.28 percent) did not change.

¹ Although the Department initiated a review for both Taishan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co., Ltd. and Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn Bhd, it is apparent from the company's separate-rate application that Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn Bhd is the exporter and Taishan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co., Ltd. is a producer only; thus, Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn Bhd is the appropriate party to grant the separate rate status.

² Although the Department initiated a review for Permasteelisa South China Factory and Permasteelisa Hong Kong Ltd., it is apparent from the company's separate-rate application that Permasteelisa Hong Kong Ltd. is the exporter and Permasteelisa South China Factory is a producer only; thus, Permasteelisa Hong Kong Ltd. is the appropriate party to grant the separate rate status.

Attachment 2 - List of Scope Rulings
Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China

Date	Product and Company	Result	Appeal
10/14/2011	Retractable Awning Mechanisms (Tri Vantage)	In scope	No
10/19/2011	Banner Stands and Back Wall Kits (Skyline Displays Inc.)	Excluded	No
10/25/2011	Cleaning System Components (Rubbermaid Commercial Products LLC)	Originally in scope; excluded on remand	Yes: CIT 11-00463 (affirming results on remand overturning original scope determination)
10/31/2011	Modular Aluminum Railing Systems (Peak Products America Inc.)	In scope	No
10/31/2011	Decorative Waste Containers (Rubbermaid Commercial Products LLC)	Excluded	No
11/7/2011	Shower Door Kits (Sapa Extrusions, Inc.)	Excluded	No
11/9/2011	EZ Fabric Wall Systems (Moss Holding Company)	Excluded	No
12/2/2011	Fence Sections, Posts and Gates (American Fence Manufacturing Company LLC)	In scope	No
12/6/2011	Window Kits (IAP Enclosure Systems, LLC)	Excluded	No
12/13/2011	Aluminum Fence and Post Parts (Ameristar Fence Products)	In scope	No
12/13/2011	Aluminum Fence Panels, Posts and Gates (Origin Point Brands, LLC)	In scope	No
2/3/2012	Drapery Rail Kits (The Rowley Company)	Originally in scope; excluded on remand	Yes: CIT 12-00055 (sustaining results of remand, in which the Department found the product excluded from scope)
3/28/2012	Precision Machine Parts (IDEX Health & Science LLC)	In scope	No
7/6/2012	Motor Cases (UQM Technologies, Inc.)	In scope	Yes: CIT 12-00217 and 12-00412 (cases joined and dismissed)
7/13/2012	Fin Evaporator Systems (Electrolux)	In scope	No
7/17/2012	Geodesic Structures (J.A. Hancock Co., Inc.)	In scope	No
8/15/2012	Aluminum Kitted Fences (Ameristar Fence Products)	In scope	No
8/17/2012	Solarmotion Controllable Sunshades (Construction Specialities Inc.)	Excluded	No
9/6/2012	Aluminum Rails for Showers and Carpets (Sinobec Resources LLS) ()	Excluded	No
10/17/2012	Aluminum Anodes for Water Heaters (A.O. Smith Corporation) (issued)	Excluded	Yes: CIT 12-00364 (dismissed)
10/26/2012	Side Mount Valve Controls (Innovative Controls Inc.)	Excluded	Yes: CIT 12-00374 (sustaining the Department's scope results)
10/31/2012	Automotive Heating and Cooling Systems (Valeo Group)	Originally in scope; excluded on remand	Yes: CIT 12-00381 (scope determination remanded and reversed)
10/31/2012	Solar Panel Mounting Systems (Clenergy (Xiamen) Technology Co. Ltd.)	Excluded	Yes: CIT 12-00385 (dismissed)
11/13/2012	Cutting and Marking Straight Edges (Plasticoid Manufacturing Inc.)	In scope	Yes: CIT 12-00407 (dismissed)
11/14/2012	Aluminum Mounting Plates (Signtex Lighting, Inc.)	In scope	No
11/19/2012	Assembled Motor Cases and Assembled Motor Cases Housing Stators (UQM Technologies Inc.)	Assembled motor cases - in scope; Assembled Motor Cases Housing Stators excluded	No
11/30/2012	Curtain Wall Systems (Northern California Glass Management Association) (issued	In scope	Yes: CIT 12-00420, CAFC 14-1386 (affirming finding that products are subject merchandise)
12/17/2012	Refrigerator/Freezer Trim Kits (Meridian Products LLC)	In scope (excluded under protest on remand)	Yes: CIT 13-00018 (sustaining the Department's results on remand, reversing original determination under protest), CAFC 16-1730 (ongoing)

3/14/2013	Curtain Walls with Non-PRC Extrusions (Tesla Wall Systems and MBM Supply Company LLC)	Excluded	No
3/20/2013	Boat and Dock Ladders and Strip Door Mounting Brackets (Asia Sourcing Corporation)	Originally found two ladder models excluded and three ladder models in scope; upon remand, found the three ladder models excluded	Yes: CIT 13-00161 (affirmed)
4/19/2013	Aluminum Flag Pole Sets (5 Diamond Promotions, Inc.)	In scope	No
6/21/2013	Kitchen Appliance Door Handles (Meridian Products LLC)	In scope (excluded under protest on remand)	Yes: CIT 13-00246 (ongoing)
9/9/2013	Louver Assemblies (Port-A-Cool LLC)	Excluded	No
9/12/2013	Disappearing Door Screens (Law St. Enterprises, LLC)	In scope	Yes: CIT 13-00359 (dismissed)
11/21/2013	Subparts for Metal Bushings (Kam Kiu Aluminium Products Sdn. Bhd. and Taishan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co. Ltd.)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 13-00403 (affirming the Department's scope results)
12/2/2013	Event Décor Parts and Kits (Traffic Brick Network, LLC)	Excluded (kits) / In Scope (parts)	No
3/27/2014	Gallery Assemblies for Wind Turbines (Aluwind Inc.)	Excluded	No
3/27/2014	Curtain Wall Units Produced and Imported Pursuant to a Contract to Supply a Curtain Wall (Shenyang Yuanda Aluminum Industry Engineering Co., Ltd.)	In Scope (excluded under protest on remand)	Yes: CIT 14-00106, 14-00107, 14-00108 (consolidated; ongoing)
6/19/2014	Window Wall Kits (N.R. Windows Inc.)	Excluded	No
6/23/2014	Trade Booth Kits (Glenmore Industries LLC)	Excluded	No
7/8/2014	Scaffolding Planks (Titan Worldwide Industries Acquisition LLC)	Excluded	No
7/16/2014	Auto Trim Kits (Signature Partners Inc.)	In Scope	No
7/22/2014	Aluminum Fence Kits (Dynasty Profiles, LLC)	In Scope	No
7/22/2014	Pocket Door Tracks (Five Lakes Trading, Inc.)	In Scope	No
7/25/2014	Fan Blade Assemblies (SPX Cooling Technologies, Inc.)	Excluded	No
8/1/2014	Storm Door Accessory Kits (Larson Manufacturing Company)	Excluded	No
8/1/2014	Recreational Marine Products - Backrest and T-Top Kits (TACO Metals Inc.)	Excluded	No
8/4/2014	Kitchen Appliance Door Handles With Plastic End Caps and Kitchen Appliance Door Handles Without Plastic End Caps (Whirlpool Corporation)	In scope (excluded under protest on remand)	Yes: CIT 14-00199 (ongoing)
8/7/2014	Screen Printing Frames (Rheetech Sales & Services Inc.)	Excluded	Yes: CIT 14-00206 (affirmed)
8/14/2014	Exhibition Booth Kits (Districargo Inc.)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 14-00208 (affirmed), CAFC 16-2192 (ongoing)
8/18/2014	Telescoping Boat Cover Poles, Fishing Rod Holders, and Fishing Rod Racks (TACO Metals Inc.)	Excluded	No
9/12/2014	Cam-Lock Support Poles (Vico Plastics Inc.)	Excluded	No
10/14/2014	Delphi Core Heater Tubes (Delphi Automotive Systems, LLC)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 14-00298 (dismissed)
10/23/2014	Exercise Equipment Bases (Core Industries LLC dba Star Trac)	Excluded	No
10/27/2014	Max Rack (Core Industries LLC dba Star Trac)	Excluded	No
11/3/2014	Micro Channel Heat Exchangers (Danfoss LLC)	Excluded	No
11/3/2014	Telescoping Poles (KIK Custom Products)	Excluded	No
11/4/2014	Aluminum Grabbers (Unger Enterprises, Inc.)	Excluded	No
11/4/2014	Motorized Arm Set Kits (Pacific Product Solutions)	Excluded	No

11/19/2014	MagPole (Clik-Clik Systems Inc.)	Excluded	No
11/24/2014	Heat Sinks for LED Light Bars (ECCO Group)	In Scope	No
11/24/2014	Pool Poles, Skimmers, & Rakes (JED Pool Tools, Inc.)	Excluded	No
12/5/2014	Screen and Storm Door Grille and Patio Door Kits (Circle Glass Co.)	Excluded (screen and storm door grilles) / In Scope (patio door kits)	Yes: CIT 15-00002 (affirmed)
1/8/2015	20-Foot Telescoping Flagpoles (Camco Manufacturing, Inc.)	Excluded	No
1/23/2015	Premium Event Tent Frame (Sign-Zone, Inc.)	Excluded	No
2/5/2015	Advertising Flag Pole Kits (5 Diamond Promotions, Inc.)	In Scope	No
2/19/2015	Telescoping Poles (Unger Enterprises Inc.)	Excluded	No
3/2/2015	Side Cam-Lock Telepoles and Ribbed Telescopic Poles (Aqua EZ, Inc.)	Excluded	Yes: CIT 15-00098 (dismissed)
3/4/2015	Display Easels and Wall Standards (Ford Atlantic)	Excluded (Display Easels) / In Scope (Wall Standards)	Yes: CIT 15-00100 (dismissed)
4/2/2015	Cleats (All Points Industries Inc.)	In Scope	No
4/20/2015	Window Anchor (Guardian Fall Protection, Inc.)	Excluded	No
4/22/2015	Pole Handles (Unger Enterprises Inc.)	Excluded	No
4/27/2015	Cabinet/Drawer Handles (IKEA Supply AG)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 15-00152 (ongoing)
4/27/2015	Towel Racks (IKEA Supply AG)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 15-00153 (ongoing)
5/14/2015	Heat Sink Parts for LED Lamps (Streamlight, Inc.)	In Scope	No
6/15/2015	Wind Sign Frames (TSS, Inc.)	Excluded	No
8/27/2015	Foreline Hose Assembly (Agilent Technologies, Inc.)	Excluded	No
8/28/2015	Telescoping Extension Poles (Ace Hardware Corporation)	Excluded	No
9/30/2015	Extension Tension Poles (Blue Blade Inc.)	Excluded	No
10/14/2014	KF16 Hose Adapter (Agilent Technologies, Inc.)	In Scope	No
10/28/2015	Certain Aluminum Spreader Poles (Clam Corporation)	Excluded	No
11/4/2015	Certain Aluminum Telescoping Wash Poles (Carrand Companies Inc.)	Excluded	No
11/18/2015	Scissor Struts (Immediate Response Technologies)	In Scope	No
11/23/2015	Lateral Arm Assemblies (Dometic Corporation)	Excluded	No
11/24/2015	Certain Tube and Block Assemblies (Delphi Tube and Block Assemblies)	In Scope	No
11/24/2015	Certain Aluminum Poles, Aluminum Skimmers, Aluminum Rakes, and Aluminum Leaf Skimmer Kites for Use in Swimming Pools (Poolmaster, Inc.)	Excluded	No
12/9/2015	Shower Door Kits (Liberty Hardware Manufacturing Company)	Excluded	No
12/28/2015	Telescoping Pool Poles (Bridging China International Ltd.)	Excluded	No
1/5/2016	Silver Spring Networks Enclosure and Kit (Plexus Corporation)	In Scope (SSN Enclosure and SSN Enclosure with spare parts)/ Excluded (SSNE Kit)	No
1/19/2016	Window Wall Kits (Ventana Design-Build Systems Inc.)	Excluded	No
1/22/2016	Woven Polypropylene Seats (Homecrest Outdoor Living, LLC)	Excluded	No
3/11/2016	Telescopic Aluminum Pool Poles and Detachable Skimmers and Rakes (Pentair Water Pool and Spa, Inc.)	Excluded	No
4/15/2016	Portal Sets (Bottom Line Traction, Inc.)	Excluded	No
6/16/2016	Banner Stands (Lockfast, Inc.)	Excluded	No

6/20/2016	Lift-a-Deck II Foot Assembly (Ancra International LLC)	Excluded	No
7/11/2016	Certain Fittings and Related Products for Engine Cooling Systems (Adams Thermal Systems, Inc.)	In Scope	Yes: CIT 16-00128 (ongoing)