



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
Washington, D.C. 20230

A-570-827
Sunset Review
Public Document
AD/CVD I: MK

September 29, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado
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 Five-Year Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China

I. SUMMARY

We have analyzed the substantive response of the domestic interested party in the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain cased pencils from the People's Republic of China (PRC). We recommend that you approve the positions we describe in this memorandum. Below is a complete list of issues in this sunset review for which we received a substantive response:

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping; and
2. Magnitude of the dumping margin likely to prevail.

II. HISTORY OF THE ORDER

On November 8, 1994, the Department published its *Final Determination* in the AD investigation of certain cased pencils from the PRC.¹ On December 21, 1994, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) published its determination that that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports from the PRC of

¹ See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 55625 (November 8, 1994) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (*Final Determination*).



certain cased pencils.² Subsequently, on December 28, 1994, the Department published its *AD Order* on certain cased pencils from the PRC.³ The final determination established the following weighted-average dumping margins for manufacturer/producer/exporter: zero percent for China First Pencil Co. (China First)/China First; 44.66 percent for China First/Any other manufacturer; zero percent for Guangdong Provincial Stationery & Sporting Goods Import & Export Corporation (Guangdong)/Three Star Stationery Industry Co. (Three Star); 44.66 percent for Guangdong/Any other manufacturer; 8.31 percent for Shanghai Foreign Trade Corporation (SFTC); 17.45 percent for Shanghai Lansheng Corp (Shanghai Lansheng); and 44.66 percent for the PRC-wide rate.

On May 11, 1999, the Department issued an amended final determination of sales at LTFV and amended antidumping duty order with respect to pencils from the PRC, following a court decision.⁴ The amended final determination established the following dumping margins for manufacturer/producer/exporter: 8.60 percent for China First; 19.36 percent for Shanghai Lansheng; 11.15 percent for SFTC; zero percent for Guangdong / Three Star; 53.65 percent for Guangdong/all other producers; and 53.65 percent for the PRC-wide rate.

The history of the *Order* is summarized in the attachment to the memorandum. Since the most recent notice of continuation of the *Order* published in July 2011,⁵ the Department completed several segments of the proceeding regarding cased pencils. In August 2011, the Department published notice of the final results of a changed circumstances review in which the Department revoked, in part, the *Order* with respect to novelty drumstick pencils, effective June 1, 2011.⁶ On July 18, 2013, the Department published the final results of the 2010-2011 administrative review of the *Order*. In that review, the Department calculated a zero percent margin for Beijing Fila Dixon Stationery Company, Ltd. a/k/a Beijing Dixon Ticonderoga Stationery Company, Ltd., a/k/a Beijing Dixon Stationery Company, Ltd., and Dixon Ticonderoga Company (collectively Beijing Dixon) and revoked the *Order* with respect to Beijing Dixon.⁷ On September 4, 2013, the Department rescinded the 2011-2012 administrative review that it had previously initiated.⁸

² See *Certain Cased Pencils From The People's Republic of China*, Investigation No. 731-TA-669 (Final) 59 FR 65788 (December 21, 1994).

³ See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 66909 (December 28, 1994) (*Order*).

⁴ See *Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amended Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance with Final Court Decision*, 64 FR 25275 (May 11, 1999) (*Amended Final Determination*). The Department also published six other notices following court decisions in various segments of the proceeding. See *Notice of Court Decision: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 65243 (December 11, 1997).

⁵ See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order*, 76 FR 40880 (July 12, 2011).

⁶ See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review, and Determination To Revoke Order, in Part*, 77 FR 53176 (August 31, 2012).

⁷ See *Beijing Fila Dixon Stationery Company, Ltd. a/k/a Beijing Dixon Ticonderoga Stationery Company, Ltd., a/k/a Beijing Dixon Stationery Company, Ltd., and Dixon Ticonderoga Company*, 78 FR 42932 (July 18, 2013).

⁸ See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011–2012*, 78 FR 54452 (September 4, 2013).

On October 27, 2014, the Department issued a scope ruling that West Texas Lighthouse for the Blind's orange flexible pencils made of polyvinyl chloride with a black carbon material writing core are outside the scope of the order.⁹ On April 9, 2015, the Department published the final results of a changed circumstances review, in which it found that Beijing FILA Dixon Stationery Co., Ltd., as currently structured under its new business license, is the successor-in-interest to Beijing Dixon.¹⁰

On May 11, 2015, the Department published the final results of the 2012-2013 administrative review of the *Order*. In those final results, the Department found Shandong Rongxin Import & Export Co. Ltd. (Rongxin) not to be eligible for a separate rate and considered Rongxin to be part of the PRC-wide entity and subject to the PRC-wide entity rate of 114.90 percent rate.¹¹ On May 13, 2015, the Department rescinded the 2013-2014 administrative review that it had previously initiated¹²

At the present time, there are two ongoing segments involving cased pencils—a new shipper review of Wah Yuen Stationery Co. Ltd. (Wah Yuen) and the 2014-2015 antidumping duty administrative review.¹³

III. BACKGROUND

On June 1, 2016, the Department published the notice of initiation of the fourth sunset review of the *Order*, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).¹⁴ The Department invited parties to comment, and received a notice of intent to participate from domestic interested parties, Dixon Ticonderoga Company (Dixon)¹⁵ and General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., and RoseMoon, Inc., (formerly known as J.R. Moon Pencil Co.).¹⁶ In accordance with 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(ii)(A), Dixon, General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., and RoseMoon, Inc., claimed status as interested parties under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as producers of the domestic like product. Dixon is related to a foreign producer of subject merchandise and is also an importer of subject merchandise.¹⁷ On July 1, 2016, General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., and RoseMoon, Inc., filed a collective substantive response in

⁹ See *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 80 FR 22969 (April 24, 2015).

¹⁰ See *Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 80 FR 19073 (April 9, 2015).

¹¹ See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013*, 80 FR 26897 (May 11, 2015).

¹² See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 80 FR 27287 (May 13, 2015).

¹³ See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review; 2014-2015*, 81 FR 37573 (June 10, 2016); *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 6832 (February 9, 2016).

¹⁴ See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 81 FR 34974 (June 1, 2016).

¹⁵ See letter from Dixon, re: "Five-Year Sunset Review of Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China: Dixon Notice of Intent to Participate," dated June 7, 2016 (Dixon's Letter Stating Its Intent to Participate).

¹⁶ See letter from General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co. and RoseMoon, Inc., re: "751(c) Five-Year Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order Against Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Appearance and Intent to Participate," dated June 14, 2016.

¹⁷ See Dixon's Letter Stating Its Intent to Participate at 2.

the sunset review within the 30-day deadline, as specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).¹⁸ The Department did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party in the sunset review. 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 *Order*. Our analysis of the comments made by the domestic parties is set forth in the “Discussion of the Issues” section, *infra*.

IV. SCOPE OF THE ORDER

Imports covered by the order are shipments of certain cased pencils of any shape or dimension (except as described below) which are writing and/or drawing instruments that feature cores of graphite or other materials, encased in wood and/or man-made materials, whether or not decorated and whether or not tipped (*e.g.*, with erasers, *etc.*) in any fashion, and either sharpened or unsharpened. The pencils subject to the order are currently classifiable under subheading 9609.10.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Specifically excluded from the scope of the order are mechanical pencils, cosmetic pencils, pens, non-cased crayons (wax), pastels, charcoals, chinks, and pencils produced under U.S. patent number 6,217,242, from paper infused with scents by the means covered in the above-referenced patent, thereby having odors distinct from those that may emanate from pencils lacking the scent infusion. Also excluded from the scope of the order are pencils with all of the following physical characteristics: (1) Length: 13.5 or more inches; (2) sheath diameter: not less than one-and-one quarter inches at any point (before sharpening); and (3) core length: Not more than 15 percent of the length of the pencil. In addition, pencils with all of the following physical characteristics are excluded from the scope of the order: Novelty jumbo pencils that are octagonal in shape, approximately ten inches long, one inch in diameter before sharpening, and three-and-one eighth inches circumference, composed of turned wood encasing one-and-one half inches of sharpened lead on one end and a rubber eraser on the other end. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

V. DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

Legal Framework

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to 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 period before, and the period after, the issuance of the *Order*.

Consistent with guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (*i.e.*, the Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Rep. No. 103-316,

¹⁸ See letter from General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co. and RoseMoon, Inc., re: “§751(c) Five-Year Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order Against Cased Pencils from the People’s Republic of China; Substantive Response of Domestic Interested Parties,” dated July 1, 2016.

Vol. 1 (1994) (SAA);¹⁹ House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) (House Report);²⁰ and Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (Senate Report), the Department will make its likelihood determination on an order-wide, rather than company-specific, basis.²¹ The Department normally determines that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping when, among other scenarios: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after 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.²² Alternatively, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an AD order is not likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where dumping was eliminated after issuance of the order and import volumes remained steady or increased.²³

Further, section 752(c)(3) of the Act states that the Department shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Generally, the Department selects the margin(s) from the final determination in the investigation, as this is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order in place.²⁴ 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”).²⁵ 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 AD order would not be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of sales at less than fair value.²⁶

In the *Final Modification for Reviews*, the Department announced that in five-year (*i.e.*, sunset) reviews, it will not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology determined by the Appellate Body to be World Trade Organization (WTO)-inconsistent, *i.e.* zeroing/the denial of offsets.²⁷ The Department also noted that “*only in the most extraordinary circumstances* will the Department rely on margins other than those calculated and published in prior determinations.”²⁸ 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

¹⁹ Reprinted at 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4040.

²⁰ Reprinted at 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3773.

²¹ See SAA at 879, and House Report at 56.

²² See SAA at 889-90, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52.

²³ See SAA at 889-90, and House Report at 63.

²⁴ 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.

²⁵ See SAA at 890-91.

²⁶ 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) (*Folding Gift Boxes*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

²⁷ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings: Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8109 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

²⁸ *Id.* (emphasis added); see also 19 CFR 351.218(e)(2).

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.”²⁹

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., and RoseMoon, Inc.’s Comments

- Revocation of the *Order* will result in continuation or recurrence of dumping because dumping has continued at a higher than *de minimis* level throughout the entire period since the *Order’s* issuance. In fact, the China-wide rate more than doubled, from 53.65 percent to 114.90 percent.
- U.S. imports of pencils have fluctuated in the five years since the third sunset review. U.S. imports of pencils from the PRC totaled 11,593,000 gross in 2015, compared with 12,432,000 gross in 2010. However, U.S. imports of pencils from the PRC have grown annually at a low but steady rate since their low point in 2012, with a 1.2 percent increase from 2014 to 2015.
- While U.S. imports of pencils fell in the years immediately after the *Order*, they subsequently increased. The persistence of higher than *de minimis* margins warrants a finding that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the *Order* is revoked.

Department’s Position:

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA),³⁰ the Department normally determines 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. In this case, the Department found dumping at above *de minimis* levels in the original antidumping duty investigation of cased pencils from the PRC, and in a number of more recent reviews. While the *Order* for one exporter of pencils, Beijing Dixon, has been revoked, dumping margins above *de minimis* levels remain in effect for the remaining exporters. See Attachment 1.

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 the original investigation, the Department found a weighted-average dumping margin of 44.66 percent for non-responding companies that failed to cooperate. This rate was based on the “best information available” provision in the statute at that time. The rate was based on the highest margin in the petition.³¹ However, in August 1995, the Department

²⁹ *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8109.

³⁰ See, e.g., SAA at 899-90, House Report at 63-64 and Senate Report at 52.

³¹ See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cased Pencils From the People’s*

requested that the CIT remand to the Department two issues: (1) basswood prices; and (2) valuation of slats and logs. In performing the remand, the Department modified the petition rate to 53.65 percent.³² This rate was not impacted by zeroing. This rate was implemented as the PRC-wide rate in the *Amended Final Determination* and was applied multiple times in subsequent administrative reviews,³³ thus constituting evidence of continued dumping after issuance of the *Order*.

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 *Order*. According to data compiled from the U.S. Bureau of Census and the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. imports of pencils from the PRC have fluctuated in the last five years since the third sunset review, from 12,775,000 gross in 2011 to 11,593,000 in 2015, growing since their trough in 2012 when imports dipped to 10,514,000 gross.³⁴ Nevertheless, import volumes are not by themselves dispositive of the likelihood of the continuation or recurrence of dumping.

The Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the *Order* is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping if the *Order* were to be revoked. As explained in the SAA, if companies continue to dump with the discipline of an order in place, it is reasonable to assume that dumping would continue if the order were removed.³⁵ Therefore, pursuant to section 752(c)(1) of the Act, because above *de minimis* dumping margins continued after issuance of the *Order*, the Department determines that dumping would likely continue or recur if the *Order* were revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Dumping Margins Likely to Prevail

General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., and RoseMoon, Inc.'s Comments

- The Department should find that the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail is identical to the margin determined in the original investigation. Those margins ranged from 8.60 percent to 53.65 percent.

Department's Position:

Section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the administering authority shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Normally, the Department will select a margin from the final determination in the investigation because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order

Republic of China, 59 FR 55625 (November 8, 1994).

³² See *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 36491 (July 8, 1997).

³³ See, e.g., *Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 779 (January 7, 1998).

³⁴ See letter from General Pencil Co., Inc., Musgrave Pencil Co., Inc. and RoseMoon, Inc., re: 751© Five-Year Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order Against Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China: Substantive Response of Domestic Interested Parties," dated July 1, 2016 at Attachment B.

³⁵ See SAA at 890.

or suspension agreement in place.³⁶ The Department finds that the margin calculated in the final determination, or in this case the amended final determination, to be the best indicator of the margins likely to prevail if the order were revoked, because it is the only calculated rate without the discipline of an order in place.

Therefore, consistent with section 752(c)(3) and section 752(c)(4)(A) of the Act, the Department will report to the ITC the corresponding individual company rates and the PRC-wide rate from the amended final determination, as noted in the "Final Results of Review" section below.

VI. FINAL RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

The Department determines that revocation of the *Order* on cased pencils from the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The Department determines that the magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins up to 53.65 percent.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

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

Agree

Disagree

Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

(Date)

³⁶ See *Eveready Battery Company v. United States*, 77 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1333 (CIT 1999); See also SAA at 890.

Attachment

History of the Antidumping Duty Order

Investigation	
Determination	Margin
<p><i>Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China, 59 FR 55625 (November 8, 1994) and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China, 59 FR 66909 (December 28, 1994)</i></p>	<p>Manufacturer/producer/exporter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/China First: 0% • China First/Any other manufacturer: 44.66% • Guangdong/Three Star Stationery: 0% • Guangdong/Any other manufacturer: 44.66% • SFTC: 8.31% • Shanghai Lansheng: 17.45% • PRC-Wide Rate: 44.66%
<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amended Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance With Final Court Decision, 64 FR 25275 (May 11, 1999)</i></p>	<p>Manufacturer/producer/exporter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 8.60% • Shanghai Lansheng: 19.36% • Shanghai Foreign Trade Corp (SFTC): 11.15% • Guangdong Stationery/Three Star Stationery: 0% • Guangdong Stationery/all other producers: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%

Administrative and New Shipper Reviews		
Segment	Determination	Margins
1994-1995 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62FR 24636 (May 6, 1997), as amended, 62 FR 36491 (July 8, 1997)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/China First: 0% • China First: 53.65% • Shanghai FTC: 8.31% • Three Star/Guangdong: 0% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
1995-1996 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 63FR 779 (January 7, 1998)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/China First: 0% • China First: 53.65% • Shanghai FTC: 8.31% • Three Star/Guangdong: 0% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
1996-1997 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 64FR 2171 (January 13, 1999)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/China First: 0% • China First: 53.65% • Shanghai FTC: 8.31% • Three Star/Guangdong: 0% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
1998-1999 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 66 FR 37638 (July 19, 2001)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 53.65% • Shanghai FTC: 8.31% • Three Star/Guangdong: 0% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
1999-2000 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 67 FR 48612 (July 25, 2002), amended final results published at 67 FR 59049 (September 19, 2002) and 71 FR 65777 (November 9,</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 6.32% • SFTC: 12.98% • Kaiyuan: 114.90% • Guangdong: 13.91% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%

<p>2000-2001 Administrative Review</p>	<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 68 FR 43082 (July 21, 2003)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CalCedar-Tianjin: 0% • Rongxin: 15.76% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
<p>2001-2002 Administrative Review</p>	<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 69 FR. 29266 (May 21, 2004), amended final results published at 71 FR 45767 (August 10, 2006)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/Three Star: 16.50% • SFTC: 5.63% • Rongxin: 4.21% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
<p>2002-2003 Administrative Review</p>	<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 70 FR. 42301 (July 22, 2005, as amended, 70 FR 51337(August 30, 2005)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/Three Star: 0.15% • SFTC: 12.69% • Rongxin: 22.63% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
<p>2003-2004 Administrative Review</p>	<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 71 FR 38366 (July 6, 2006)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/Three Star: 26.62% • Shanghai FTC: 25.70% • Rongxin: 12.37% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
<p>2004-2005 Administrative Review</p>	<p><i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 72 FR 27074 (May 14, 2007)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 2.66% • Shanghai First Writing Instrument Co., Ltd.: 2.66% • Shanghai Great Wall Pencil Co., Ltd./Three Star: 2.66% • Dixon: 2.66% • Rongxin: 2.66%

2006-2007 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 74 FR 33406 (July 13, 2009), as amended, 74 FR 45177 (September 1, 2009) and 76 FR 4285 (January 25, 2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 1.13% • Three Star: 3.06% • Rongxin: 11.48% • SFTC: 1.66% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
2007-2008 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 75 FR 38980 (July 7, 2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 1.00% • Three Star: 6.10% • Dixon: 3.55% • SFTC: 3.55% • Rongxin: 3.55% • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
2010-2011 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination To Revoke Order In Part</i> , 78 FR 42932 (July 18, 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dixon: 0%
2012-2013 Administrative Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 80 FR 26897 (May 11, 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRC-Wide Rate: 114.90%
2000-2001 New Shipper Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review</i> , 67 FR 11462 (March 14, 2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rescinded
2001-2002 New Shipper Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review</i> , 68 FR 62427 (Nov. 4, 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rescinded

Sunset Reviews		
Determination		Margins
First Sunset Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order, 65 FR 41431 (July 5, 2000)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 8.60% • Shanghai Lansheng: 19.36% • SFTC: 11.15% • Guangdong/Three Star: 0% • Guangdong/all other producers: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
Second Sunset Review	<i>Cased Pencils from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order, 70 FR 67427 (Nov. 7, 2005)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First/Three Star: 8.60% • Shanghai Lansheng: 19.36% • SFTC: 11.15% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%
Third Sunset Review	<i>Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order, 76 FR 12323 (March 7, 2011)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China First: 8.60% • Shanghai Lansheng: 19.36% • Shanghai FTC: 11.15% • Three Star: 0% • Guangdong: 53.65% • PRC-Wide Rate: 53.65%