



A-570-881
Sunset Review 2019
Public Document
E&C/OIII: LG

October 28, 2019

MEMORANDUM TO: Jeffrey I. Kessler
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: James Maeder
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China

I. SUMMARY

We analyzed the substantive response submitted jointly by two domestic interested parties, Anvil International, LLC¹ and Ward Manufacturing (collectively, domestic interested parties) in this third sunset review of the antidumping duty (AD) order² covering certain malleable cast iron pipe fittings (malleable pipe fittings) from the People's Republic of China (China). No respondent interested party submitted a substantive response. Accordingly, we conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2). The following is a complete list of the 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 margin likely to prevail.

In accordance with our analysis of the domestic interested parties' substantive response, we recommend that you approve the positions described in the instant memorandum.

¹ Anvil International Inc., the predecessor to Anvil International, LLC, was one of the petitioners in the initial less-than-fair-value investigation of this proceeding. Ward Manufacturing was also a petitioner in the initial investigation.

² See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 69376 (December 12, 2003) (*Order*).

II. BACKGROUND

On July 1, 2019, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) published the notice of initiation of the third sunset review of the *Order* on malleable pipe fittings from China, pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act.³ On July 9, 2019, Commerce received a notice of intent to participate from the domestic interested parties within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i).⁴ On July 31, 2019, Commerce received a complete substantive response from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).⁵ We received no substantive response from respondent interested parties. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), Commerce conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the *Order*.

III. SCOPE OF THE ORDER

The products covered by the *Order* are certain malleable iron pipe fittings, cast, other than grooved fittings, from the People's Republic of China. The merchandise is currently classifiable under item numbers 7307.19.30.60, 7307.19.30.85, 7307.19.90.30, 7307.19.90.60, 7307.19.90.80, and 7326.90.86.88 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Excluded from the scope of this order are metal compression couplings, which are imported under HTSUS number 7307.19.90.80. A metal compression coupling consists of a coupling body, two gaskets, and two compression nuts. These products range in diameter from ½ inch to 2 inches and are carried only in galvanized finish. Although HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, Commerce's written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

IV. HISTORY OF THE ORDER

Final Determination of Sales at Less-than-Fair Value and Order

On December 12, 2003, Commerce published the *Order* with respect to imports of malleable pipe fittings from China. In the initial *Order*, we established the following weighted-average dumping margins:

| Exporter/Manufacturer | Margin (percent)⁶ |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Beijing Sai Lin Ke Hardware Co. Ltd. (SLK) | 15.92 |
| Langfang Pannext Pipe Fitting Co., Ltd. (Pannext) | 7.35 |
| Chengde Malleable Iron General Factory (Chengde) | 11.18 |

³ See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 84 FR 31304 (July 1, 2019).

⁴ See Domestic Interested Parties' Letter, "Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from China, Third Sunset Review: Notice of Intent to Participate," dated July 9, 2019.

⁵ See Domestic Interested Parties' Letter, "Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from China, Third Sunset Review: Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation," dated July 31, 2019 (Substantive Response).

⁶ See *Order*; see also *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 65873 (November 24, 2003) (*Final Determination*).

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| SCE Co., Ltd. (SCE) | 11.18 |
| Jinan Meide Casting Co., Ltd. (JMC) | 11.31 |
| PRC-Wide | 111.36 |

Commerce conducted one administrative review prior to the *First Sunset*.⁷ Commerce then rescinded the December 1, 2004 through November 30, 2005, administrative review based on the timely withdrawal of a request for review submitted by LDR Industries, Inc. (LDR) and SLK.⁸ Commerce also rescinded the December 1, 2005 through November 30, 2006, administrative review and December 1, 2006 through November 30, 2007 administrative review based on the timely withdrawals of requests for review submitted by SLK and Mueller Comercial de Mexico, D. de R.L. de C.V (Mueller).⁹

In the *First Sunset*, we found that revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping.¹⁰ In addition, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.¹¹ Thus, Commerce published the notice of continuation of the *Order*.¹²

After the *First Sunset*, Commerce initiated two administrative reviews, the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 reviews, each of which was rescinded based on the timely withdrawal of the request for review from the requesting company (LDR/SLK and Mueller/Southland Pipe Nipples Company, Inc. (Southland) in 2007-2008 and Mueller/Southland in 2008-2009).¹³ After the 2008-2009 review, there were no requests for review in response to the annual publication in the *Federal Register* of notification of the opportunity to request administrative review in the anniversary month of the *Order*. As such, Commerce did not conduct an administrative review of the *Order* for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, or 2012-2013 periods.

⁷ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 74 FR 10239 (March 10, 2009) (*First Sunset*).

⁸ See *Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China*, 71 FR 14500 (March 22, 2006).

⁹ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 9731 (March 5, 2007); see also *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 9998 (February 25, 2008).

¹⁰ See *First Sunset*.

¹¹ See *Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings from China*, 74 FR 16233 (April 9, 2009); see also USITC Publication 4069 (Inv. No. 731-TA-1021 (Review)) (April 2009).

¹² See *Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order on Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China*, 74 FR 18349 (April 22, 2009).

¹³ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of the 2007-2008 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 74 FR 10548 (March 11, 2009); see also *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of the 2008-2009 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 75 FR 10216 (March 5, 2010).

In the *Second Sunset*, we again found that revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping.¹⁴ In addition, the ITC determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.¹⁵ Thus, Commerce published the notice of continuation of the *Order*.¹⁶ Since the *Second Sunset*, Commerce initiated two administrative reviews, the 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 reviews, both of which were rescinded.¹⁷

Commerce has not conducted any new shipper reviews, changed circumstance proceedings, or found duty absorption over the history of the *Order*. Commerce has issued six scope rulings over the history of the *Order*, five of which have been issued since the last notice of continuation of the *Order*.¹⁸ The *Order* remains in effect for all Chinese producers and exporters of malleable pipe fittings.

V. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

In accordance with section 751(c) of the Act, Commerce is conducting this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making this determination, Commerce shall consider 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 AD order.

In accordance with the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically the Statement of Administrative Action,¹⁹ the House

¹⁴ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 79 FR 42291 (July 21, 2014) (*Second Sunset*).

¹⁵ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from China*, 79 FR 45460 (August 5, 2014); see also USITC Publication 4484 (Inv. No. 731-TA-1021) (August 2014).

¹⁶ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order*, 79 FR 47089 (August 12, 2014).

¹⁷ See *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2015-2016*, 82 FR 24677 (May 30, 2017); see also *Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017-2018*, 84 FR 22809 (May 20, 2019).

¹⁸ See *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 84 FR 50385 (September 25, 2019) (stainless steel castings imported by MCC Holdings dba Crane, and electrical conduit fittings imported by Steel Electric Products Company, Inc.); see also *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 84 FR 44849 (August 27, 2019) (electrical conduit fittings imported by Atkore Steel Components, Inc.; reversing prior scope finding in *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 83 FR 26257 (June 6, 2018)); and Memorandum, "Final Scope Ruling concerning Certain Cast Iron Pipe Connectors," dated October 26, 2016 (certain cast iron pipe connectors imported by AETAS Corporation). For the scope ruling completed prior to the last continuation notice, see *Notice of Scope Rulings*, 70 FR 41374 (July 19, 2005) (gas meter swivels and nuts, requested by Sango International L.P.).

¹⁹ See Statement of Administrative Action Accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H.R. Doc. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994) (SAA) at 879. .

Report,²⁰ and the Senate Report,²¹ Commerce's determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide, rather than a company-specific, basis.²² In addition, Commerce normally determines that revocation of an AD duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping when: (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; (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.²³ Alternatively, Commerce may 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.²⁴

In addition, as a base period of import volume comparison, it is Commerce'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 the investigation may dampen import volumes and, thus, skew the comparison.²⁵ When analyzing import volumes for second and subsequent sunset reviews, Commerce's practice is to compare import volumes during the year preceding initiation of the underlying investigation to import volumes since the issuance of the last continuation notice.²⁶

Further, section 752(c)(3) of the Act states that Commerce shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Generally, Commerce 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.²⁷ In certain circumstances, however, 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, {Commerce} may conclude that exporters are likely to continue dumping at the lower rates found in a more recent review").²⁸

In February 2012, Commerce 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 (*i.e.*, zeroing/the denial

²⁰ See H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) (House Report).

²¹ See S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (Senate Report).

²² See SAA at 879; *see also* House Report at 56.

²³ See SAA at 889-890; *see also* House Report at 63-64; Senate Report at 52; and *Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871, 18872 (April 16, 1998) (*Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

²⁴ See SAA at 889-890; *see also* House Report at 63.

²⁵ 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 (IDM) at Comment 1.

²⁶ See *Ferrovandium from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of South Africa: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 79 FR 14216 (March 13, 2014), and accompanying IDM.

²⁷ 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 IDM at Comment 2.

²⁸ See SAA at 890-91.

of offsets).²⁹ In the *Final Modification*, Commerce stated that “only in the most extraordinary circumstances” would it rely on margins other than those calculated and published in prior determinations.³⁰ Commerce further stated that, apart from the “most extraordinary circumstances,” it did not anticipate needing to recalculate dumping margins in the vast majority of future sunset determinations and, instead 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.”³¹ Commerce “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 adverse facts available, and dumping margins where no offsets were denied because all comparison results were positive.”³²

Finally, pursuant to section 752(c)(4)(A) of the Act, a dumping margin of zero or *de minimis* shall not by itself require Commerce 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 (LTFV).³³ Below we address the comments submitted by the domestic interested parties.

VI. DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Domestic Interested Parties’ Comments:

Domestic interested parties believe that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by the manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise by margins equivalent to or greater than those found in the original investigation.³⁴ According to the domestic interested parties, the record demonstrates that dumping above the *de minimis* level has persisted in the U.S. market since the issuance of the *Order*, and that Chinese producers are thus likely to continue to engage in dumping in the absence of the *Order*.³⁵

Commerce’s Position: As explained in the Legal Framework section above, Commerce’s determinations of likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping will be made on an order-wide basis.³⁶ When determining whether revocation of the *Order* would be likely to lead to

²⁹ 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*).

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ 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 IDM at Comment 1.

³⁴ See Substantive Response at 3.

³⁵ *Id.* at 8.

³⁶ See SAA at 879; see also House Report at 56.

continuation of dumping, sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act instruct Commerce 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 *Order*.

Pursuant to section 752(c)(1)(A) of the Act, Commerce first considered the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and any subsequent reviews. We note that the margins determined for the individual company respondents in the investigation and administrative review were based on the zeroing methodology. In the *Second Sunset*, Commerce determined that these rates should be recalculated without using the zeroing methodology.³⁷ However, Commerce found dumping at above *de minimis* levels with respect to the China-wide entity in the investigation, and a 111.36 percent margin is in effect for all exporters of subject merchandise from China except for those companies that have their own rate. Thus, entries of subject merchandise into the United States after issuance of the *Order* were assessed at above *de minimis* AD rates. As noted above, Commerce normally determines that revocation of an AD order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping when dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after issuance of the order.

In addition, pursuant to section 752(c)(1)(B) of the Act, Commerce also considers the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the AD order. In the *First Sunset*, upon review of import statistics obtained from the ITC Trade Data Web, we found that U.S. imports of malleable pipe fittings from China increased from the 2001 pre-*Order* period levels in comparison to the post-*Order* period levels.³⁸ Additionally, we found that the level of imports of subject merchandise from China fluctuated in volume during the five-year period of the first sunset review, and that imports of malleable pipe fittings from China were higher in volume at the time of the *First Sunset* than before the *Order* was put in place.³⁹ In the second sunset, using statistics provided by the Global Trade Atlas (GTA), Commerce found that U.S. imports of malleable pipe fittings from China remained consistent with the levels of trade evaluated in the first sunset review and which resulted in the first continuation of the *Order*.⁴⁰

As noted above, when analyzing import volumes for second and subsequent sunset reviews, Commerce's practice is to compare import volumes during the year preceding initiation of the underlying investigation (*i.e.*, 2001 for this sunset review) to import volumes since the issuance of the last continuation notice. The last continuation notice for this sunset review was issued July 21, 2014.⁴¹ In analyzing import volumes for the five-year period following issuance of the notice of continuation of the *Order* (*i.e.*, 2014 through 2018), we have determined that the annual import volumes of subject merchandise from China for relevant, non-broad basket HTSUS subheadings listed in the scope of the *Order* (*i.e.* HTSUS 7307.19.90.60, 7307.19.90.80, and

³⁷ See *Second Sunset*, and accompanying IDM at 8.

³⁸ See *First Sunset*, and accompanying IDM at 5 and Attachment I.

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ See *Second Sunset*.

7307.19.90.30)⁴² are significantly higher than the pre-initiation volume and maintained and generally exceeded the levels observed in the prior sunset review period for each subcategory and in total, steadily increasing year upon year to the highest levels observed either prior to the *Order*, or in any sunset review period since, for each category, including 7307.19.90.60 (which is the primary distinct category under which subject merchandise enters).⁴³

If companies continue to dump with the discipline of an AD order in place, it is reasonable to assume that dumping would continue if the AD order were removed.⁴⁴ Therefore, pursuant to section 752(c)(1) of the Act, because an above *de minimis* dumping margin applies to post-*Order* entries of subject merchandise, we find that companies continued to dump notwithstanding the discipline of the *Order* and, thus, dumping is likely to continue or recur if the *Order* is revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail

Domestic Interested Parties' Comments:

According to the domestic interested parties, the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* and SAA indicate that, when determining the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if an order were revoked, Commerce will normally select a dumping margin from the original investigation.⁴⁵ Accordingly, the domestic interested parties assert that the dumping margin that should be reported by Commerce to the ITC is the margin calculated without zeroing in the original investigation: 111.36 for the China-wide entity.⁴⁶ The domestic interested parties cite the rationale provided in the SAA which states that “[t]he Administration intends that Commerce normally will select the rate from the investigation, because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters . . . without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place.”⁴⁷ The domestic interested parties assert that the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* acknowledges that the SAA reflects appropriate policy and provides the following guidance:

{T}he Department normally will provide the company-specific margin from the investigation for each company regardless of whether the margin was calculated using a company’s own information or based on best information available or facts available.⁴⁸

The domestic interested parties note that in the *Second Sunset*, the dumping margin for the China-wide entity in the investigation was based on the information contained in the

⁴² Other HTSUS subheadings listed in the scope of the *Order* are either non-distinct to subject merchandise and/or did not provide available information from prior sunset reviews from which to allow comparison. Use of these three HTSUS subheadings is consistent with those used in prior sunset reviews of the *Order*. See, e.g., *Second Sunset* IDM at Attachment I.

⁴³ See Attachment.

⁴⁴ See SAA at 890.

⁴⁵ See Substantive Response at 8-9 (citing to *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873; and SAA at 890).

⁴⁶ See Substantive Response at 9.

⁴⁷ *Id.* (citing to SAA at 890).

⁴⁸ *Id.* (citing to *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18873).

petition.⁴⁹ Thus, this dumping margin does not include zeroing and is consistent with the *Final Modification*.⁵⁰ Accordingly, Commerce should follow the SAA and its own *Sunset Policy Bulletin* by reporting to the ITC the dumping margin calculated in the investigation for the China-wide entity as the margin likely to prevail if the *Order* were revoked.

Commerce's Position: Pursuant to section 752(c)(3) of the Act, Commerce shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if the *Order* were revoked. Generally, Commerce will select a weighted-average dumping margin from the investigation to report to the ITC.⁵¹ Commerce's preference is to select a weighted-average dumping margin from the LTFV investigation because it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of the producers and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place.⁵² Under certain circumstances, however, we may select a more recent rate to report to the ITC. Additionally, as explained above, in accordance with the *Final Modification*, Commerce will not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that it calculated using the methodology found to be WTO-inconsistent.⁵³

For companies not investigated individually, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, Commerce will normally provide a rate based on the all-others rate from the investigation. However, Commerce considers China to be a nonmarket economy under section 771(18) of the Act and, thus, instead of an all-others rate, Commerce uses a rate established for the China-wide entity, which it applies to all imports from an exporter that has not established its eligibility for a separate rate.⁵⁴

As indicated in the Legal Framework section above, our current practice is to not rely on weighted-average dumping margins calculated using the zeroing methodology, consistent with the *Final Modification*. 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.⁵⁵ In the *Final Determination*, SLK, JMC, and Pannext were assigned individually calculated dumping margins.⁵⁶ We note that these margins were calculated using the zeroing methodology. As discussed above and following our current practice, Commerce determined that these rates should be recalculated without using the zeroing methodology. Upon recalculating these rates without the zeroing methodology in the *Second*

⁴⁹ *Id.* (citing to *Second Sunset* and accompanying IDM at 7-8).

⁵⁰ *Id.* (citing to *Second Sunset* and accompanying IDM at 8).

⁵¹ 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 IDM at Comment 2.

⁵² See *Final Modification*, 77 FR at 8103.

⁵³ See SAA at 890.

⁵⁴ See *Paper Clips from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 76 FR 26242 (May 6, 2011), and accompanying IDM at Comment 2; see also 19 CFR 351.107(d).

⁵⁵ See *Final Modification*, 77 FR at 8103.

⁵⁶ See *Final Determination*, 68 FR at 65874. Chengde and SCE were assigned separate rate margins based on the weighted-average of the three individually reviewed respondents' calculated margins.

Sunset, we determined that the recalculated rate for each individually examined respondent was *de minimis*.⁵⁷ However, the dumping margin for the China-wide entity in the AD investigation was based on the dumping margin from the petition and, therefore, does not include zeroing and is thus consistent with the *Final Modification*. Therefore, consistent with our finding in the *Second Sunset*, we determine that the margin for the China-wide entity originally calculated in the *Final Determination* does not need to be recalculated and will be reported to the ITC without modification.

VII. FINAL RESULTS OF THIRD EXPEDITED SUNSET REVIEW

We determine that revocation of the AD duty order on malleable pipe fittings from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins of up to 111.36 percent.

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 this sunset review in the *Federal Register* and notify the ITC of our determination.

Agree

Disagree

10/28/2019

X 

Signed by: JEFFREY KESSLER

Jeffrey I. Kessler
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

⁵⁷ See *Second Sunset*, and accompanying IDM at 8.

ATTACHMENT

Imports of Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings into United States from the People's Republic of China

United States Import Statistics From China

Commodity: 730719, Pipe Or Tube Fittings, Cast, Of Iron NesoI Or Steel

Year To Date: January - December

| Commodity | Unit | Description | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Total Second Sunset | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | Total Current Period | Increase from Prior Period |
|--------------|-----------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 7307199060 | KG | Tube/Pipe Fittings, Threaded, Iron Or Steel, Cast | 8,882,58 | 8,754,304 | 14,060,073 | 12,633,512 | 14,908,490 | 17,532,33 | 20,526,635 | 17,934,995 | 17,589,42 | 11,505,220 | 17,400,21 | 18,256,515 | 20,163,325 | 20,183,44 | 87,508,716 | 19,996,666 | 21,133,294 | 22,582,722 | 21,951,684 | 23,711,580 | 109,375,946 | 25% |
| 7307199080 | KG | Oth Tube/Pipe Fittings, Iron Or Steel, Cast, NesoI | 2,981,860 | 2,997,628 | 4,405,398 | 3,336,544 | 4,040,491 | 5,365,88 | 4,168,036 | 3,530,152 | 3,454,300 | 2,499,219 | 4,038,548 | 3,386,848 | 3,111,795 | 2,958,32 | 15,994,724 | 4,849,030 | 4,340,618 | 3,753,036 | 3,827,437 | 5,416,857 | 22,186,978 | 39% |
| 7307199030 | KG | Unions, Pipe, Of Iron Or Steel Cast | 374,984 | 443,238 | 466,720 | 570,043 | 401,263 | 489,566 | 781,015 | 1,208,503 | 1,584,797 | 856,75 | 1,977,39 | 2,039,052 | 1,944,324 | 2,109,31 | 8,926,805 | 2,169,284 | 2,783,548 | 2,284,304 | 2,015,542 | 2,063,458 | 11,316,16 | 27% |
| Total | KG | All | 12,239,420 | 12,195,167 | 18,932,188 | 16,540,100 | 19,350,244 | 23,387,789 | 25,475,686 | 22,673,648 | 22,628,530 | 14,861,154 | 23,416,154 | 23,682,416 | 25,219,444 | 25,251,077 | 112,430,245 | 27,014,980 | 28,257,460 | 28,620,062 | 27,794,663 | 31,191,898 | 142,879,060 | 27% |
| | | | Pre-Investigation period (approx.) | | POI-period (approx.) | | First Sunset Period | | | | | Second Sunset Period | | | | | Current Sunset Period | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Avg Yearly Imports = 22,703,179 / Total Imports = 113,515,897 | | | | | Avg Yearly Imports = 22,486,049 / Total Imports = 112,430,245 | | | | | Avg Yearly Imports = 28,575,812 / Total Imports = 142,879,060 | | | | | | |

Source of Data: Global Trade Atlas

