

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-560-822, A-557-813, A-570-886, A-583-843, A-549-821, A-552-806, C-552-805]

Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Indonesia, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders and Countervailing Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) and the International Trade Commission (the ITC) have determined that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) orders on polyethylene retail carrier bags (PRCBs) from Indonesia, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China (PRC), Taiwan, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Vietnam) would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States. The Department and the ITC have also determined that revocation of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on PRCBs from Vietnam would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of net countervailable subsidies and material injury to an industry in the United States. Therefore, the Department is publishing a notice of continuation of the AD orders and CVD order.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 5, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Schauer or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0410 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 1, 2015, the Department initiated ¹ and the ITC instituted ² five-year (sunset) reviews of the AD orders on PRCBs from Indonesia, Malaysia, the PRC, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam, and the CVD order on PRCBs from Vietnam ³ pursuant to section 751(c) of

the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). As a result of its reviews, the Department determined that revocation of the AD orders would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and that revocation of the CVD order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of net countervailable subsidies. Therefore, the Department notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins and the net countervailable subsidy rate likely to prevail should the orders be revoked, pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(b) and (c) of the Act.⁴

On April 22, 2016, the ITC published its determination that revocation of the AD orders on PRCBs from Indonesia, Malaysia, the PRC, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam and the CVD order on PRCBs from Vietnam would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act.⁵

Scopes of the Orders

The merchandise covered in the sunset reviews of the AD orders on PRCBs from Indonesia, Malaysia, the PRC, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam and the CVD order on PRCBs from Vietnam is PRCBs, which may be referred to as t-shirt sacks, merchandise bags, grocery bags, or checkout bags. The subject merchandise is defined as non-sealable sacks and bags with handles (including drawstrings), without zippers or integral extruded closures, with or without gussets, with or without printing, of polyethylene film having a thickness no greater than 0.035 inch (0.889 mm) and no less than 0.00035 inch (0.00889 mm), and with no length or width shorter than 6 inches (15.24 cm) or longer than 40 inches (101.6 cm). The depth of the bag may be

shorter than 6 inches but not longer than 40 inches (101.6 cm).

PRCBs are typically provided without any consumer packaging and free of charge by retail establishments, e.g., grocery, drug, convenience, department, specialty retail, discount stores, and restaurants, to their customers to package and carry their purchased products. The scope of the order excludes (1) polyethylene bags that are not printed with logos or store names and that are closeable with drawstrings made of polyethylene film and (2) polyethylene bags that are packed in consumer packaging with printing that refers to specific end-uses other than packaging and carrying merchandise from retail establishments, e.g., garbage bags, lawn bags, trash-can liners.

As a result of changes to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), imports of the subject merchandise are currently classifiable under statistical category 3923.21.0085 of the HTSUS. Furthermore, although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Continuation of the Orders

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the ITC that revocation of the AD orders and the CVD order would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and, in the case of Vietnam, countervailable subsidies, and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(a), the Department hereby orders the continuation of the AD orders on PRCBs from Indonesia, Malaysia, the PRC, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam and the CVD order on PRCBs from Vietnam. U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise.

The effective date of the continuation of the AD orders and the CVD order will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2), the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of this continuation notice.

These five-year sunset reviews and this notice are in accordance with sections 751(c) and 751(d)(2) of the Act and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Malaysia, 69 FR 48203 (August 9, 2004); *Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From the People's Republic of China*, 69 FR 48201 (August 9, 2004); *Antidumping Duty Order: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Thailand*, 69 FR 48204 (August 9, 2004); and *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Countervailing Duty Order*, 75 FR 23670 (May 4, 2010).

⁴ See *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Indonesia, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 80 FR 39997 (July 13, 2015), and *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of Expedited First Sunset Review of the Countervailing Duty Order*, 80 FR 46539 (August 5, 2015).

⁵ See *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam: Determinations*, 81 FR 23749 (April 22, 2016). See also the letter from the ITC Chairman Meredith M. Broadbent to Deputy Assistant Secretary Christian Marsh dated April 18, 2016.

¹ See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 80 FR 17388 (April 1, 2015).

² See *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam: Institution of Five-Year Reviews*, 80 FR 17490 (April 1, 2015).

³ See *Antidumping Duty Orders: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Indonesia, Taiwan, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam*, 75 FR 23667 (May 4, 2010); *Antidumping Duty Order:*

Dated: April 28, 2016.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016-10625 Filed 5-4-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-867]

Large Power Transformers From the Republic of Korea: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is amending its final results in the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on large power transformers from the Republic of Korea (Korea) for the period August 1, 2013, through July 31, 2014, to correct a ministerial error.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 5, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Davis (Hyosung) or Edythe Artman (Hyundai), AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-7924 or (202) 482-3931, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 6, 2016, the Department published the final results for the 2013/2014 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on large power transformers from Korea.¹

On March 16, 2016, Petitioner, ABB Inc., and one of the respondents, Hyosung Corporation and HICO America, Inc. (collectively, Hyosung), submitted allegations of ministerial errors. The other respondent, Hyundai Heavy Industries Co., Ltd. and Hyundai Corporation, USA (collectively, Hyundai) and Petitioner filed comments on the allegations on March 21, 2016. Based on our analysis of the allegations, we made changes to the calculation of the weighted-average dumping margin

for Hyosung and for the non-individually examined respondents.²

Scope of the Order

The scope of this order covers large liquid dielectric power transformers (LPTs) having a top power handling capacity greater than or equal to 60,000 kilovolt amperes (60 megavolt amperes), whether assembled or unassembled, complete or incomplete.

Incomplete LPTs are subassemblies consisting of the active part and any other parts attached to, imported with or invoiced with the active parts of LPTs. The “active part” of the transformer consists of one or more of the following when attached to or otherwise assembled with one another: the steel core or shell, the windings, electrical insulation between the windings, the mechanical frame for an LPT.

The product definition encompasses all such LPTs regardless of name designation, including but not limited to step-up transformers, step-down transformers, autotransformers, interconnection transformers, voltage regulator transformers, rectifier transformers, and power rectifier transformers.

The LPTs subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 8504.23.0040, 8504.23.0080 and 8504.90.9540 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Ministerial Error

Section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.224(f) define a “ministerial error” as an error “in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other similar type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial.”

Hyosung argues that in the *Final Results*, the Department did not update certain programming language in the Margin Calculation Program. As a result, Hyosung contends, the programming language did not fully implement the Department’s intended changes. We

agree with Hyosung and, therefore, have corrected our Margin Calculation Program.³ As a result, the weighted-average dumping margin for Hyosung changes from 9.40 percent to 7.89 percent. Furthermore, the rate for the respondents not selected for individual examination, which is based on the weighted, simple-average of the two respondents selected for individual examination, changes from 6.74 percent to 5.98 percent.⁴

Hyosung also claimed that the Department erred in its application of a freight-revenue cap, but we find this claim does not constitute a ministerial error within the meaning of 735(e) of the Act or 19 CFR 351.224(f), because our adjustment is methodological in nature and the adjustment we made was consistent with our stated intention in the *Final Results*.⁵

Finally, Petitioner argued that the Department made a ministerial error when it determined it was not necessary to cap sales-related revenues of directly-associated expenses in the calculation of Hyundai’s final dumping margin. We find that this claim does not constitute a ministerial error within the meaning of 735(e) of the Act or 19 CFR 351.224(f), as our decision is methodological in nature and our intent to not impose any such caps is reflected in our final margin calculations.⁶

Amended Final Results of the Review

The Department determines that the following amended weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period August 1, 2013, through July 31, 2014:

Company	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Hyosung Corporation	7.89
Hyundai Heavy Industries Co., Ltd	4.07
ILJIN Electric Co., Ltd	5.98
ILJIN	5.98
LSIS Co., Ltd	5.98

Disclosure

We will disclose the calculation memorandum used in our analysis to parties to this segment of the proceeding within five days of the date of the publication of these amended final results pursuant to 19 CFR 351.224(b).

³ See Ministerial Error Memorandum at 3.

⁴ The rate applied to the non-selected companies (i.e., ILJIN, ILJIN Electric, and LSIS) is a simple average percentage margin calculated based on Hyosung’s and Hyundai’s dumping margins for the period August 1, 2013, through July 31, 2014.

⁵ See Ministerial Error Memorandum at 3-5.

⁶ *Id.* at 6-7.

¹ See *Large Power Transformers From the Republic of Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 81 FR 14087 (March 6, 2016) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (*Final Results*).

² This analysis is set forth in the Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, from Scot Fullerton, Director, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, Office VI, on the subject of “Ministerial Error Memorandum for the Amended Final Results of the 2013/2014 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Large Power Transformers from the Republic of Korea”, dated April 29, 2016 (Ministerial Error Memorandum).