

Suspension Agreements

None

Duty Absorption Reviews

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under 19 CFR 351.211 or a determination under 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Gap Period Liquidation

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures “gap” period, of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the POR.

Administrative Protective Orders and Letters of Appearance

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with the procedures outlined in Commerce’s regulations at 19 CFR 351.305. Those procedures apply to administrative reviews included in this notice of initiation. Parties wishing to participate in any of these administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

Factual Information Requirements

Commerce’s regulations identify five categories of factual information in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21), which are summarized as follows: (i) Evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by Commerce; and (v) evidence other than factual information

described in (i)–(iv). These regulations require any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. The regulations, at 19 CFR 351.301, also provide specific time limits for such factual submissions based on the type of factual information being submitted. Please review the final rule, available at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/2013/1304frn/2013-08227.txt>, prior to submitting factual information in this segment.

Any party submitting factual information in an antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.¹⁰ Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials as well as their representatives. All segments of any antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.¹¹ Commerce intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

Extension of Time Limits Regulation

Parties may request an extension of time limits before a time limit established under part 351 expires, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. See 19 CFR 351.302. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the time limit established under part 351 expires. For submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Examples include, but are not limited to: (1) Case and rebuttal briefs, filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309; (2) factual information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c), or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2), filed pursuant to 19

CFR 351.301(c)(3) and rebuttal, clarification and correction filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(iv); (3) comments concerning the selection of a surrogate country and surrogate values and rebuttal; (4) comments concerning U.S. Customs and Border Protection data; and (5) quantity and value questionnaires. Under certain circumstances, Commerce may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, Commerce will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. This modification also requires that an extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission, and clarifies the circumstances under which Commerce will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after October 21, 2013. Please review the final rule, available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm>, prior to submitting factual information in these segments.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: November 8, 2018.

James Maeder,

Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations performing the duties of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2018–24943 Filed 11–14–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[C–570–085]

Certain Quartz Surface Products From the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, in Part, in the Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of certain quartz surface products (quartz surface products) from certain producers and

¹⁰ See section 782(b) of the Act.

¹¹ See *Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*); see also the frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.

exporters from the People's Republic of China (China).

DATES: Applicable November 15, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Darla Brown, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1791.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 17, 2018, Commerce received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of quartz surface products from China filed in proper form on behalf of the petitioner, Cambria Company LLC.¹ On May 16, 2018, we initiated this investigation,² and on September 21, 2018, we published an affirmative *Preliminary Determination*.³

Commerce selected Fasa Industrial Corporation, Limited (Fasa Industrial), Foshan Yixin Stone Co., Ltd. (Foshan Yixin), and Foshan Hero Stone Co., Ltd. (Hero Stone) as the individually-examined respondents in this investigation. With respect to Hero Stone and Fasa Industrial, in the *Preliminary Determination* we based the subsidy rates for these respondents on adverse facts available (AFA), in accordance with section 776(a) and (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).⁴

On October 9, 2018, the petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of quartz surface products from China, pursuant to section 703(e)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.206.⁵

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.206(c)(1), if the petitioner submits an allegation of critical circumstances 30 days or more before the scheduled

date of the final determination,⁶ Commerce will make a preliminary finding whether there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that critical circumstances exist. Commerce will issue its preliminary finding of critical circumstances within 30 days after the petitioner submits the allegation.⁷

Period of Investigation (POI)

The POI is January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.

Critical Circumstances Allegation

The petitioner alleged a massive increase of imports of certain quartz surface products from China and provided monthly import data for the period January 2017 through August 2018.⁸ The petitioner states that a comparison of total imports, by quantity, for the period February 2018 through April 2018, to the period May 2018 through July 2018, shows that imports of quartz surface products from China increased by 81 percent,⁹ which is considered “massive” under 19 CFR 351.206(h)(2). The petitioner also alleges that there is a reasonable basis to believe that there are subsidies in this investigation which are inconsistent with the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures Agreement (SCM Agreement).¹⁰

Critical Circumstances Analysis

Section 703(e)(1) of the Act provides that Commerce will preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist if there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that: (A) The alleged countervailable subsidy is inconsistent with the SCM Agreement;¹¹ and (B) there have been massive imports of the subject merchandise over a relatively short period.

In determining whether there are “massive imports” over a “relatively short period,” pursuant to section 703(e)(1)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.206(h) and (i), Commerce normally compares the import volumes of the subject merchandise for at least three

months immediately preceding the filing of the petition (*i.e.*, the base period) to a comparable period of at least three months following the filing of the petition (*i.e.*, the comparison period). However, the regulations also provide that if Commerce finds that importers, or exporters or producers, had reason to believe, at some time prior to the beginning of the proceeding, that a proceeding was likely, Commerce may consider a period of not less than three months from the earlier time.¹² Imports must increase by at least 15 percent during the comparison period to be considered massive.¹³

Foshan Yixin

In the *Preliminary Determination*, we found that Foshan Yixin did not receive any countervailable subsidies during the POI that are inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.¹⁴ Accordingly, because the requirement under section 703(e)(1)(A) of the Act has not been met, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances do not exist with respect to Foshan Yixin.

Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone

As explained in our *Preliminary Determination*, we applied total adverse facts available (AFA) to Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act. In applying total AFA to these two companies, we preliminarily determined that both Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone benefited from countervailable subsidies under the “Export Assistance Grants” program.¹⁵ Although we did not make a preliminary finding as to whether the “Export Assistance Grants” program was inconsistent with the SCM Agreement in the *Preliminary Determination*, we now preliminarily find, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that the program, as alleged in the Petition and supported by information reasonably available to the petitioner, is export contingent within the meaning of section 771(5A)(B) of the Act and, thus, inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.¹⁶ We preliminarily found this program to have a program-specific rate of 0.58 percent.¹⁷ We are making the inconsistency determination

¹ See “Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Certain Quartz Surface Products from the People's Republic of China,” dated April 17, 2018 (Petition).

² See *Certain Quartz Surface Products from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation*, 83 FR 22618 (May 16, 2018) (*Initiation Notice*), and accompanying Initiation Checklist.

³ See *Certain Quartz Surface Products from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination, and Alignment of Final Determination with Final Antidumping Determination*, 83 FR 47881 (September 21, 2018) (*Preliminary Determination*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).

⁴ See *Preliminary Determination PDM at Use of Facts Otherwise Available and Adverse Inferences*.

⁵ See Letter from the petitioner, “Certain Quartz Surface Products from the People's Republic of China: Amendment to Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties to Allege Existence of Critical Circumstances,” dated October 9, 2018 (Critical Circumstances Allegation).

⁶ The final determination for this CVD investigation is currently due no later than January 28, 2019.

⁷ See 19 CFR 351.206(c)(2)(ii).

⁸ See Amended Critical Circumstances Allegation at Exhibit 1.

⁹ See Critical Circumstances Allegation at 2.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 5–6.

¹¹ Commerce limits its critical circumstances findings to those subsidies contingent upon export performance or use of domestic over imported goods (*i.e.*, those prohibited under Article 3 of the SCM Agreement). See *e.g.*, *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Negative Critical Circumstances Determination: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire from Germany*, 67 FR 55808, 55809–10 (August 30, 2002) (*Steel Wire from Germany*).

¹² See 19 CFR 351.206(i).

¹³ See 19 CFR 351.206(h)(2).

¹⁴ See *Preliminary Determination PDM at Analysis of Programs*.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 11.

¹⁶ See Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Quartz Surface Products from the People's Republic of China, dated May 7, 2018.

¹⁷ See *Preliminary Determination PDM at Appendix*.

with regard to this program, which had the lowest rate in the *Preliminary Determination* among the programs alleged to be inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. In so doing, we intend to limit the corresponding offset to the dumping margin (if one is found) in the companion antidumping duty investigation, which best fulfills our statutory mandate “to ensure that the party does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate than if it had cooperated fully,”¹⁸ and induce future cooperation by companies in investigations where the petitioners allege the existence of programs potentially inconsistent with the SCM Agreement.

Because we preliminarily find that the “Export Assistance Grants” program is export contingent, we preliminarily find that the criterion under section 703(e)(1)(A) of the Act has been met. In addition, for the purposes of the “massive imports” analysis, we preliminarily determine, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, that Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone shipped quartz surface products in “massive” quantities during the comparison period, thereby fulfilling the criteria under section 703(e)(1)(B) of the Act.¹⁹ As a result, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist with regard to Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone.

All Other Companies

We based the all-others rate applied in the *Preliminary Determination* on the rate preliminarily calculated for Foshan Yixin. As noted above, we preliminarily found that Foshan Yixin did not use any countervailable subsidies inconsistent with the SCM Agreement. As a result, we also preliminarily determine that all other exporters of subject merchandise from China not selected as mandatory respondents did not use countervailable subsidies inconsistent with the SCM Agreement, and thus preliminarily find that critical circumstances do not exist with respect to the companies covered by the all-others rate.

Final Determination

We will make a final determination concerning critical circumstances in the final determination of this investigation, which is currently scheduled for January 28, 2019.

¹⁸ Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H.R. Doc. 103–316, Vol. 1 (1994) at 870, reprinted in 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4040, 4199.

¹⁹ See Critical Circumstances Allegation at Exhibit 1.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance no later than seven days after the date on which the last verification report is issued in this investigation. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be submitted no later than five days after the deadline date for case briefs.²⁰ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2), parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this investigation are encouraged to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities.²¹

Electronically filed documents must be received successfully in their entirety by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on the due dates established above.²²

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 703(e)(2)(A) of the Act, for Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone, we will direct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to suspend liquidation of any unliquidated entries of subject merchandise from the China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after June 23, 2018, which is 90 days prior to the date of publication of the *Preliminary Determination* in the **Federal Register**. For such entries, CBP shall require a cash deposit equal to the estimated preliminary subsidy rates established for Fasa Industrial and Hero Stone in the *Preliminary Determination*. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 703(f) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of this preliminary determination of critical circumstances.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 8, 2018.

Gary Taverman,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2018–24941 Filed 11–14–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

²⁰ See 19 CFR 351.309(d)(1).

²¹ See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2).

²² See 19 CFR 351.303(b)(1).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–073]

Antidumping Duty Investigation of Common Alloy Aluminum Sheet From the People’s Republic of China: Affirmative Final Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair Value

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that common alloy aluminum sheet (common alloy sheet) from the People’s Republic of China (China) is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less-than-fair value (LTFV) for the period of investigation (POI) April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017.

DATES: Applicable November 15, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Hoefke or Julie Geiger, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4947 and (202) 482–2057, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 6, 2018, Commerce published in the **Federal Register** the *Preliminary Determination* and invited interested parties to comment.¹ On August 8, 2018, Commerce published in the **Federal Register** the *Amended Preliminary Determination*.² A summary of the events that occurred since Commerce published the *Preliminary Determination*, as well as a full discussion of the issues raised by parties for this final determination, may be found in the Issues and Decision Memorandum that is dated concurrently with this determination and hereby adopted by this notice.³

¹ See *Antidumping Duty Investigation of Common Alloy Aluminum Sheet from the People’s Republic of China: Affirmative Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair Value, Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstance, and Postponement of Final Determination*, 83 FR 29088 (June 22, 2018) (*Preliminary Determination*) and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

² See *Common Alloy Aluminum Sheet from the People’s Republic of China: Amended Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 83 FR 39056 (August 8, 2018) (*Amended Preliminary Determination*).

³ See Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Investigation of Common Alloy

Continued