

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration**

[C-570-046]

**1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid From People's Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation**

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

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* February 20, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Davina Friedmann at (202) 482-0698, Robert James at (202) 482-0649, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****The Petition**

On March 31, 2016, the Department of Commerce (Department) received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid (HEDP) from the People's Republic of China (the PRC), filed in proper form on behalf of Compass Chemical International, LLC (Petitioner). The CVD petition was accompanied by an antidumping duty (AD) petition, also concerning imports of HEDP from the PRC.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner is a domestic producer of HEDP.<sup>2</sup>

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Petitioner alleges that the Government of the PRC (GOC) is providing countervailable subsidies (within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act) with respect to imports of HEDP from the PRC, and that imports of HEDP from the PRC are materially injuring, and threaten material injury to, the domestic industry producing HEDP in the United States. Also, consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, for those alleged programs on which we have initiated a CVD investigation, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an

interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and that Petitioner has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the investigation Petitioner is requesting.<sup>3</sup>

**Period of Investigation**

The period of investigation is January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015.<sup>4</sup>

**Scope of the Investigation**

The product covered by this investigation is HEDP from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, see "Scope of Investigation" at Appendix I of this notice.

**Comments on Scope of the Investigation**

During our review of the Petition, the Department issued questions to, and received responses from, Petitioner pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.<sup>5</sup>

As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations,<sup>6</sup> we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.*, scope). The Department will consider all comments received from interested parties, and if necessary, will consult with interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information (*see* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), all such factual information should be limited to public information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaire, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Tuesday, May 10, 2016, which is 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Friday, May 20, 2016, which is ten calendar days after the initial comments deadline.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider relevant to the scope of the investigation be submitted during this time period.

<sup>3</sup> See "Determination of Industry Support for the Petition" below.

<sup>4</sup> See 19 CFR 351.204(b)(2).

<sup>5</sup> See Letter from Petitioner to the Department, "Petitioner for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties, Supplemental Submission, Petition Volume I: 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China," dated April 7, 2016 (Petition Supplemental Information).

<sup>6</sup> See *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997).

However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigation may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments also must be filed on the record of the concurrent AD investigation.

**Filing Requirements**

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).<sup>7</sup> An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.*, in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

**Consultations**

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act, the Department notified representatives of the GOC of the receipt of the Petition. Also, in accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department provided representatives of the GOC the opportunity for consultations with respect to the CVD petition.<sup>8</sup> In lieu of consultation with the Department, the GOC submitted comments to the Department on the alleged subsidy programs.<sup>9</sup>

**Determination of Industry Support for the Petition**

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic

<sup>7</sup> See 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements); *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011), for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at <https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx> and a handbook can be found at <https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filing%20Procedures.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> See Letter of invitation from the Department regarding, "Countervailing Duty Petition on 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China," dated April 7, 2016.

<sup>9</sup> See Department Memorandum, "Countervailing Duty Petition on 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China: GOC Comments on Alleged Subsidy Programs," dated April 19, 2016.

<sup>1</sup> See "Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China," dated March 31, 2016 (Petitions).

<sup>2</sup> See Volume I of the Petitions, at 2, and Exhibit I-1.

producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the “industry.”

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the “industry” as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether “the domestic industry” has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,<sup>10</sup> they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department’s determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.<sup>11</sup>

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as “a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.” Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is “the article subject to an investigation” (*i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioner does not offer a definition of the domestic like product

distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that HEDP, as defined in the scope, constitutes a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.<sup>12</sup>

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the “Scope of the Investigation,” in Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its 2015 production of the domestic like product.<sup>13</sup> Petitioner states that it is the only known producer of HEDP in the United States; therefore, the Petition is supported by 100 percent of the U.S. industry.<sup>14</sup>

Our review of the data provided in the Petition and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioner has established industry support.<sup>15</sup> First, the Petition established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.*, polling).<sup>16</sup> Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product.<sup>17</sup> Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition

<sup>12</sup> For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: 1 Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People’s Republic of China (PRC CVD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People’s Republic of China (Attachment II). This checklist is dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

<sup>13</sup> *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 5 and Exhibit I–1.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

<sup>16</sup> *See* section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act; *see also* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

<sup>17</sup> *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the CVD investigation that it is requesting the Department initiate.<sup>19</sup>

### Injury Test

Because the PRC is a “Subsidies Agreement Country” within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, section 701(a)(2) of the Act applies to this investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from the PRC materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

### Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that imports of the subject merchandise are benefitting from countervailable subsidies and that such imports are causing, or threaten to cause, material injury to the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.<sup>20</sup>

Petitioner contends that the industry’s injured condition is illustrated by reduced market share; underselling and price suppression or depression; decline in shipments and production; decline in employment; decline in financial performance; and lost sales and revenues.<sup>21</sup> We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> *See* General Issues Supplement, at 2.

<sup>21</sup> *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 10–13, 19–38 and Exhibit I–5; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 2.

<sup>22</sup> *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People’s Republic of China.

<sup>10</sup> *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

<sup>11</sup> *See USEC, Inc. v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff’d* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

### Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a CVD investigation whenever an interested party files a CVD petition on behalf of an industry that: (1) Alleges elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a) of the Act; and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting the allegations.

Petitioner alleges that producers/exporters of HEDP in the PRC benefit from countervailable subsidies bestowed by the GOC. The Department examined the Petition and finds that it complies with the requirements of section 702(b)(1) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of HEDP from the PRC receive countervailable subsidies from the GOC and various authorities thereof.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.<sup>23</sup> The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.<sup>24</sup> The amendments to sections 776 and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to this CVD investigation.<sup>25</sup>

Based on our review of the petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on the four remaining alleged programs in the PRC.<sup>26</sup> For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate on each program, see the PRC CVD Initiation Checklist. A public version of the initiation checklist for

<sup>23</sup> See Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

<sup>24</sup> See *Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015*, 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*). The 2015 amendments may be found at <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl>.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*, at 46794–95.

<sup>26</sup> Petitioner initially alleged nine subsidy programs, but subsequently withdrew allegations on five of those programs. See Volume III of the Petition, at 18–30; see also Petition Supplemental Information at 1–3.

this investigation is available on ACCESS.

In accordance with section 703(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

### Respondent Selection

Following standard practice in CVD investigations, the Department will, where appropriate, select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) data for U.S. imports of HEDP during the period of investigation. For this investigation, the Department will release U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports of subject merchandise during the period of investigation under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States numbers: 2931.90.9043. Subject merchandise may also enter under HTSUS subheadings 2811.19.6090 and 2931.90.9041. We intend to release the CBP data under Administrative Protective Order (APO) to all parties with access to information protected by APO within five business days of the announcement of this **Federal Register** notice. Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(b). Instructions for filing such applications may be found at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/apo/>.

Interested parties may submit comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection by 5:00 p.m. ET on the seventh calendar day after publication of this notice. Comments must be filed in accordance with the filing requirements stated above. If respondent selection is necessary, we intend to base our decision regarding respondent selection upon comments received from interested parties and our analysis of the record information within 20 days of publication of this notice.

### Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petition has been provided to the GOC *via* ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each known exporter (as named in the Petition), consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

### ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

### Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petition was filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of HEDP from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.<sup>27</sup> A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated;<sup>28</sup> otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

### Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (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 the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). The regulation requires 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. Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

### Extension of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301 expires. For submissions that 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. Under certain circumstances, we 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

<sup>27</sup> See section 703(a)(2) of the Act.

<sup>28</sup> See section 703(a)(1) of the Act.

such a case, we 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. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. Review *Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule*, 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm>, prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

### Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.<sup>29</sup> Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.<sup>30</sup> The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable revised certification requirements.

### Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures*, 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Parties wishing to participate in this investigation should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 702 and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: April 20, 2016.

**Christian Marsh,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

### Appendix I—Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise covered by this investigation includes all grades of aqueous acidic (non-neutralized) concentrations of 1-hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-diphosphonic acid (HEDP), also referred to as hydroxyethylidenediphosphonic acid, hydroxyethanediphosphonic acid, acetodiphosphonic acid, and etidronic acid. The CAS (Chemical Abstract Service) registry number for HEDP is 2809–21–4.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheading 2931.90.9043. It may also enter under HTSUS subheadings 2811.19.6090 and 2931.90.9041. While HTSUS subheadings and the CAS registry number are provided for convenience and customs purposes only, the written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2016–09882 Filed 4–27–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–896]

### Magnesium Metal From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015

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

**SUMMARY:** On January 5, 2016, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on magnesium metal from the People's Republic of China (“PRC”) covering the period April 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015.<sup>1</sup> This review covers two PRC companies, Tianjin Magnesium International, Co., Ltd. (“TMI”) and Tianjin Magnesium Metal Co., Ltd. (“TMM”). The Department gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the *Preliminary Results*, but we received no comments. Hence, these final results are unchanged from the *Preliminary Results*, and we continue to find that TMI and TMM did not have reviewable

entries during the period of review (“POR”).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* April 28, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James Terpstra or Brendan Quinn, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3965 or (202) 482–5848, respectively.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On January 5, 2016, the Department published the *Preliminary Results*.<sup>2</sup> We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*, but no comments were received. Also, as explained in the memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement & Compliance, the Department exercised its authority to toll all administrative deadlines due to the recent closure of the Federal Government.<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by four business days. The revised deadline for the final results is now May 10, 2016.

The Department conducted this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”).

#### Scope of the Order

The product covered by this antidumping duty order is magnesium metal from the PRC, which includes primary and secondary alloy magnesium metal, regardless of chemistry, raw material source, form, shape, or size. Magnesium is a metal or alloy containing by weight primarily the element magnesium. Primary magnesium is produced by decomposing raw materials into magnesium metal. Secondary magnesium is produced by recycling magnesium-based scrap into magnesium metal. The magnesium covered by this order includes blends of primary and secondary magnesium.

The subject merchandise includes the following alloy magnesium metal products made from primary and/or secondary magnesium including, without limitation, magnesium cast into ingots, slabs, rounds, billets, and other shapes; magnesium ground, chipped, crushed, or machined into rasping,

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> See Memorandum to the File from Ron Lorentzen, Acting A/S for Enforcement & Compliance, “Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During Snowstorm Jonas,” dated January 27, 2016.

<sup>29</sup> See section 782(b) of the Act.

<sup>30</sup> See *Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (“*Final Rule*”); see also frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at [http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual\\_info\\_final\\_rule\\_FAQ\\_07172013.pdf](http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf).

<sup>1</sup> See *Magnesium Metal From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015*, 81 FR 220 (January 5, 2016) (“*Preliminary Results*”).