

relationships; and (4) customer base.⁷ While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of a successor-in-interest relationship, generally, the Department will consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if the new company's resulting operation is not materially dissimilar to that of its predecessor.⁸ Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor.⁹

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216, we preliminarily determine that Avanti Frozen is the successor-in-interest to Avanti Feeds. Record evidence, as submitted by Avanti Frozen, indicates that Avanti Frozen operates as essentially the same business entity as Avanti Feeds with respect to the subject merchandise.¹⁰ For the complete successor-in-interest analysis, including discussion of business proprietary information, refer to the accompanying successor-in-interest memorandum.¹¹

Record evidence, as submitted by Avanti Frozen, indicates that the shrimp business was transferred fully from Avanti Feeds to its subsidiary, Avanti Frozen. Specifically, Avanti Frozen provided a Business Transfer Agreement which transfers Avanti Feed's entire shrimp business to Avanti Frozen; approvals from various governing entities approving/confirming the transfer of the shrimp business from Avanti Feeds to Avanti Frozen; letters notifying customers, suppliers, and employees of the business transfer; Avanti Frozen's first annual report;

charts demonstrating the board of directors and equity stockholders of both Avanti Feed and Avanti Frozen; and a list of suppliers, customers, and production and business locations before and after the transfer.¹² In summary, Avanti Frozen presented evidence to support its claim of successorship and the transfer did not impact any of the criteria that the Department typically looks to when making a changed circumstances determination.

We find that the evidence provided by Avanti Frozen is sufficient to preliminarily determine that the transfer of shrimp operations from Avanti Feeds to its subsidiary Avanti Frozen did not affect the company's operations in a meaningful way. Therefore, based on the aforementioned reasons, we preliminarily determine that Avanti Frozen is the successor-in-interest to Avanti Feeds and, thus, should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to the subject merchandise as Avanti Feeds.

Public Comment

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii), interested parties may submit case briefs not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the case briefs, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit case or rebuttal briefs 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. All comments are to be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS) available to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> and in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building, and must also be served on interested parties.²⁹ An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by ACCESS by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on the day it is due.¹³

Consistent with 19 CFR 351.216(e), we will issue the final results of this changed circumstances review no later than 270 days after the date on which this review was initiated, or within 45 days if all parties agree to our preliminary finding. This notice is

published in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(b), 351.221(b) and 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: October 24, 2016.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016-26214 Filed 10-28-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-848]

Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review

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

DATES: Effective October 31, 2016.

SUMMARY: Based on a request, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a new shipper review (NSR) of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China (PRC) with respect to Jingzhou Tianhe Aquatic Products Co., Ltd. (Jingzhou Tianhe). We have determined that this request meets the statutory and regulatory requirements for initiation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dmitry Vladimirov, 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) 482-0665.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC published in the **Federal Register** on September 15, 1997.¹ Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department received a timely and properly filed request for a NSR of the order from Jingzhou Tianhe during the anniversary month of the antidumping duty order.² In its request, Jingzhou

¹ See Notice of Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China, 62 FR 48218 (September 15, 1997) (*Crawfish Order*).

² See Letter from Jingzhou Tianhe, "RE: Freshwater Crawfish Tail meat From the People's Republic of China; Request for New Shipper Review," dated September 30, 2016.

⁷ See, e.g., Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan, 67 FR 58 (January 2, 2002).

⁸ See, e.g., Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999).

⁹ See, e.g., Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From the Republic of Korea; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review, 63 FR 14679 (March 26, 1998), unchanged in Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe From Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review, 63 FR 20572 (April 27, 1998), in which the Department found that a company which only changed its name and did not change its operations is a successor-in-interest to the company before it changed its name.

¹⁰ See Avanti Frozen CCR Request.

¹¹ See Memorandum to Melissa G. Skinner, Director, Office II, entitled "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India: Preliminary Successor-In-Interest Determination" dated concurrently with this notice.

¹² See Avanti Frozen CCR Request.

¹³ See 19 CFR 351.303(b).

Tianhe certified that it is both the producer and exporter of the subject merchandise upon which the request was based.³

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), Jingzhou Tianhe certified that it did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation (POI).⁴ In addition, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(II) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(A), Jingzhou Tianhe certified that, since the initiation of the investigation, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported subject merchandise to the United States during the POI, including those respondents not individually examined during the POI.⁵ As required by 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(B), Jingzhou Tianhe also certified that its export activities were not controlled by the government of the PRC.⁶

In addition to the certifications described above, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2), Jingzhou Tianhe submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) The date on which it first shipped subject merchandise for export to the United States; (2) the volume of its first shipment; and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.⁷

Period of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(A), the period of review (POR) for a NSR initiated in the month immediately following the anniversary month will be the twelve-month period immediately preceding the anniversary month. Therefore, the POR for this NSR is September 1, 2015, through August 31, 2016.

Initiation of New Shipper Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b), we find that the request from Jingzhou Tianhe meets the threshold requirements for initiation of a NSR for shipments of freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC produced and exported by Jingzhou Tianhe.⁸

On February 24, 2016, the President signed into law the “Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015,” H.R. 644, which made several amendments to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act. We will conduct this NSR in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act, as amended by the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.⁹

Unless extended, the Department intends to issue the preliminary results of this NSR no later than 180 days from the date of initiation and final results of the review no later than 90 days after the date the preliminary results are issued.¹⁰

It is the Department’s usual practice, in cases involving non-market economy countries, to require that a company seeking to establish eligibility for an antidumping duty rate separate from the country-wide rate provide evidence of *de jure* and *de facto* absence of government control over the company’s export activities. Accordingly, we will issue a questionnaire to Jingzhou Tianhe which will include a section requesting information concerning its eligibility for a separate rate. We will rescind the NSR of Jingzhou Tianhe if we determine that Jingzhou Tianhe has not demonstrated that it is eligible for a separate rate.

Because Jingzhou Tianhe certified that it produced and exported subject merchandise, the sale of which is the basis for the request for a NSR, we will instruct CBP to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of subject merchandise produced and exported by Jingzhou Tianhe.

To assist in its analysis of the *bona fides* of Jingzhou Tianhe’s sales, upon initiation of this NSR, the Department will require Jingzhou Tianhe to submit on an ongoing basis complete transaction information concerning any sales of subject merchandise to the United States that were made subsequent to the POR.

Interested parties requiring access to proprietary information in the NSR should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are published in accordance with section

751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Christian Marsh,

DAS for AD/CVD Operations.

[FR Doc. 2016–26148 Filed 10–28–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–557–813]

Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Malaysia: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015

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

SUMMARY: On June 24, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene retail carrier bags (PRCBs) from Malaysia. The review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Euro SME Sdn Bhd (Euro SME) for the period of review (POR) August 1, 2014, through July 31, 2015. The final estimated weighted-average dumping margin is listed below in the “Final Results of Review” section of this notice.

DATES: Effective October 31, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bryan Hansen 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) 482–3683 or (202) 482–1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 24, 2016, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* in the **Federal Register**, and invited parties to comment.¹ For events subsequent to the *Preliminary Results*, see the Department’s Final Decision Memorandum.² The Department

¹ See *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags From Malaysia: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015*, 81 FR 41294 (June 24, 2016) (*Preliminary Results*).

² See Memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from Malaysia,” dated concurrently

³ *Id.*, at 2.

⁴ *Id.*, at Attachment 1.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*, at Attachment 2; see also Jingzhou Tianhe’s October 14, 2016, response to the Department’s request for additional information, dated October 3, 2016.

⁸ See the memorandum to the file entitled, “Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People’s Republic of China: Initiation Checklist for Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review of Jingzhou Tianhe Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.,” dated concurrently with this notice.

⁹ Notably, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 removed from section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act the provision directing the Department to instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to allow an importer the option of posting a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit during the pendency of a NSR.

¹⁰ See section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.