DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[Application No. 84–22A12]

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Application (84–22A12) to Amend the Export Trade Certificate of Review Issued to Northwest Fruit Exporters, Application No. 84–22A12.

SUMMARY: The Office of Competition and Economic Analysis (“OCEA”) of the International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, has received an application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review (“Certificate”). This notice summarizes the proposed amendment and requests comments relevant to whether the amended Certificate should be issued.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Joseph Flynn, Director, Office of Competition and Economic Analysis, International Trade Administration, 27994 Federal Register number) or e-mail at etca@trade.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. 4001–21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. An Export Trade Certificate of Review protects the holder and the members identified in the Certificate from State and Federal government antitrust actions and from private treble damage antitrust actions for the export conduct specified in the Certificate and carried out in compliance with its terms and conditions. Section 302(b)(1) of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 and 15 CFR 325.6(a) require the Secretary to publish a notice in the Federal Register identifying the applicant and summarizing its proposed export conduct.

Request for Public Comments

Interested parties may submit written comments relevant to the determination whether an amended Certificate should be issued. If the comments include any privileged or confidential business information, it must be clearly marked and a nonconfidential version of the comments (identified as such) should be included. Any comments not marked as privileged or confidential business information will be deemed to be nonconfidential.

An original and five (5) copies, plus two (2) copies of the nonconfidential version, should be submitted no later than 20 days after the date of this notice to: Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 7021–X, Washington, DC 20230.

Information submitted by any person is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). However, nonconfidential versions of the comments will be made available to the applicant if necessary for determining whether or not to issue the Certificate. Comments should refer to this application as “Export Trade Certificate of Review, application number 84–22A12.”

The Northwest Fruit Exporters’ (“NWF”) original Certificate was issued on June 11, 1984 (49 FR 24581, June 14, 1984), and last amended on August 18, 2010 (75 FR 51980, August 19, 2010). A summary of the current application for an amendment follows.

Summary of the Application

Applicant: Northwest Fruit Exporters, 105 South 18th Street, Suite 227, Yakima, WA 98901.

Contact: James R. Archer, Manager, (509) 576–8004.

Application No.: 84–22A12.

Date Deemed Submitted: April 29, 2011.

Proposed Amendment: NWF seeks to amend its Certificate to:

1. Add the following companies as a new Members of the Certificate within the meaning of section 325.2(l) of the Regulations (15 CFR 325.2(l)): Frosty Packing Co. LLC (Yakima, WA), J & D Packing LLC (Outlook, WA), and Polehn Farm’s Inc. (The Dalles, OR); and

2. Remove the following companies as a Member of NWF’s Certificate: Cervantes Orchards & Vineyards LLC (Grandview, WA), Chief Orchards LLC (Yakima, WA), Dovex Fruit Co. (Wenatchee, WA), and Jack Frost Fruit Co. (Yakima, WA); and

3. Change the name of the following member: Conrad and Gilbert Fruit of Grandview, WA is now Conrad & Adams Fruit LLC.

Dated: May 5, 2011.

Joseph E. Flynn,
Director, Office of Competition and Economic Analysis.

BILLING CODE 3510–OR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–918]

First Administrative Review of Steel Wire Garment Hangers From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results and Final Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On November 9, 2010, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire garment hangers from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”).1 We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Results. Based upon our analysis of the comments and information received, we made changes to the margin calculations for the final results. We continue to find that certain exporters have sold subject merchandise at less than normal value during the period of review (“POR”), March 25, 2008, through November 30, 2009.

DATES: Effective Date: May 13, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Irene Gorelik or Josh Startup, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6905 or (202) 482–5260, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background


On March 17, 2011, we reset the schedule for interested parties to submit case briefs and rebuttal briefs to March 24, 2011, and March 29, 2011, respectively. On March 17, 2011, the Department placed certain entry data, obtained from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) with respect to Dingli, on the record and solicited comments from interested parties. Both Petitioner and Dingli filed comments regarding this data on March 21, 2011. Dingli filed rebuttal comments on March 23, 2011. On March 23, 2011, Shanghai Wells Hanger Co., Ltd. (“Wells”) filed its case brief. On March 24, 2011, Petitioner, Dingli, Fabricare (U.S. importer), and one of the separate rate respondents filed case briefs. On April 1, 2011, Petitioner, Dingli, and the Shaoxing Metal Companies filed rebuttal briefs. The Department did not hold a public hearing pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(d), as all hearing requests made by interested parties were withdrawn.

Verification
Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.307(b)(iv), we conducted a verification of Dingli’s questionnaire responses.3

3 In the Preliminary Results, we preliminarily found that Wells, Hong Kong Wells Limited (“HK Wells”), and Hong Kong Wells Limited (USA) (“Wells USA”) are affiliated, pursuant to sections 771(33)(B), (I), and (F) of the Act and that Wells and HK Wells are affiliated pursuant to sections 771(33)(A), (E), and (F) of the Act, as amended (“the Act”). We also preliminarily found that Wells and HK Wells should be treated as a single entity for the purposes of this administrative review. See Preliminary Results 76 FR at 68759. For the final results, we continue to find that Wells, HK Wells, and Wells USA are affiliated pursuant to sections 771(33)(A), (E), and (F) of the Act and that Wells and HK Wells comprise a single entity pursuant to 19 CFR 350.41(f)(1) and (2). See id.

3 See the “Background” section of the Steel Wire Garment Hangers from the People’s Republic of China: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the First Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, (“Decision Memo”), dated concurrently with this notice, for a discussion of the post-case briefs submitted by Petitioner and Dingli regarding arguments of untimely filed and Dingli regarding arguments of untimely filed.

4 From February 22 to February 25, 2011, we verified Dingli’s constructed export price (“CEP”) sales responses in the United States. See Memorandum to the File through Catherine Bertrand, Program Manager, Office 9, from Irene Gorelik, Senior Case Analyst, Office 9, and Joshua Startup, Analyst, Office 9, re: Verification of the Sales Response of Shaoxing Dingli Metal Clotheshore Co., Ltd., in the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Steel Wire Garment Hangers from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), dated March 16, 2011 (“CEP Report”). Then, from March 7 to March 11, 2011, we verified Dingli’s export price (“EP”) sales and factors of production (“FOF”) responses. See Memorandum to the File through Catherine Bertrand, Program Manager, Office 9 from Irene Gorelik, Senior Case Analyst, Office 9, and Joshua Startup, Analyst, Office 9, re: Verification of the Sales and Factors Response of Shaoxing Dingli Metal Clothsoroe Co., Ltd. in the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Steel Wire Garment Hangers from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), dated March 17, 2011 (“EP Report”).

Analysis of Comments Received
All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this review are addressed in the Decision Memo, which is dated concurrently with this notice. A list of the issues which parties raised in tandem with those we responded to in the Decision Memo is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The Decision Memo is a public document and is on file in the Central Records Unit (“CRU”), Main Commerce Building, Room 7046, and is accessible on the Department’s Web site at http://www.trade.gov/ia. The paper copy and electronic version of the memorandum are identical in content.

Final Partial Rescission of Review
Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), the Department preliminarily rescinded the review, in part, with respect to five companies that stated that they made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. These companies are: Viet Anh Import-Export Joint Stock Company; Dong Nam A Co., Ltd.; Vietnam Hangers Joint Stock Company; Royal McGoun Chemicals Inc.; and NV Hanger Co., Ltd. See Preliminary Results at 68759. Because the Department did not receive any information to the contrary, we continue to find that these companies did not make any shipments during the POR. Thus, for these final results, we are rescinding this review, in part, with respect to the five above-named companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Changes Since the Preliminary Results
Based on a review of the record, the verifications, and comments received from parties regarding our Preliminary Results, we have made changes to the surrogate financial ratio calculation and to the dumping margin calculations for Wells and Dingli in the final results. See Decision Memo at Comment 2. We have also corrected errors from the Preliminary Results alleged by Wells and Dingli. See Decision Memo at Comments 5 and 7. Lastly, we have made certain changes to a portion of Dingli’s submitted sales data as a result of the verification findings and minor corrections presented at verification. For all detailed changes made to Dingli’s reported sales and factor data, see Decision Memo at Comments 4B and 4F.

Scope of the Order
The merchandise that is subject to the order is steel wire garment hangers, fabricated from carbon steel wire, whether or not galvanized or painted, whether or not coated with latex or epoxy or similar gripping materials, and/or whether or not fashioned with paper covers or caps (with or without printing) and/or nonslip features such as saddles or tubes. These products may also be referred to by a commercial designation, such as shirt, suit, strut, caped, or latex (industrial) hangers. Specifically excluded from the scope of the order are wooden, plastic, and other garment hangers that are not made of steel wire. Also excluded from the scope of the order are chrome-plated steel wire garment hangers with a diameter of 3.4 mm or greater. The products subject to the order are currently classified under U.S. Harmonized Tariff Schedule (“HTSUS”) subheadings 7326.20.0020, 7323.99.9060, and 7323.99.9080. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Separate Rates
In proceedings involving NME countries, it is the Department’s practice to begin with a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and thus should be assessed a single antidumping duty rate. See Policy Bulletin 5.1; see also Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, and Affirmative Critical Circumstances. In Part: Certain Lined Paper Products From the People’s Republic of China, 71 FR 53079, 53080 (September 8, 2006); and Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Partial Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances: Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China, 71 FR 29303, 29307 (May 22, 2006).

In our Preliminary Results, we determined that the following


Additionally, in the Preliminary Results, we noted that the Department received completed responses to the Section A portion of the NME questionnaire from the individually reviewed respondents (Dingli and Wells), which contained information pertaining to the companies’ eligibility for a separate rate. With respect to Wells, we preliminarily determined that there is no PRC ownership, and because the Department has no evidence indicating that Wells is under the control of the PRC, a separate rates analysis was not necessary to determine whether it is independent from government control. With respect to Dingli, we preliminarily granted separate rate status to it based on its submitted information. See Preliminary Results, 75 FR at 68760–62.

We did not receive any information since the issuance of the Preliminary Results that provides a basis for the reconsideration of these preliminary separate rate determinations. Therefore, the Department continues to find that Wells, Dingli, and the 13 above-named, non-individually examined companies meet the criteria for a separate rate.

Separate Rate Calculation

The separate rate is determined based on the estimated weighted-average antidumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding zero and de minimis margins or margins based entirely on AFA. In this administrative review, one mandatory respondent, Dingli, has an estimated weighted-average antidumping margin which is above de minimis and which is not based entirely on AFA. Therefore, because there is only one weighted-average antidumping margin calculated for these final results that is neither zero, de minimis, nor based entirely on AFA, we have assigned Dingli’s margin to the companies not selected for individual examination.8

Facts Available

Section 776(a) of the Act provides that if necessary information is not available on the record, or an interested party: (A) Withholds information that has been requested by the Department; (B) fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested, subject to sections 782(c)(1) and (e) of the Act; (C) significantly impedes a proceeding under the antidumping statute; or (D) provides such information but the information cannot be verified; the Department shall, subject to subsection 782(d) of the Act, use facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. Section 782(c)(1) of the Act provides that if an interested party “promptly after receiving a request from (the Department) for information, notifies (the Department) that such party is unable to submit the information requested in the requested form and manner, together with a full explanation and suggested alternative form in which such party is able to submit the information,” the Department may modify its requirements to avoid imposing an unreasonable burden on that party.

Section 782(d) of the Act provides that, if the Department determines that a response to a request for information does not comply with its request, the Department will inform the person submitting the response of the nature of the deficiency and shall, to the extent practicable, provide that person the opportunity to remedy or explain the deficiency. If that person submits further information that continues to be unsatisfactory, or this information is not submitted within the applicable time limits, the Department may, subject to section 782(e), disregard all or part of the original and subsequent responses.

Section 782(e) of the Act states that the Department shall not decline to consider information deemed “deficient” under section 782(d) if: (1) The information is submitted by the established deadline; (2) the information can be verified; (3) the information is not so incomplete that it cannot serve as a reliable basis for reaching the applicable determination; (4) the interested party has demonstrated that it acted to the best of its ability; and (5) the information can be used without undue difficulties.

Furthermore, section 776(b) of the Act states that if the Department “finds that an interested party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with a request for information from the administering authority * * *, the administering authority * * *, in reaching the applicable determination under this title, may use an inference that is adverse to the interests of that party in selecting from among the facts otherwise available.” The Department’s determination is in accordance with sections 776(a)(2)(A), (B), and 776(b) of the Act.9

For the final results, in accordance with sections 776(a)(2)(A) and (B) of the Act, we have determined that the use of facts available (“FA”) is appropriate to account for Dingli’s consumption of its hydrochloric acid (“HCL”) input in the production of subject merchandise. See

---

8 In the Preliminary Results, we stated that these three companies all reported in their individual separate rate certifications that their affiliations with one another, legal structure, and ownership structure have not changed since the underlying investigation. For the final results, we continue to find that Shaoxing Gangyuan Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd., Shaoxing Tongzhou Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd., and Shaoxing Andrew Metal Manufactured Co., Ltd. comprise a single entity, as determined in the underlying investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f)(1) and (2). See Preliminary Results at 68766; see also Steel Wire Garment Hangers from the People’s Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 73 FR 47587, 47589 (August 14, 2008) (“Hangers LTFV”).

9 See, e.g., Certain Steel Nails From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of the First Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 76 FR 16379, 16381–16382 (March 13, 2011); Certain Frozen Fish Fillets From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews, 74 FR 11349, 11350 (March 17, 2009) (where the Department stated “For the exporters subject to review that are determined to be eligible for separate-rate status, but were not selected as mandatory respondents, the Department normally establishes a weighted-average margin based on an average of the rates it calculated for the mandatory respondents, excluding any rates that are zero, de minimis, or based entirely on facts available. In this proceeding, there is only one such mandatory respondent, QVD. Accordingly, the rate calculated for QVD is applied as the rate for Agifish and Anvifish.”).
Decision Memo at Comment 4C. During the on-site verification of Dingli’s sales and factors of production, we found that Dingli failed to report information requested by the Department: specifically, one month of HCL consumption, which is a direct material used to produce subject merchandise. Additionally, for the final results, in accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we find that Dingli failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with our request for information and, as a result, have determined that the application of an adverse inference is warranted for Dingli’s unreported consumption of HCL. See id.; see also “EP Report” at 2 and 17. As an adverse inference, we are using the highest reported monthly consumption quantity of HCL during the POR as a proxy for the unreported month in the normal value calculation. See “Dingli Final Analysis Memo” for further details.

**Final Results of Review**

The final weighted-average dumping margins for the POR are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Weighted average margin (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Wells Hanger Co., Ltd. and/or Hong Kong Wells Limited</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Dingli Metal Clothseshorse Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Gangyuan Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Andrew Metal Manufacturing Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Tongzhou Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Shenji Metal Clothseshorse Co. Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiwu Ao-Si Metal Products Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangyu Baxiyan Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiaxing Boyi Medical Device Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu Jiang County Command Metal Products Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Meide Metal Hanger Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Zhongbao Metal Manufactured Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang Lucky Cloud Hanger Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningbo Dasheng Hanger Ind. Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Guochao Metallic Products Co. Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Jianhai International Trade Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaoxing Liangbao Metal Manufactured Co., Ltd</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC-Wide Entity</td>
<td>187.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 For the final results, we continue to find that Wells and HK Wells comprise a single entity, as determined in the Preliminary Results, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f)(1) and (2). See Preliminary Results, 75 FR at 68759.
11 For the final results, we continue to find that Shaoxing Gangyuan Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd., Shaoxing Tongzhou Metal Manufactured Co. Ltd., and Shaoxing Andrew Metal Manufacturing Co., Ltd. comprise a single entity, as determined in the underlying investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f)(1) and (2). See Preliminary Results, 75 FR at 68766; see also Hangers LTFV, 73 FR at 47589.
12 The PRC-Wide entity continues to include the 94 companies listed in footnote 17 of the Preliminary Results. See Preliminary Results, 75 FR at 68762.

**Assessment**

Upon issuance of these final results, the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by these reviews. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication date of the final results of this review excluding any reported sales that entered during the gap period. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we calculated exporter/importer (or customer)-specific assessment rates for the merchandise subject to this review. Where the respondent has reported reliable entered values, we calculated importer (or customer)-specific \textit{ad valorem} rates by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total entered value of the sales to each importer (or customer). See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). Where an importer (or customer)-specific \textit{ad valorem} rate is greater than \textit{de minimis}, we will apply the assessment rate to the entered value of the importers'/customers’ entries during the POR. See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

Where we do not have entered values for all U.S. sales, we calculated a per-unit assessment rate by aggregating the antidumping duties due for all U.S. sales to each importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total quantity sold to that importer (or customer). See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). To determine whether the duty assessment rates are \textit{de minimis}, in accordance with the requirement set forth in 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we calculated importer (or customer)-specific \textit{ad valorem} ratios based on the estimated entered value. Where an importer (or customer)-specific \textit{ad valorem} rate is zero or \textit{de minimis}, we will instruct CBP to liquidate appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties. See 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2). For the companies receiving a separate rate that were not selected for individual review, we will calculate an assessment rate based on the simple average of the cash deposit rates calculated for the companies selected for individual review pursuant to section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act.

With respect to the companies upon which we have rescinded this review, we intend to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of this notice. The Department will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i).

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following cash-deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For the exporters listed above, the cash deposit rate will be established in the final results of this review (except, if the rate...
is zero or de minimis, i.e., less than 0.5 percent, no cash deposit will be required for that company; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 187.25 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporters that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this POR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties has occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing this administrative review and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: May 9, 2011.
Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I—Decision Memorandum

General Issues
Comment 1: Treatment of Sales with Negative Margins

Comment 2: Surrogate Financial Ratios
Comment 3: Calculation of the Separate Rate Margin

Company-Specific Issues
Dingli
Comment 4: Whether to Assign Adverse Facts Available (“AFA”) to Dingli
A. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) Data on the Record
B. Hanger Quantity Conversions
C. Hydrochloric Acid (“HCL”) Consumption
D. Weight of Packing Cartons
E. Sale of Machinery
F. Changes to Margin Calculation Per Verification Findings

Comment 5: Calculation of Domestic Movement Expenses
Comment 6: Byproduct Offset for Scrap Iron Buckets

Wells
Comment 7: Calculation of Domestic Movement Expenses

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
RIN 0648-XA433

Public Meeting of the Steering Committee for the National Fish, Wildlife and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Steering Committee for the National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy will be holding its second meeting. This meeting will focus on the progress of the Strategy’s Technical Teams and stakeholder engagement.

DATES: The second Steering Committee meeting will be held Wednesday, June 1, 2011, from 1:15 p.m. to 4 p.m. There will be opportunity for public comment during the meeting at approximately 3 p.m., and written comments may be submitted via the Web site http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held in the Spring Room of the Silver Spring Civic Building, One Veterans Place (corner of Ellsworth Drive and Fenton Street), Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. Additional information on the National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy can be found at http://www.wildlifeadaptationstrategy.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger Griffis, Climate Change Coordinator, Office of Science and Technology, NMFS/NOAA, 1315 East-West Highway, 12th Floor, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, or Roger.B.Griffis@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background

The National Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Climate Adaptation Strategy (Strategy) is an integrated, coordinated, and comprehensive response to the threats of climate change. This multi-partner effort will outline a unified approach to maintaining the key terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems needed to sustain fish, wildlife and plant resources and the services they provide in the face of accelerating climate change.

The Strategy will be guided by input and participation from a diverse group of agencies from across the country. For this reason, Federal, State and tribal agencies have been asked to participate as members of an intergovernmental Steering Committee to provide advice and support for development of the Strategy by 2012.

The Steering Committee consists of representatives from 16 Federal agencies with management authorities for fish, wildlife, plants, or their habitat, as well as representatives from five state fish and wildlife agencies and two tribal commissions. The purpose of the Steering Committee is to exchange views, information, and advice relating to the management and implementation of the Strategy. The Committee will oversee the Technical (writing) Teams, ensure a robust engagement process with a diverse group of stakeholders, and facilitate coordination and communication across agencies and departments.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Helen Allen, (907) 271–2809, at least 5 working days prior to the meeting date.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.