of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department’s presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition 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 or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 2, 2011.
Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix—List of Issues in Decision Memorandum
Comment 1: Allegedly Incorrect Classification of Entry Documents
Comment 2: Verification

[FR Doc. 2011–32102 Filed 12–13–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–0S–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A–570–937]
Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of the First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On June 10, 2011, the Department published the preliminary results of the first administrative review of the antidumping duty order on citric acid and certain citrate salts (“citric acid”) from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), covering the period November 20, 2008, through April 30, 2010. See Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Results of the First Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order; and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review, 76 FR 34048 (June 10, 2011) (“Preliminary Results”). We invited interested parties to comment on our Preliminary Results. Based on our findings from on-site verifications and analysis of the comments received, we made certain changes to our margin calculations for the respondents. The final dumping margins for this review are listed in the “Final Results of the Review” section below.

DATES: Effective Date: December 14, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Krisha Hill or Maisha Cryor, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4037 or (202) 482–5831, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background


Period of Review
The period of review (“POR”) is November 20, 2008, through April 30, 2010.

Scope of the Order
The scope of the order includes all grades and granulation sizes of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate in their unblended forms, whether dry or in solution, and regardless of packaging type. The scope also includes blends of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate; as well as blends with other ingredients, such as sugar, where the unblended form(s) of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate constitute 40 percent or more, by weight, of the blend. The scope of the order also includes all forms of crude calcium citrate, including dicalcium citrate monohydrate, and tricalcium citrate tetrahydrate, which are intermediate products in the production of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate. The scope of the order does not include calcium citrate that satisfies the standards set forth in the United States Pharmacopeia and has been mixed with a functional excipient, such as dextrose or starch, where the excipient constitutes at least 2 percent, by weight, of the product. The scope of the order includes the hydrous and anhydrous forms of citric acid, the dihydrate and anhydrous forms of sodium citrate, otherwise known as citric acid sodium salt, and the monohydrate and

1 Petitioners are Archer Daniels Midland Company, Cargill, Incorporated, and Tate & Lyle Americas LLC.
monopotassium forms of potassium citrate. Sodium citrate also includes both trisodium citrate and monosodium citrate, which are also known as citric acid trisodium salt and citric acid monosodium salt, respectively. Citric acid and sodium citrate are classifiable under 2918.14.0000 and 2918.15.1000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”), respectively. Potassium citrate and crude calcium citrate are classifiable under 2918.15.5000 and 3824.90.9290 of the HTSUS, respectively. Blends that include citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate are classifiable under 3824.90.9290 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs filed by parties in this review are addressed in the Memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, titled “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the 2008–2010 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from the People’s Republic of China,” dated concurrently with this notice (“Issues and Decision Memorandum”), which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues that parties raised and to which we responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum follows as an appendix to this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Import Administration’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (“IA ACCESS”). Access to IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit, room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at http://www.trade.gov/ia/. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on an analysis of the comments received from interested parties, the Department has made certain changes to the margin calculations. For the final results, the Department has made the following changes:

**Changes to Financial Ratio Calculations**
- We treated other income as an offset to selling, general and administrative (“SG&A”) expenses.
- We capped the foreign exchange gains and losses (not figure) to not more than total financial expenses (i.e., financial expenses, which includes interest expenses and provision and bank charges, cannot be less than zero).
- Also, we made a profit adjustment to exclude the amounts of foreign exchange gains above the total financial expenses.
- We included the change in finished goods inventory in the denominators of the SG&A and profit surrogate ratios for the final results.
- We adjusted profit to exclude interest income.
- We excluded the current and deferred income tax expenses from SG&A/interest expense.

**Changes to RZBC’s Margin Calculation**
- We adjusted RZBC’s reported by-product offsets by adding the cost of packaging high-protein corn feed and mycelium to the normal value.

**Changes to Yixing Union’s Margin Calculation**
- We changed Yixing Union’s reported by-product offsets by adding the cost of packaging high-protein corn feed, mycelium, and calcium sulfate dihydrate to the normal value.

**Changes to Surrogate Values**
- We changed the surrogate value used to value the respondents’ sulfuri acid input. For the final results, we have inflated the Indonesian sulfuric acid value used in the preceding less than fair value investigation to the current POR.

**Changes to Calculation of Wage Rate**
- For the Preliminary Results, we calculated a wage-rate based upon a simple average of industry-specific wage rates from countries that were both economically comparable and significant producers of comparable merchandise. However, for the final

---

8 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 9.
9 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 10.
10 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 11.
11 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6.
12 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6.
13 See Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 11.
15 See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People’s Republic of China, 56 FR 20588 (May 6, 1991), as further developed in Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People’s Republic of China, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994).
16 See Preliminary Results, 76 FR at 34049–50.
company’s respective exports of the subject merchandise. Therefore, the Department continues to find that RZBC and Yixing Union meet the criteria for a separate rate.

Export Subsidy Adjustment
Section 772(c)(1)(C) of the Act unconditionally states that U.S. price “shall be increased by the amount of any countervailing duty imposed on the subject merchandise * * * to offset an export subsidy.”13 The Department determined in its final results of the companion countervailing duty administrative review that RZBC’s merchandise benefited from export subsidies.14 15 Therefore, we have increased RZBC’s U.S. price for countervailing duties imposed attributable to export subsidies, where appropriate.16

Final Results of the Review
The Department has determined that the following margins exist for the period November 20, 2008, through April 30, 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exporter</th>
<th>Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RZBC Co., Ltd./RZBC Imp. &amp; Exp. Co., Ltd./RZBC (Juxian) Co., Ltd./Yixing Union Biochemical Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Rates
Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication of this notice.

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 from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For RZBC and Yixing Union, the cash deposit rate will be the margins listed above; (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 156.87 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.

Notification to Importers
This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary’s presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Order
This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under the APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3), 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.

Disclosure
We intend to disclose the calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice to parties in this proceeding in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b).

We are issuing and publishing the final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 7, 2011.

Christian Marsh,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix

General Issues

Comment 1: Whether the Department Should Exclude Water from the Margin Calculation
Comment 2: Whether the Department Failed to Inflate the Water Value
Comment 3: Certifications in Petitioners’ Previous Submissions
Comment 4: Double Remedy
Comment 5: Zeroing
Comment 6: Whether the Department Should Disallow RZBC’s and Yixing Union’s By-Product Offsets
Comment 7: Whether to Use an Alternate Source to Calculate the Surrogate Wage Rate and Financial Ratios
Comment 8: Whether the Department Should Use Multiple Financial Statements from a Single Company
Comment 9: Whether the Department Should Adjust the Financial Ratio Calculation to Account for Interest Income and Other Income
Comment 10: Whether the Department Should Adjust the Financial Ratio Calculation to Account for Foreign Exchange Gains and Losses

13 See, e.g., Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 38076, 38077 (July 1, 2010) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.
15 Yixing Union’s merchandise was not found to have benefitted from export subsidies. Id.
16 See Memorandum to the File regarding.
General Surrogate Value Issues

Comment 12: Surrogate Value for Sulfuric Acid

Mandatory Respondent Specific Issues

Comment 13: Whether the Department

Verified RZBC’s Corn Usage Rate

Comment 14: Calcium Carbonate and

Sulfuric Acid Usage Rates

Comment 15: Adjustment of Financial Ratios

for Corn and Sulfuric Acid

Yixing Union

Comment 16: Whether the Department

Verified Yixing Union’s Corn Usage Rate

Comment 17: Whether the Department

Should Deny Yixing Union’s Claimed By-

Product Offset for Mycelium or, At a

Minimum, Reduce the Valuation of this

Offset

Comment 18: Possible Unreported Inputs in

the Chromatographic Process

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Florida, et al.; Notice of

Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscope

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, as amended by Pub. L. 106–38; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. in Room 3720, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC.


Reasons: Each foreign instrument is an electron microscope and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring an electron microscope. We know of no electron microscope, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States at the time of order of each instrument.

Dated: December 8, 2011.

Gregory W. Campbell,
Director, Subsidies Enforcement Office, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2011–32081 Filed 12–13–11; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background

On August 31, 2011, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) published a notice of preliminary results of the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from the Republic of Korea covering the period January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009. See Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Republic of Korea: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, 76 FR 54209 (August 31, 2011) (“Preliminary Results”). The final results were originally due no later than December 29, 2011.

Extension of Time Limit for Final Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), requires the Department to make a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results is published. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act further states that if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period specified, the administering authority may extend the 120-day period to issue its final results to up to 180 days.

We have determined that it is not practicable to complete the final results within the 120-day period. Specifically, after the issuance of the Preliminary Results, complex issues arose concerning the short-term benchmark interest rate. Therefore, to allow sufficient time to collect and analyze the additional information, and to conduct the briefing process, the Department is fully extending the final results.

Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we are extending the time period for issuing the final results of the review by 60 days. The final results are now due no later than February 27, 2012.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: December 7, 2011.

Edward C. Yang,
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011–32092 Filed 12–13–11; 8:45 am
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From India: Amended Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On November 29, 2011, the Court of International Trade (CIT) issued an order in Tata Steel Limited v. United States, and United States Steel Corporation and Nucor Corporation, Court No. 10–00219, Order of Judgment By Stipulation of the Parties (November 29, 2011) (Tata) pertaining to the Department’s agreement with Tata Steel Limited (Tata), setting the final countervailing duty rate for the period of review (POR) of January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008 (2008 POR) to 102.74 percent, and specifying the future countervailing duty cash deposit rate to 102.74 percent for that company. The Department is amending the final results of the administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain