



A-122-853
AR: 05/01/2015-04/30/2016
Public Document
AD/CVDOps/VIII/KJ/GA

January 24, 2017

MEMORANDUM TO: Ronald K. Lorentzen
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: Gary Taverman
Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Decision Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Antidumping
Duty Administrative Review: Citric Acid and Certain Citrate
Salts from Canada; 2015-2016

I. SUMMARY

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on citric acid and certain citrate salts (citric acid) from Canada. The review covers one producer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Jungbunzlauer Canada Inc. (JBL Canada). The period of review (POR) is May 1, 2015, through April 30, 2016. We preliminarily determine that JBL Canada did not make sales below normal value (NV) during this POR.

II. BACKGROUND

In response to the Department's notice of opportunity to request an administrative review on citric acid from Canada,¹ on May 13, 2016, JBL Canada timely requested an administrative review of the AD order on citric acid from Canada with respect to its exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR. On May 31, 2016, Archer Daniels Midland Company; Cargill, Incorporated; and Tate & Lyle Ingredients Americas LLC (collectively, the petitioners), domestic producers of the subject merchandise, requested an administrative review with respect to JBL Canada.² Accordingly, on July 7, 2016, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the AD order on citric acid from Canada.³

¹ See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 81 FR 26206 (May 2, 2016).

² See JBL Canada's and the petitioners' letters to the Department, dated May 13, 2016, and May 31, 2016, respectively.

³ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 44260 (July 7, 2016).

On July 18, 2016, we issued the AD questionnaire to JBL Canada. On August 24 and September 14, 2016, JBL Canada timely submitted its responses to our questionnaire. On November 2, 2016, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to JBL Canada to which it timely responded on November 16, 2016.

III. 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 this 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 this 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 this 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 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, our written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE METHODOLOGY

We are conducting this administrative review of the order in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213.

A. Normal Value Comparisons

Pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and (d), in order to determine whether JBL Canada's sales of citric acid from Canada to the United States were made at less than NV, the Department compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the NV, as described in the "Constructed Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this memorandum.

For purposes of determining an appropriate product comparison to the U.S. sale, in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the "Scope of the Order" section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of

trade. If contemporaneous sales of identical comparison market merchandise were reported, as described below, we made comparisons to the monthly weighted-average comparison market prices that were based on all such sales. If there were no contemporaneous sales of identical merchandise in the comparison market, then we identified sales of the most similar merchandise that were contemporaneous with the U.S. sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.414(e).

1. Determination of Comparison Method

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1), the Department calculates weighted-average dumping margins by comparing weighted-average NVs to weighted-average export prices (EPs) (or CEPs) (*i.e.*, the average-to-average method) unless the Secretary determines that another method is appropriate in a particular situation. In less-than-fair-value investigations, the Department examines whether to compare weighted-average NVs with the EPs (or CEPs) of individual sales (*i.e.*, the average-to-transaction method) as an alternative comparison method using an analysis consistent with section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act. Although section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act does not strictly govern the Department's examination of this question in the context of administrative reviews, the Department nevertheless finds that the issue arising under 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) in administrative reviews is, in fact, analogous to the issue in less-than-fair-value investigations.⁴

In certain investigations, the Department applied a “differential pricing” analysis for determining whether application of the average-to-transaction method is appropriate in a particular situation pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act.⁵ The Department finds that the differential pricing analysis used in certain investigations may be instructive for purposes of examining whether to apply an alternative comparison method in this administrative review. The Department will continue to develop its approach in this area based on comments received in this and other proceedings, and on the Department’s additional experience with addressing the potential masking of dumping that can occur when the Department uses the average-to-average method in calculating a respondent’s weighted-average dumping margin.

The differential pricing analysis used in these preliminary results examines whether there exists a pattern of EPs (or CEPs) for comparable merchandise that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. The analysis evaluates all export sales by purchaser, region and time period to determine whether a pattern of prices that differ significantly exists. If such a pattern is found, then the differential pricing analysis evaluates whether such differences can be taken into account when using the average-to-average method to calculate the weighted-average dumping

⁴ See *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, and Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; 2010–2011*, 77 FR 73415 (December 10, 2012) and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at comment 1; see also *Apex Frozen Foods Private Ltd. v. United States*, 37 F. Supp. 3d 1286 (Ct. Int’l Trade 2014); see also *JBF RAK LLC v. United States*, 790 F.3d 1358, 1363-65 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“the fact that the statute is silent with regard to administrative reviews does not preclude Commerce from filling gaps in the statute to properly calculate and assign antidumping duties”) (*citations omitted*).

⁵ See, e.g., *Xanthan Gum from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 78 FR 33351 (June 4, 2013); *Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar from Mexico: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 79 FR 54967 (September 15, 2014); or *Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Turkey: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 80 FR 61362 (October 13, 2015).

margin. The analysis incorporates default group definitions for purchasers, regions, time periods, and comparable merchandise. Purchasers are based on the reported consolidated customer codes. Regions are defined using the reported destination code (*i.e.*, zip code) and are grouped into regions based upon standard definitions published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Time periods are defined by the quarter within the period of review based upon the reported date of sale. For purposes of analyzing sales transactions by purchaser, region and time period, comparable merchandise is defined using the product control number and all characteristics of the U.S. sales, other than purchaser, region and time period, that the Department uses in making comparisons between EPs (or CEPs) and NV for the individual dumping margins.

In the first stage of the differential pricing analysis used here, the “Cohen’s *d* test” is applied. The Cohen’s *d* coefficient is a generally recognized statistical measure of the extent of the difference between the mean (*i.e.*, weighted-average price) of a test group and the mean (*i.e.*, weighted-average price) of a comparison group. First, for comparable merchandise, the Cohen’s *d* coefficient is calculated when the test and comparison groups of data for a particular purchaser, region or time period each have at least two observations, and when the sales quantity for the comparison group accounts for at least five percent of the total sales quantity of the comparable merchandise. Then, the Cohen’s *d* coefficient is used to evaluate the extent to which the prices to the particular purchaser, region or time period differ significantly from the prices of all other sales of comparable merchandise. The extent of these differences can be quantified by one of three fixed thresholds defined by the Cohen’s *d* test: small, medium or large (0.2, 0.5 and 0.8, respectively). Of these thresholds, the large threshold provides the strongest indication that there is a significant difference between the mean of the test and comparison groups, while the small threshold provides the weakest indication that such a difference exists. For this analysis, the difference is considered significant, and the sales in the test group are found to pass the Cohen’s *d* test, if the calculated Cohen’s *d* coefficient is equal to or exceeds the large (*i.e.*, 0.8) threshold.

Next, the “ratio test” assesses the extent of the significant price differences for all sales as measured by the Cohen’s *d* test. If the value of sales to purchasers, regions, and time periods that pass the Cohen’s *d* test account for 66 percent or more of the value of total sales, then the identified pattern of prices that differ significantly supports the consideration of the application of the average-to-transaction method to all sales as an alternative to the average-to-average method. If the value of sales to purchasers, regions, and time periods that pass the Cohen’s *d* test accounts for more than 33 percent and less than 66 percent of the value of total sales, then the results support consideration of the application of an average-to-transaction method to those sales identified as passing the Cohen’s *d* test as an alternative to the average-to-average method, and application of the average-to-average method to those sales identified as not passing the Cohen’s *d* test. If 33 percent or less of the value of total sales passes the Cohen’s *d* test, then the results of the Cohen’s *d* test do not support consideration of an alternative to the average-to-average method.

If both tests in the first stage (*i.e.*, the Cohen’s *d* test and the ratio test) demonstrate the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly such that an alternative comparison method should be considered, then in the second stage of the differential pricing analysis, the Department examines whether using only the average-to-average method can appropriately account for such differences. In considering this question, the Department tests whether using an alternative

comparison method, based on the results of the Cohen's *d* and ratio tests described above, yields a meaningful difference in the weighted-average dumping margin as compared to that resulting from the use of the average-to-average method only. If the difference between the two calculations is meaningful, then this demonstrates that the average-to-average method cannot account for differences such as those observed in this analysis, and, therefore, an alternative comparison method would be appropriate. A difference in the weighted-average dumping margins is considered meaningful if: 1) there is a 25 percent relative change in the weighted-average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method where both rates are above the *de minimis* threshold; or 2) the resulting weighted-average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method move across the *de minimis* threshold.

Interested parties may present arguments and justifications in relation to the above-described differential pricing approach used in these preliminary results, including arguments for modifying the group definitions used in this proceeding.

2. Results of the Differential Pricing Analysis

For JBL Canada, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, the Department preliminarily finds that 73.17 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen's *d* test,⁶ and confirms the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. Further, the Department preliminarily determines that there is no meaningful difference between the weighted-average dumping margin calculated using the average-to-average method and the weighted-average dumping margin calculated using an alternative comparison method based on applying the average-to-transaction method to all U.S. sales. Thus, for these preliminary results, the Department is applying the average-to-average method for all U.S. sales to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for JBL Canada.

B. Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products produced by JBL Canada that meet the description in the "Scope of the Order" section, above, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(f), we compared JBL Canada's U.S. sales of citric acid made during a particular month to its sales of citric acid made in the home market in the same month. Where there were no contemporaneous sales within the same month, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(f)(2), we compared JBL Canada's U.S. sales of citric acid to its sales of citric acid made in the home market in the most recent of the three months prior to the month of the U.S. sales. Finally, if JBL Canada did not make home market sales of citric acid during any of these months, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(f)(3), we compared JBL Canada's U.S. sales of citric acid to JBL Canada's home market sales of citric acid in the earlier of the two months following the month of the U.S. sales in which JBL Canada made a home market sale of citric acid.

⁶ See the Memorandum to the File from Katherine Johnson and George Ayache, "Preliminary Results Margin Calculation for Jungbunzlauer Canada Inc.; Seventh Administrative Review of Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from Canada" dated concurrently with this memorandum (Preliminary Results Calculation Memorandum) at 2.

In making the product comparisons, we matched foreign like products based on the physical characteristics reported by JBL Canada in the following order of importance: type, form, grade, and particle size. JBL Canada reported that, within the meaning of section 771(16)(A) of the Act, all of its U.S. sales during the POR were identical based on the product matching criteria (*i.e.*, type, form, grade, and particle size) to contemporaneous sales in the home market. Accordingly, in calculating JBL Canada's NV, we made product comparisons without having to account for cost differences associated with differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

C. Constructed Export Price

In accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, we calculated CEP for those sales where the subject merchandise was first sold or agreed to be sold in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter. We based CEP on packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c), we adjusted the starting prices for billing adjustments and rebates, where appropriate. We made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, which included, where appropriate, inland freight, insurance, brokerage, and warehousing expenses. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.402(b), we deducted selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, imputed credit expenses) and indirect selling expenses (including inventory carrying costs). We also deducted from CEP an amount for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by JBL Inc. (Boston), JBL Canada's U.S. affiliate, on its sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the profit associated with those sales. Additionally, consistent with our normal practice, we recalculated indirect selling expenses incurred on U.S. sales by adding the administrative and financial expenses incurred by JBL Inc. (Boston) to the total indirect selling expense figure because these expenses support the selling functions of JBL Inc. (Boston).⁷

D. Normal Value

1. Home Market Viability as Comparison Market

To determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section

⁷ See *Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*; 2012-2013, 79 FR 37286 (July 1, 2014), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 3; see also *Certain frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Ecuador: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 52070 (September 12, 2007); *First Administrative Review of Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 57995 (November 10, 2009), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 5b; and the Preliminary Results Calculation Memorandum.

773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404. Based on this comparison, we determine that, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.404(b), JBL Canada had a viable home market during the POR because the volume of JBL Canada's home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Consequently, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404(c)(1)(i), we based NV on home market sales.

2. Level of Trade (LOT)

Section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act states that, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales of the foreign like product at the same LOT as U.S. sales. Sales are made at different LOTs if they are made at different marketing stages (or their equivalent).⁸ Substantial differences in selling activities are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for determining that there is a difference in the stages of marketing.⁹ To determine whether the comparison-market sales were at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales, we review the distribution system in each market (*i.e.*, the chain of distribution), including selling functions, class of customer (customer category), and the level of selling expenses for each type of sale.

Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, in identifying LOTs for EP and comparison market sales (*i.e.*, where NV is based on either home market or third country prices),¹⁰ we consider the starting prices before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and profit under section 772(d) of the Act.¹¹

When the Department is unable to match U.S. sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP or CEP sale, the Department may compare the U.S. sales to sales at a different LOT in the comparison market. In comparing EP or CEP sales at a different LOT in the comparison market, where available data make it possible, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales only, if the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the LOT of the CEP sale and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in LOTs between NV and CEP affects price comparability (*i.e.*, no LOT adjustment is possible), the Department shall grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412(f).¹²

⁸ See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2).

⁹ *Id.*; see also *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731, 61732 (November 19, 1997) (*Plate from South Africa*).

¹⁰ Where NV is based on constructed value (CV), we determine the NV LOT based on the LOT of the sales from which we derive selling expenses, general and administrative expenses, and profit for CV, where possible. See, *e.g.*, *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil*, 69 FR 47081, 47086 (August 4, 2004), unchanged in *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil*, 69 FR 76910 (December 23, 2004).

¹¹ See *Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States*, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

¹² See *Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR at 61732-33.

In this administrative review, we obtained information from JBL Canada regarding the marketing stages involved in making its reported home market and U.S. sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by the respondent and its affiliates for each channel of distribution. During the POR, JBL Canada reported that it sold citric acid to end-users and distributors through two channels of distribution in both the U.S. and home markets. JBL Canada stated that its selling process was essentially the same for both channels of distribution. Because the details of JBL Canada's reported selling functions for each channel of distribution are business proprietary, our analysis of these selling functions for purposes of determining whether different LOTs exist is contained in a separate memorandum entitled "Level-of-Trade Analysis for the Preliminary Results."¹³

Based on our analysis, we found that the selling functions JBL Canada performed for each of its channels of distribution in the U.S. market were essentially the same, with the exception of one selling function which we determine is not sufficient to warrant a LOT distinction between these channels. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that there is only one LOT in the U.S. market. Similarly, we found that the selling functions that JBL Canada (and its affiliates) performed for each of the channels of distribution in the home market were essentially the same, with the exception of certain selling activities which we determine are not sufficient to warrant a LOT distinction between these channels.¹⁴ Therefore, we preliminarily determine that there is only one LOT in the home market.

In comparing the home market LOT to the U.S. LOT, we found that the selling activities performed by JBL Canada (and its affiliates) for its home market customers are at a more advanced stage of distribution than those performed for its U.S. customers. That is, there are significantly more selling activities performed for home market sales than for U.S. sales. Therefore, based on the totality of the facts and circumstances, we preliminarily determine that home market sales during the POR were made at a different LOT than U.S. sales.

Therefore, we could not match U.S. CEP sales to sales at the same LOT in the home market, nor could we determine a LOT adjustment based on JBL Canada's home market sales because there is only one LOT in the home market, and it is not possible to determine if there is a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and the home market sales at the LOT of the export transaction.¹⁵ Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a LOT adjustment. Consequently, because the available data do not form an appropriate basis for making a LOT adjustment but the home market LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the U.S. LOT, we find it is appropriate to make a CEP offset to NV, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412. The CEP offset is calculated as the lesser of: (1) the indirect selling expenses incurred on the home market sales; or (2) the indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP.

¹³ See Memorandum from The Team to Irene Darzenta Tzafolias, Director, AD/CVD Operations Office VIII, "Level-of-Trade Analysis for the Preliminary Results," dated contemporaneously with this memorandum.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ See Section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

E. Cost of Production (COP) Analysis

In accordance with Section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act,¹⁶ the Department requested CV and COP information from JBL Canada. We examined JBL Canada's cost data and determine that our quarterly cost methodology is not warranted, and, therefore, we are applying our standard methodology of using annual costs based on the reported data.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the respondent's COP based on the sum of its costs of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for general and administrative (G&A) expenses and interest expenses (*see* "Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices" section, below, for treatment of home market selling expenses).

2. Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices

On a product-specific basis, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the home market sales prices of the foreign like product, in order to determine whether the sales prices were below the COP. For purposes of this comparison, we used COP exclusive of selling and packing expenses. The prices (inclusive of billing adjustments, where appropriate) were exclusive of any applicable movement charges, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses.

3. Results of the COP Test

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined, in accordance with sections 773(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act whether: 1) within an extended period of time, such sales were made in substantial quantities; and 2) such sales were made at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. In accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of the respondent's comparison market sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determine that in such instances the below-cost sales were not made within an extended period of time and in "substantial quantities." Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we disregard the below-cost sales when: 1) they were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, in accordance with sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act; and 2) based on our comparison of prices to the weighted-average COPs for the POR, they were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

¹⁶ The TPEA amended section 773(b)(2)(A) of the Act. *See Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015*, Pub. L. No. 114-27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015) found at <https://www.congress.gov/bills/114/congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl> (TPEA). *See also 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).

In this case, we found that less than 20 percent of JBL Canada's sales were at prices less than the COP. Therefore, we used all of JBL Canada's home market sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

F. Calculation of NV Based on Comparison Market Prices

We based NV for JBL Canada on packed prices to unaffiliated customers in the home market. We adjusted, where appropriate, the starting price for billing adjustments, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for movement expenses, including inland freight and inland insurance, under section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410, we made deductions for direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, imputed credit).

We also deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. Finally, as discussed in the "Level of Trade" section above, we made a CEP offset pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.412(f). We calculated the CEP offset as the lesser of the indirect selling expenses incurred on the home market sales or the indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP, revised as described under the "Constructed Export Price" section of this memorandum.

G. Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A of the Act and 19 CFR 351.415, based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

V. RECOMMENDATION

We recommend applying the above methodology for these preliminary results.



Agree

Disagree

1/24/2017

X *Ronald K. Lorentzen*

Signed by: RONALD LORENTZEN

Ronald K. Lorentzen
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance