




A-533-840  
Administrative Review  
POR: 2/1/2014 – 1/31/2015  
**Public Document**  
E&C ADCVDII: BW

March 4, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado  
Assistant Secretary  
for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: Christian Marsh   
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the 2014-2015 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India

---

## SUMMARY

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on certain frozen warmwater shrimp (shrimp) from India. The review covers 223 producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise. The period of review (POR) is February 1, 2014, through January 31, 2015. We preliminarily find that sales of the subject merchandise have been made at prices below normal value (NV). Additionally, we preliminarily determine that certain companies for which we initiated a review did not have any shipments during the POR.

## BACKGROUND

In February 2005, the Department published in the Federal Register an AD order on shrimp from India.<sup>1</sup> Subsequently, on February 2, 2015, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the AD order on shrimp from India for the period February 1, 2014, through January 31, 2015.<sup>2</sup>

Pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), in February and March 2015, the Department received requests to conduct an administrative review of the AD order on shrimp from India from two domestic interested parties, the Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee (the petitioner) and the American Shrimp

---

<sup>1</sup> See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India, 70 FR 5147 (February 1, 2005) (Shrimp Order).

<sup>2</sup> See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 80 FR 5509 (February 2, 2015).



Processors Association (ASPA), for numerous Indian producers/exporters. The Department also received requests to conduct an administrative review from certain individual companies.<sup>3</sup> On March 30, 2015, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we published a notice of initiation of administrative review for 223 companies.<sup>4</sup>

In the Initiation Notice, the Department indicated that, in the event that we would limit the respondents selected for individual examination in accordance with section 777A(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), we would select mandatory respondents for individual examination based upon U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) entry data.<sup>5</sup> In April 2015, we received comments on the issue of respondent selection from two potential respondents, Devi Fisheries Group Limited (Devi Fisheries) and Falcon Marine Exports Limited/K.R. Enterprises (Falcon).<sup>6</sup>

In April 2015, after considering the large number of potential producers/exporters involved in this administrative review, and the resources available to the Department, we determined that it was not practicable to examine all exporters/producers of subject merchandise for which a review was requested.<sup>7</sup> As a result, pursuant to section 777A(c)(2)(B) of the Act, we determined that we could reasonably individually examine only the two largest producers/exporters of shrimp from India by volume during the POR (i.e., Falcon and the Liberty Group<sup>8</sup>).<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, we issued the AD questionnaire to these companies.<sup>10</sup> Also in April 2015, we received statements from 20 companies indicating that they had no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the POR.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In its request for review, one company, Choice Trading Corporation Private Limited (CTCPL), requested treatment as a voluntary respondent in the event that it was not selected as a mandatory respondent. However, CTCPL did not submit a response to the Department's questionnaire, and, as a result, we did not consider its request further.

<sup>4</sup> See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India and Thailand: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 80 FR 16634 (March 30, 2015) (Initiation Notice).

<sup>5</sup> See Initiation Notice, 80 FR at 16635.

<sup>6</sup> See letter from Devi Fisheries and Falcon, "Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India: Comments on Respondent Selection," dated April 6, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> See Memorandum to Irene Darzenta, Acting Director, Office II, AD/CVD Operations, from Stephen A. Banea, International Trade Compliance Analyst, Office II, AD/CVD Operations entitled, "Selection of Respondents for Individual Review," dated April 29, 2015 (Respondent Selection Memo).

<sup>8</sup> The Liberty Group consists of: Devi Marine Food Exports Private Ltd.; Kader Exports Private Limited; Kader Investment and Trading Company Private Limited; Liberty Frozen Foods Pvt. Ltd.; Liberty Oil Mills Ltd.; Premier Marine Products Private Limited; and Universal Cold Storage Private Limited.

<sup>9</sup> Id.

<sup>10</sup> On April 30, 2015, Devi Fisheries requested treatment as a voluntary respondent. See letter from Devi Fisheries, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India: Devi Fisheries Group (comprising, Devi Fisheries Limited, Satya Seafoods Private Limited, and Usha Seafoods) ("Devi") Request for Voluntary Respondent Treatment," dated April 30, 2015. On June 29, 2015, Devi Fisheries withdrew this request. See letter from Devi Fisheries, "and Usha Seafoods) ("Devi") Request for Voluntary Respondent Treatment," dated June 29, 2015. As a result, we not consider this request further.

<sup>11</sup> These companies are: Amulya Sea Foods; Ayshwarya Sea Foods Private Limited; Baby Marine International; Baby Marine Sarass; Blue Water Foods & Exports Pvt. Ltd.; Britto Sea Foods Exports Pvt. Ltd.

In June, 2015, we received responses from Falcon and the Liberty Group to section A (i.e., the section related to general information) of the questionnaire, and in July, 2015, we received responses from these companies to the remaining sections of the questionnaire (i.e., sections B, C, and D, the sections covering comparison market, U.S. sales, and cost of production (COP)/constructed value (CV), respectively).

In July and August 2015, we issued supplemental section D questionnaires to Falcon and the Liberty Group, as well as a supplemental section A questionnaire to the Liberty Group. We received responses to these supplemental questionnaires in August and September 2015. Also in September, 2015, we selected Belgium as the appropriate third market country for Falcon, and the United Kingdom as the appropriate third market country for the Liberty Group.<sup>12</sup>

In October 2015, we extended the preliminary results in this review to no later than February 29, 2016.<sup>13</sup> Also in October and November 2015, we issued additional supplemental sales questionnaires to Falcon and the Liberty Group. We received responses to these supplemental questionnaires in November 2015.

In January 2016, as explained in the memorandum from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement & Compliance, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll all administrative deadlines due to the recent closure of the Federal Government. All deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by four business days. The revised deadline for the preliminary results of this review is now March 4, 2016.<sup>14</sup>

## **SCOPE OF THE ORDER**

The scope of this order includes certain frozen warmwater shrimp and prawns, whether wild-caught (ocean harvested) or farm-raised (produced by aquaculture), head-on or head-off, shell-on

---

(Britto Sea Foods); Capithan Exporting Company; Cherukattu Industries (Marine Division); Coreline Exports; Delsea Exports Pvt. Ltd.; GEO Aquatic Products Pvt. Ltd.; GVR Exports Pvt. Ltd.; Indo Fisheries; Navayuga Exports Limited; R F Exports; Santhi Fisheries & Exports Limited; Selvam Exports Private Limited; Sterling Foods; Veronica Marine Exports Private Limited; and Vinner Marine Processors & Exporters of Marine Products. We did not consider the statement from Britto Sea Foods because we did not receive a request for an administrative review for this company.

<sup>12</sup> See Memorandum to Melissa G. Skinner, Director, Office II, AD/CVD Operations, from Blaine Wiltse, Senior International Trade Compliance Analyst, entitled, "Selection of an Appropriate Third Country Market," dated September 1, 2015 (Liberty Group Market Selection Memo) and Memorandum to Melissa G. Skinner, Director, Office II, AD/CVD Operations, from the Team, entitled, "Selection of an Appropriate Third Country Market," dated September 3, 2015 (Falcon Market Selection Memo).

<sup>13</sup> See Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, from Blaine Wiltse, Senior International Trade Compliance Analyst, Office II, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, entitled, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India and Thailand: Extension of Deadline for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review," dated October 2, 2015.

<sup>14</sup> See Memorandum to the Record from Ron Lorentzen, Acting A/S for Enforcement & Compliance, regarding "Tolling of Administrative Deadlines as a Result of the Government Closure during Snowstorm Jonas," dated January 27, 2016.

or peeled, tail-on or tail-off,<sup>15</sup> deveined or not deveined, cooked or raw, or otherwise processed in frozen form.

The frozen warmwater shrimp and prawn products included in the scope of this order, regardless of definitions in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), are products which are processed from warmwater shrimp and prawns through freezing and which are sold in any count size.

The products described above may be processed from any species of warmwater shrimp and prawns. Warmwater shrimp and prawns are generally classified in, but are not limited to, the *Penaeidae* family. Some examples of the farmed and wild-caught warmwater species include, but are not limited to, whiteleg shrimp (*Penaeus vannamei*), banana prawn (*Penaeus merguensis*), fleshy prawn (*Penaeus chinensis*), giant river prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*), giant tiger prawn (*Penaeus monodon*), redspotted shrimp (*Penaeus brasiliensis*), southern brown shrimp (*Penaeus subtilis*), southern pink shrimp (*Penaeus notialis*), southern rough shrimp (*Trachypenaeus curvirostris*), southern white shrimp (*Penaeus schmitti*), blue shrimp (*Penaeus stylirostris*), western white shrimp (*Penaeus occidentalis*), and Indian white prawn (*Penaeus indicus*).

Frozen shrimp and prawns that are packed with marinade, spices or sauce are included in the scope of this order. In addition, food preparations, which are not “prepared meals,” that contain more than 20 percent by weight of shrimp or prawn are also included in the scope of this order. Excluded from the scope are: (1) breaded shrimp and prawns (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.10.20); (2) shrimp and prawns generally classified in the *Pandalidae* family and commonly referred to as coldwater shrimp, in any state of processing; (3) fresh shrimp and prawns whether shell-on or peeled (HTSUS subheadings 0306.23.00.20 and 0306.23.00.40); (4) shrimp and prawns in prepared meals (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.05.10); (5) dried shrimp and prawns; (6) canned warmwater shrimp and prawns (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.10.40); (7) certain battered shrimp. Battered shrimp is a shrimp-based product: (1) that is produced from fresh (or thawed-from-frozen) and peeled shrimp; (2) to which a “dusting” layer of rice or wheat flour of at least 95 percent purity has been applied; (3) with the entire surface of the shrimp flesh thoroughly and evenly coated with the flour; (4) with the non-shrimp content of the end product constituting between four and ten percent of the product’s total weight after being dusted, but prior to being frozen; and (5) that is subjected to IQF freezing immediately after application of the dusting layer. When dusted in accordance with the definition of dusting above, the battered shrimp product is also coated with a wet viscous layer containing egg and/or milk, and par-fried.

The products covered by this order are currently classified under the following HTSUS subheadings: 0306.17.00.03, 0306.17.00.06, 0306.17.00.09, 0306.17.00.12, 0306.17.00.15, 0306.17.00.18, 0306.17.00.21, 0306.17.00.24, 0306.17.00.27, 0306.17.00.40, 1605.21.10.30, and 1605.29.10.10. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only and are not dispositive, but rather the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> “Tails” in this context means the tail fan, which includes the telson and the uropods.

<sup>16</sup> On April 26, 2011, the Department amended the antidumping duty order to include dusted shrimp, pursuant to the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) decision in Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee v.

## PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION OF NO SHIPMENTS

During the review, we received no-shipment claims from 19 companies named in the Initiation Notice.<sup>17</sup> We subsequently confirmed with CBP the no-shipment claims made by all of these companies. Because the evidence on the record indicates that these companies did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the POR, we preliminarily determine that the following 19 companies had no reviewable transactions during the POR:

1. Amulya Sea Foods
2. Ayshwarya Sea Foods Private Limited
3. Baby Marine International
4. Baby Marine Sarass
5. Blue Water Foods & Exports Pvt. Ltd.
6. Capithan Exporting Company
7. Cherukattu Industries (Marine Division)
8. Coreline Exports
9. Delsea Exports Pvt. Ltd.
10. GEO Aquatic Products Pvt. Ltd.
11. GVR Exports Pvt. Ltd.
12. Indo Fisheries
13. Navayuga Exports Limited
14. R F Exports
15. Santhi Fisheries & Exports Limited
16. Selvam Exports Private Limited
17. Sterling Foods
18. Veronica Marine Exports Private Limited
19. Vinner Marine Processors & Exporters of Marine Products

Since the implementation of the 1997 regulations, our practice concerning no-shipment respondents had been to rescind the administrative review if the respondent certified that it had no shipments and we had confirmed through our examination of CBP data that there were no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR.<sup>18</sup> As a result, in such circumstances, we previously instructed CBP to liquidate any entries from the no-shipment company at the deposit rate in effect on the date of entry.

---

United States, 703 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (CIT 2010) and the U.S. International Trade Commission determination, which found the domestic like product to include dusted shrimp. See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, India, the People's Republic of China, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Amended Antidumping Duty Orders in Accordance with Final Court Decision, 76 FR 23277 (April 26, 2011); see also Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee v. United States, 703 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (CIT 2010) and Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, China, India, Thailand, and Vietnam (Investigation Nos. 731-TA-1063, 1064, 1066-1068 (Review), USITC Publication 4221, March 2011).

<sup>17</sup> We also received a no shipment claim from a company which was not named in the Initiation Notice. See letter from Britto Sea Foods, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India, 10th Administrative Review; Submission of Statement of No Shipments," dated April 29, 2015. Because we are not conducting an administrative review of Britto Sea Foods, we did not considered a Britto Sea Foods' no shipment claim.

<sup>18</sup> See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final rule, 62 FR 27296, 27393 (May 19, 1997).

In our May 6, 2003, “automatic assessment” clarification, we explained that, where respondents in an administrative review demonstrate that they had no knowledge of sales through resellers to the United States, we would instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the all-others rate applicable to the proceeding.<sup>19</sup> Because “as entered” liquidation instructions do not alleviate the concerns which the May 2003 clarification was intended to address, we find it appropriate in this case to instruct CBP to liquidate any existing entries of merchandise produced by the 19 companies listed above, and exported by other parties, at the all-others rate, should we continue to find that these companies had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR in our final results.<sup>20</sup> In addition, the Department finds that it is more consistent with the May 2003 clarification not to rescind the review in part in these circumstances but, rather, to complete the review with respect to these 19 companies and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of the review. See the “Assessment Rates” section of the Federal Register notice accompanying this memorandum.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE METHODOLOGY**

### **Normal Value Comparisons**

Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and (d), in order to determine whether Falcon’s and the Liberty Group’s sales of shrimp from India to the United States were made at less than NV, the Department compared the export price (EP) to the NV as described in the “Export Price” and “Normal Value” sections of this memorandum.

### **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 EPs (or constructed export prices (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 (LTFV) 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 LTFV investigations.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Preliminary No Shipment Determination, 77 FR 13275, 13277 (March 6, 2012) (2011-12 India Shrimp Prelim) unchanged in Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final No Shipment Determination, 77 FR 40848 (July 11, 2012) (2011-12 India Shrimp Final). This instruction only applies where there is no rate established for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.

<sup>21</sup> 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 accompanying Issues and

In recent investigations, the Department applied a “differential pricing” analysis to determine 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.<sup>22</sup> The Department finds that the differential pricing analysis used in recent 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 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 margin. The analysis incorporates default group definitions for purchasers, regions, time periods, and comparable merchandise. Purchasers are based on the reported customer codes. Regions are defined using the reported destination code (*i.e.*, state 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 POR based upon the reported date of sale. For purposes of analyzing sales transactions by purchaser, region and time period, comparable merchandise is considered 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 EP 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 a particular purchaser, region, or time period differ significantly from the net 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

---

Decision Memorandum at Comment 1; see also JBK RAK LLC v. United States, 790 F.3d 1358, 1363-65 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“{t}he 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).

<sup>22</sup> 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).

is a significant difference between the means 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.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Falcon and the Liberty Group in their supplemental questionnaire responses requested that the Department modify the time periods used in the differential pricing analysis. See Falcon's submission entitled, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India: Falcon Marine Response to Supplemental Sections A/B/C Questionnaire," dated November 12, 2015, at pages 27-29; and the Liberty Group's submission entitled, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India: Liberty Group Response to Supplemental Sections B/C Questionnaire," dated November 25, 2015, at pages 39-42. We will consider these comments for purposes of the final results.



## Results of the Differential Pricing Analysis

For Falcon, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, the Department preliminarily finds that 62.19 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen's *d* test,<sup>24</sup> and confirms the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. Further, the Department preliminarily determines that the average-to-average method cannot account for such differences because the weighted-average dumping margin crosses the de minimis threshold when calculated using the average-to-average method and when calculated using an alternative comparison method based on applying the average-to-transaction method to those U.S. sales which passed the Cohen's *d* test and the average-to-average method to those sales which did not pass the Cohen's *d* test. Thus, for these preliminary results, the Department is applying the average-to-transaction method to those U.S. sales which passed the Cohen's *d* test and the average-to-average method to those sales which did not pass the Cohen's *d* test to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for Falcon.

For the Liberty Group, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, the Department preliminarily finds that 72.15 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen's *d* test,<sup>25</sup> and confirms the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. Further, the Department preliminarily determines that the average-to-average method cannot account for such differences because there is a 25 percent relative change between the weighted-average dumping margin calculated using the average-to-average method and the weighted-average dumping calculated using an alternative comparison method based on applying the average-to-transaction method to all U.S. sales. Thus, for this preliminary determination, the Department is applying the average-to-transaction method to all U.S. sales to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for the Liberty Group.

## Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16)(A) of the Act, we considered all products produced by Falcon and the Liberty Group covered by 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(e) and (f), we compared U.S. sales of shrimp to sales of shrimp made in the third country comparison market within the contemporaneous window period, which extends from three months prior to the month of the first U.S. sale until two months after the month of the last U.S. sale.

Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the comparison market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, according to section 771(16)(B) of the Act, we compared U.S. sales of non-broken shrimp to sales of the most similar non-broken foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade. In making the product comparisons, we matched

---

<sup>24</sup> See the Memorandum to the File from Elizabeth Eastwood, Senior Analyst, entitled, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India; Calculations for Falcon Marine Exports Limited (Falcon) for the Preliminary Results of the 2014-2015 Administrative Review," dated concurrently with this memorandum.

<sup>25</sup> See the Memorandum to the File from Blaine Wiltse, Senior Analyst, entitled, "Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India; Calculations for the Liberty Group for the Preliminary Results of the 2014-2015 Administrative Review," dated concurrently with this memorandum.

foreign like products based on the physical characteristics to the product sold in the United States. In the order of importance, these physical characteristics are 1) cooked form; 2) head status; 3) count size; 4) organic certification; 5) shell status; 6) vein status; 7) tail status; 8) other shrimp preparation; 9) frozen form; 10) flavoring; 11) container weight; 12) presentation; 13) species; and 14) preservatives. Where there were no sales of identical or similar non-broken merchandise, we made product comparisons using CV, as discussed in the “Calculation of Normal Value Based on Constructed Value” section below.<sup>26</sup>

### Export Price

For all U.S. sales made by Falcon and the Liberty Group, we used EP methodology, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold by the producer/exporter outside of the United States directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and CEP methodology was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record.

#### *A. Falcon*

We based EP on packed prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for discounts, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We made deductions from the starting price for cold storage charges, loading and unloading charges, trailer hire charges, local van hire charges, foreign inland freight expenses, export survey charges, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, international freight expenses (offset by freight revenue), terminal handling and other shipment charges, marine insurance expenses, and U.S. customs duties (including harbor maintenance fees and merchandise processing fees), where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

#### *B. The Liberty Group*

We based EP on packed prices to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for discounts, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We also made deductions from the starting price for cold storage expenses, loading and unloading expenses, trailer hire expenses, foreign inland freight expenses, export survey charges, terminal handling charges, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, international freight expenses, marine insurance expenses, terminal handling charges, U.S. customs duties (including harbor maintenance fees and merchandise processing fees), and U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

---

<sup>26</sup> See section 773(a)(4) of the Act.

## Normal Value

### A. *Home Market Viability and Comparison Market*

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we normally use home market sales as the basis for NV. However, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(C)(ii), we use third country sales as the basis for NV if the volume of home market sales is insufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of subject merchandise to the United States.

In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is five percent or more of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the volume of Falcon's and the Liberty Group's respective home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of their U.S. sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product for each of the respondents was insufficient to permit a proper comparison with U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, pursuant to 773(a)(1)(C)(ii).

For Falcon, we selected Belgium as the comparison market because, among other things, Falcon's sales of foreign like product in Belgium were the most similar to the subject merchandise.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, we used sales to Belgium as the basis for comparison market sales, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404.

Similarly, for Liberty Group, we selected the United Kingdom as the comparison market because, among other things, Liberty Group's sales of foreign like product in the United Kingdom were the most similar to the subject merchandise.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, we used sales to the United Kingdom as the basis for comparison market sales, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.404.

### B. *Level of Trade*

Section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act states that, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP or CEP. Sales are made at different LOTs if they are made at different marketing stages (or their equivalent).<sup>29</sup>

Substantial differences in selling activities are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for determining that there is a difference in the stages of marketing.<sup>30</sup> In order to determine whether the comparison market sales were at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales, we reviewed the distribution system in each market (*i.e.*, the chain of distribution), including

---

<sup>27</sup> See Falcon Market Selection Memo.

<sup>28</sup> See the Liberty Group Market Selection Memo.

<sup>29</sup> See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2).

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*; see also Certain Orange Juice From Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part, 75 FR 50999, 51001 (August 18, 2010), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 7 (OJ from Brazil).

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., NV based on either home market or third country prices),<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup>

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, the Department may compare the U.S. sale 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 and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in LOTs between NV and CEP affects price comparability (i.e., no LOT adjustment was possible), the Department will grant a CEP offset, as provided in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.<sup>33</sup>

In this administrative review, we obtained information from the respondents regarding the marketing stages involved in making the reported third country and U.S. sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by each respondent for each channel of distribution. Company-specific LOT findings are summarized below.

#### *1. Falcon*

Falcon reported that it made EP sales in the U.S. market through a single channel of distribution (i.e., direct sales to unaffiliated trading companies). We examined the selling activities performed for U.S. sales and found that Falcon performed the following selling functions: customer contact and price negotiation; order processing; arranging for freight and the provision of customs clearance/brokerage services; cold storage and inventory maintenance; and quality-assurance-related activities. These selling activities can be generally grouped into four selling function categories for analysis: 1) sales and marketing; 2) freight and delivery; 3) inventory maintenance and warehousing; and 4) warranty and technical support. Accordingly, based on the selling function categories, we find that Falcon performed sales and marketing, freight and delivery services, inventory maintenance and warehousing, and warranty and technical support for U.S. sales. Because all sales in the United States are made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities to Falcon's customers did not vary within this channel, we preliminarily determine that there is one LOT in the U.S. market.

With respect to the third country market, Falcon reported that it made sales through a single channel of distribution (i.e., direct sales to unaffiliated trading companies). We examined the

---

<sup>31</sup> Where NV is based on CV, we determine the NV LOT based on the LOT of the sales from which we derive selling expenses, general and administrative (G&A) expenses, and profit for CV, where possible.

<sup>32</sup> See Micron Tech., Inc. v. United States, 243 F.3d 1301, 1314-16 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., OJ from Brazil, at Comment 7.

selling activities performed for third country sales and found that Falcon performed the following selling functions: customer contact and price negotiation; order processing; arranging for freight and the provision of customs clearance/brokerage services; cold storage and inventory maintenance; and quality-assurance-related activities. Accordingly, based on the selling function categories noted above, we find that Falcon performed sales and marketing, freight and delivery services, inventory maintenance and warehousing, and warranty and technical support for all third country sales. Because all third country sales are made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities to Falcon's customers did not vary within this channel, we preliminarily determine that there is one LOT in the third country market for Falcon.

Finally, we compared the EP LOT to the third country market LOT and found that the selling functions performed for U.S. and third country market customers do not differ, as Falcon performed the same selling functions at the same relative level of intensity in both markets. Therefore, we determine that sales to the U.S. and third country markets during the POR were made at the same LOT, and as a result, no LOT adjustment is warranted.

## *2. The Liberty Group*

The Liberty Group reported that it made EP sales in the U.S. market through a single channel of distribution (i.e., direct sales to unaffiliated trading companies). We examined the selling activities performed for U.S. sales and found that the Liberty Group performed the following selling functions: customer contact and price negotiation; order processing; arranging for freight and the provision of customs clearance/brokerage services; cold storage and inventory maintenance; quality-assurance-related activities, and banking-related activities. These selling activities can be generally grouped into four selling function categories for analysis: 1) sales and marketing; 2) freight and delivery; 3) inventory maintenance and warehousing; and 4) warranty and technical support. Accordingly, based on the selling function categories noted above, we find that the Liberty Group performed sales and marketing, freight and delivery services, inventory maintenance and warehousing, and warranty and technical support for U.S. sales. Because all sales in the United States are made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities to the liberty Group's customers did not vary within this channel, we preliminarily determine that there is one LOT in the U.S. market.

With respect to the third country market, the Liberty Group reported that it made sales through a single channel of distribution (i.e., direct sales to unaffiliated trading companies). We examined the selling activities performed for third country sales and found that the Liberty performed the following selling functions: customer contact and price negotiation; order processing; arranging for freight and the provision of customs clearance/brokerage services; cold storage and inventory maintenance; quality-assurance-related activities; and banking-related activities. Accordingly, based on these selling function categories noted above, we find that the Liberty Group performed sales and marketing, freight and delivery services, inventory maintenance and warehousing, and warranty and technical support for all third country sales. Because all third country sales are made through a single distribution channel and the selling activities to the Liberty Group's customers did not vary within this channel, we preliminarily determine that there is one LOT in the third country market for the Liberty Group.

Finally, we compared the EP LOT to the third country market LOT and found that the selling functions performed for U.S. and third country market customers do not differ, as the Liberty Group performed the same selling functions at the same relative level of intensity in both markets. Therefore, we determine that sales to the U.S. and third country markets during the POR were made at the same LOT, and as a result, no LOT adjustment is warranted.

### C. *Cost of Production Analysis*

We found that Falcon and the Liberty Group made sales below the COP in the most recently-completed segment of this proceeding for each company as of the date of initiation of this review, and such sales were disregarded.<sup>34</sup> Thus, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, we preliminarily find that there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Falcon and the Liberty Group made comparison market sales at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise during the current POR. Accordingly, we are also conducting a sales-below-cost investigation to determine whether Falcon's and the Liberty Group's comparison market sales were made at prices below their COP.

#### 1. *Calculation of Cost of Production*

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the respondents' COPs based on the sum of materials and conversion cost for the foreign like product, plus amounts for G&A and interest expenses (see "Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices" section, below, for treatment of comparison market selling expenses).

Based on our review of the record evidence, the respondents do not appear to have experienced significant changes in the cost of manufacturing during the POR. Therefore, we followed our normal methodology of calculating an annual weighted-average cost. The Department relied on the COP data submitted by each respondent in its most recently submitted cost database for the COP calculation.

We relied on the weighted-average cost databases submitted on August 13, 2015, and September 1, 2015, in calculating COP for Falcon and the Liberty Group, respectively. We made no changes to the respondents' reported costs.

#### 2. *Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices*

On a product-specific basis, pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act, we compared the weighted-average COP to the third country 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 were exclusive of any applicable movement charges, discounts, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses.

---

<sup>34</sup> See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013, 79 FR 51309 (August 28, 2014) and Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, and Notice of Revocation of Order in Part, 75 FR 41813 (July 19, 2010).

### 3. *Results of the COP Test*

In determining whether to disregard third country 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 third country sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we disregard none of the 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) the sales 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. Because we are applying our standard annual-average cost test in these preliminary results, we also applied our standard cost recovery test with no adjustments.

We found that, for certain products, more than 20 percent of Falcon's and the Liberty Group's comparison market sales were at prices less than the COP and, in addition, such sales did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. We therefore disregarded these sales and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

For those U.S. sales of subject merchandise for which there were no comparable third country sales in the ordinary course of trade, we compared EP to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act. See "Calculation of Normal Value Based on Constructed Value" section below.

#### D. *Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices*

##### 1. *Falcon*

We calculated NV for Falcon based on the reported packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in Belgium. We made deductions to the starting price, where appropriate, for discounts, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We also made deductions for cold storage expenses, loading and unloading expenses, local van hire charges, foreign inland freight expenses, export survey charges, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, inland insurance, international freight expenses (offset by freight revenue), and terminal handling and other shipment charges, under section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act.

In addition, we made adjustments under section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for differences in circumstances of sale for direct selling expenses (including bank charges, Export Credit and Guarantee Corporation (ECGC) fees, Export Inspection Agency fees, outside inspection/lab expenses, imputed credit expenses, and other direct selling expenses), and

commissions. We also made adjustments, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.410(e), for indirect selling expenses incurred in the third country market or the United States where commissions were granted on sales in one market but not in the other, also known as the “commission offset.” Specifically, where commissions were incurred in only one market, we limited the amount of such allowance to the amount of either the indirect selling expenses incurred in the one market or the commissions allowed in the other market, whichever is less.

We added U.S. packing costs and deducted third country packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B)(i) of the Act. When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise.<sup>35</sup>

## *2. The Liberty Group*

We calculated NV for the Liberty Group based on the reported packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in the United Kingdom. We made deductions to the starting price, where appropriate, for discounts, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(c). We also made deductions for cold storage expenses, loading and unloading expenses, trailer hire expenses, foreign inland freight expenses, export survey charges, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, international freight expenses, and terminal handling charges, under section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act.

In addition, we made adjustments under section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for differences in circumstances of sale for direct selling expenses (including bank charges, ECGC fees, Export Inspection Agency fees, outside inspection/lab expenses, imputed credit expenses, and other direct selling expenses), and commissions. We also made adjustments, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.410(e), for indirect selling expenses incurred in the third country market or the United States where commissions were granted on sales in one market but not in the other, as described above.

We added U.S. packing costs and deducted third country packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B)(i) of the Act. When comparing U.S. sales with comparison market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing for the foreign like product and subject merchandise.<sup>36</sup>

## *E. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Constructed Value*

Section 773(a)(4) of the Act provides that where NV cannot be based on comparison market sales, NV may be based on CV. Accordingly, for those shrimp products for which we could not determine the NV based on comparison market sales because, as noted in the “Results of the

---

<sup>35</sup> See 19 CFR 351.411(b).

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*



COP Test” section above, all sales of the comparable products failed the COP test, we based NV on CV.

Sections 773(e)(1) and (2)(A) of the Act provide that CV shall be based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication for the imported merchandise, plus amounts for selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. For each respondent, we calculated the cost of materials and fabrication based on the methodology described in the “Cost of Production Analysis” section, above. We based SG&A and profit for each respondent on the actual amounts incurred and realized by it in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the comparison market, in accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made adjustments to CV for differences in circumstances of sale, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) and (a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to EP, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments by deducting direct selling expenses incurred on comparison market sales from, and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to, CV.<sup>37</sup> We also made adjustments, when applicable, for comparison market indirect selling expenses, to offset U.S. commissions in EP comparisons.<sup>38</sup>

#### Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars for all spot transactions by Falcon and the Liberty Group, 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. In addition, Falcon and the Liberty Group reported that they purchased forward exchange contracts which were used to convert their sales prices into home market currency. Under 19 CFR 351.415(b), if a currency transaction on forward markets is directly linked to an export sale under consideration, the Department is directed to use the exchange rate specified with respect to such currency in the forward sale agreement to convert the foreign currency.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, we used the reported forward exchange rates for currency conversions where applicable.

---

<sup>37</sup> See 19 CFR 351.410(c).

<sup>38</sup> See 19 CFR 351.410(e).


<sup>39</sup> See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Negative Final Determination of Critical Circumstances: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp From India, 69 FR 76916 (December 23, 2004), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6; see also 2011-12 India Shrimp Prelim, unchanged in 2011-12 India Shrimp Final.


### Recommendation

Based on our analysis, we recommend adopting the above positions in these preliminary results. If this recommendation is accepted, we will publish the preliminary results of the review and the preliminary dumping margins for Falcon and the Liberty Group in the Federal Register.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Agree

\_\_\_\_\_  
Disagree

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Piquado  
Assistant Secretary  
for Enforcement and Compliance

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)