



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
Washington, D.C. 20230

A-427-602

A-428-602

A-475-601

A-588-704

Sunset Reviews

Public Document

AD/CVD I: AP

DATE: June 28, 2017

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

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

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the
Expedited Fourth Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders
on Brass Sheet and Strip from France (A-427-602), Germany (A-
428-602), Italy (A-475-601), and Japan (A-588-704)

SUMMARY

We have analyzed the substantive responses of Aurubis Buffalo, Inc., GBC Metals, LLC (doing business as, Olin Brass), Heyco Metals, Inc., PMX Industries, Inc. and Revere Copper Products, Inc. (collectively, the domestic interested parties) in the fourth sunset reviews of the antidumping duty (AD) orders covering brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. No respondent interested party submitted a substantive response.¹ Accordingly, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2) we have conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review.² We recommend that you approve the positions described in the “Discussion of the Issues” section of this memorandum. Below is a complete list of the issues in these sunset reviews for which we received substantive responses

¹ See Letters from domestic interested parties regarding “Brass Sheet and Strip From France – Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation” (Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – France), dated March 31, 2017; “Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany – Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation” (Domestic interested parties’ Substantive Response – Germany), dated March 31, 2017; “Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy – Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation” (Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – Italy), dated March 31, 2017; and “Brass Sheet and Strip From Japan – Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation” (Domestic interested parties’ Substantive Response – Japan), dated March 31, 2017.

² See section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2).



1. Likelihood of a continuation or recurrence of dumping
2. Magnitude of margin likely to prevail

BACKGROUND

On March 3, 2017, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the notice of initiation of the fourth sunset reviews of the AD orders on brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act.³ On March 17, 2017, the Department received notice of intent to participate in the France, Germany, Italy and Japan reviews by the domestic interested parties.⁴ Submission of the notices of intent to participate were filed by the domestic interested parties within the 15-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). The domestic interested parties all claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product.⁵ On March 31, 2017, the Department received substantive responses in all four reviews from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).⁶ We received no substantive responses from any respondent interested parties. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department is conducting expedited 120-day sunset reviews of these AD orders with respect to brass sheet and strip imports from France, Germany, Italy and Japan.

HISTORY OF THE ORDERS

The Department published its final affirmative determinations of sales at less than fair value (LTFV) with respect to imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan at the following rates:⁷

³ See *Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 82 FR 12438 (March 3, 2017).

⁴ See Letters from domestic interested parties regarding, “Five-Year (Sunset) Review of Antidumping Duty Orders on Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan – Petitioners’ Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated March 17, 2017.

⁵ See Letters from domestic interested parties regarding, “Five-Year (Sunset) Review of Antidumping Duty Orders on Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan – Petitioners’ Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated March 17, 2017.

⁶ See Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – France, dated March 31, 2017; Domestic interested parties’ Substantive Response – Germany, dated March 31, 2017; Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – Italy, dated March 31, 2017; and Domestic interested parties’ Substantive Response – Japan, dated March 31, 2017.

⁷ See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip from France*, 52 FR 812 (January 9, 1987) (*France Final Determination*); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Brass Sheet and Strip from the Federal Republic of Germany*, 52 FR 822 (January 9, 1987) (*Germany Final Determination*), amended at *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from the Federal Republic of Germany*, 52 FR 35750 (September 23, 1987) (*Germany Amended Order*); *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy*, 52 FR 816 (January 9, 1987) (*Italy Final Determination*), amended at *Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment of Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance with Decision Upon Remand: Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy*, 56 FR 23272 (May 21, 1991) (*Italy Amended Order*); and *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan*, 53 FR 23296 (June 21, 1988) (*Japan Final Determination*).

France

Trefimetaux S.A.	42.24
All Others	42.24

Germany

Wieland-Werke AG (Wieland)	3.81 Amended
Langenberg Kupfer-und Messingwerke GmbH KG (Langenberg)	16.18 Amended
All Others	7.30 Amended

Italy

LMI- La Metalli Industriale SpA	5.44 Amended
All Others	5.44 Amended

Japan

Nippon Mining Co., Ltd.	57.98
Sambo Copper Alloy Co., Ltd.	13.30
Mitsubishi Shindoh Co., Ltd.	57.98
Kobe Steel, Ltd.	57.98
All Others	45.72

Following the publication of the Department's final determinations, the International Trade Commission (ITC) found that the U.S. industry was materially injured by reason of LTFV imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan.⁸ The Department later published in the *Federal Register* AD orders on brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan.⁹ The history of the *Orders* is summarized in the attachment to the memorandum.¹⁰

Administrative Reviews

Since the publication of the *Orders*, the Department has conducted one administrative review with respect to brass sheet and strip from France.¹¹ In the 2014-15 review, the Department applied adverse facts available (AFA) and assigned to both respondents, Griset SA and KME France, weighted-average dumping margins of 42.24 percent, the highest rate found in the final

⁸ See *Certain Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy, Sweden, and West Germany*, Inv. No. 731-TA-313 (Final), USITC Pub. 1951 (February 1987). See *Certain Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan and Netherlands*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-379 and 380 (Final) USITC Pub. 2099 (July 1988).

⁹ See *Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from France*, 52 FR 6995 (March 6, 1987) (*France Order*); *Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from the Federal Republic of Germany*, 52 FR 6997 (March 6, 1987), amended at *Germany Amended Order*; *Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy*, 52 FR 6997 (March 6, 1987), amended at *Italy Amended Order*; and *Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan*, 53 FR 30454 (August 12, 1988) (*Japan Order*) (collectively, the *Orders*).

¹⁰ See Attachment I at 16-24.

¹¹ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015* (81 FR 14091) March 16, 2016.

LTFV determination.¹² The 42.24 percent rate is derived from the investigation, which prior to the 2014-15 review, was the only segment in the 28-year history of this order in which a rate was assigned.¹³

In addition, three administrative reviews of the order on brass sheet and strip from France were requested by the domestic interested parties since the final results of the third sunset review, but all of these were subsequently rescinded.¹⁴ The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from France.

The Department has conducted 13 administrative reviews with respect to imports of brass sheet and strip from Germany. Since the final results of the third sunset review, the Department has issued the final results of review for the 2013-14 review,¹⁵ and the 2014-15 review,¹⁶ with respect to brass sheet and strip from Germany.

In the *Germany BSS 2013-14 Review*, we applied AFA and assigned a weighted-average dumping margin of 55.60 percent to Messingwerk Plettenberg Herfeld GmbH & Co. KG (Messingwerk), the sole company selected for individual examination.¹⁷ We found a margin of 22.61 percent to be applied for the six firms not selected for individual review: Aurubis Stolberg GmbH & Co. KG, Carl Schreiber GmbH, KME Germany AG & Co. KG, Messing GmbH, and Schlenk Metallfolien GmbH & Co. KG. This margin was based on an average of the range of certain dumping margins contained in the underlying petition. We determined no shipments of subject merchandise for Schwermetall, ThyssenKrupp, and Wieland, during the period of review (POR).¹⁸

In the *Germany BSS 2014-15 Review*, we applied AFA and assigned a margin of 55.60 percent for Messingwerk, the sole company selected for individual examination. Aurubis Stolberg GmbH & Co. KG, Carl Schreiber GmbH, KME Germany AG & Co. KG, Messing GmbH, and

¹² See *France Final Determination and Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015*, 80 FR 75055 (December 1, 2015).

¹³ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy, and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 76 FR 39849 (July 7, 2011) and accompanying Issues and Decision memorandum at 1-3 (“History of the Orders” section). Because this was an AFA rate derived from the petition in the investigation, the rate was not subject to the Department’s so-called “zeroing” methodology. See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) (Final Modification for Reviews).

¹⁴ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 77 FR 34937 (June 12, 2012); *Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013*, 78 FR 56656 (September 13, 2013); *Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 79 FR 46772 (August 11, 2014).

¹⁵ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 80 FR 61369 (October 13, 2015) (*Germany BSS 2013-14 Review*).

¹⁶ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015*, 81 FR 44274 (July 7, 2016) (*Germany BSS 2014-15 Review*).

¹⁷ Because this was an AFA rate derived from the petition in the investigation, the rate was not subject to the Department’s so-called zeroing methodology. For a full description of the Department’s selection of the 55.60 percent AFA dumping margins, see “Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany; 2013-2014.”

¹⁸ See “Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany; 2013-2014.”

Schlenk Metallfolien GmbH & Co. KG, which were not selected for individual examination, each received a rate of 22.61 percent, based on an average of certain dumping margins contained in the underlying petition. We determined no shipments of subject merchandise for Schwermetall, ThyssenKrupp, and Wieland, during the POR.¹⁹

In addition, two administrative reviews of the order on brass sheet and strip from Germany were requested by the domestic interested parties since the final results of the third sunset review, but both of these were subsequently rescinded.²⁰ The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Germany.

The Department has conducted five administrative reviews with respect to brass sheet and strip from Italy. Since the final results of the third sunset review, the Department has issued the final results of review for the 2013-14 review,²¹ and the 2014-15 review,²² with respect to brass sheet and strip from Italy.

In the *Italy BSS 2013-14 Review*, we applied AFA and assigned the sole respondent, KME Italy SpA (KME Italy), a margin of 22.00 percent, which is the highest rate presented in the petition and relied on for purposes of initiating an investigation.²³

In the *Italy BSS 2014-15 Review*, we applied AFA and assigned the sole respondent, KME Italy, the dumping margin of 22.00 percent, which is the highest rate assigned to a respondent in a separate segment of this proceeding. Specifically, we assigned this dumping rate to KME Italy in the 2013-14 review.²⁴

In addition, two administrative reviews of the order on brass sheet and strip from Italy were requested by the domestic interested parties since the final results of the third sunset review, but both of these were subsequently rescinded.²⁵ The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Italy.

The Department has conducted no administrative reviews in respect to brass sheet and strip from Japan since the *Japan Order* has been published. Three administrative reviews of the order on brass and strip from Japan were requested by the domestic interested parties since the final results of the third sunset review, but all of these were subsequently rescinded.²⁶ The order

¹⁹ See *Germany BSS 2014-15 Review*.

²⁰ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 77 FR 32507 (June 1, 2012); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013*, 78 FR 52759 (August 26, 2013).

²¹ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 80 FR 38437 (July 6, 2015) (*Italy BSS 2013-14 Review*).

²² See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015*, 81 FR 15038 (March 21, 2016) (*Italy BSS 2014-15 Review*).

²³ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 51 FR 11774 (April 7, 1986).

²⁴ See *Italy BSS 2013-14 Review*.

²⁵ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 77 FR 49780 (August 17, 2012); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013*, 78 FR 52133 (August 22, 2013).

²⁶ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 78 FR 9669 (February 11, 2013); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping*

remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise from Japan.

Duty-Absorption Findings, Changed-Circumstances Reviews, Scope Inquiries

There have been no changed circumstances reviews or scope inquiries with respect to the *Orders*, nor have there been any duty-absorption findings with respect to the *Orders*.

In the administrative review, which covered the period of March 1, 1997, through February 28, 1998, for brass sheet and strip imports from Germany, the Department determined that antidumping duties were being absorbed on all of Wieland's U.S. sales of the subject merchandise through its affiliated importer, based on adverse facts available.²⁷

On January 11, 1989, domestic interested parties²⁸ requested the Department conduct an anti-circumvention inquiry, alleging that Wieland had been selling C.D.A. 667-series manganese brass, nearly identical to C.D.A. 200-series brass sheet and strip, to circumvent the AD order on brass sheet and strip from Germany. Domestic interested parties claimed that C.D.A. 667-series manganese brass was only slightly chemically distinguishable from C.D.A. 200-series brass by the presence of a small amount of manganese, but both brass series were identical in their commercial uses and purposes. On December 19, 1991, the Department determined that C.D.A. 667-series manganese brass was not a minor alteration of C.D.A. 200-series brass sheet and strip and, thus, Wieland was not circumventing the AD order on brass sheet and strip from Germany.²⁹ The order remains in effect for all manufacturers, producers, and exporters of the subject merchandise from Germany.

Sunset Reviews

The Department conducted the first sunset reviews on imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy and Japan, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, and found that revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations.³⁰ The ITC determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to continuation or

Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013, 79 FR 12152 (March 4, 2014); *Brass Sheet and Strip from France: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014*, 80 FR 4538 (January 28, 2015).

²⁷ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR at 43342-43343 (August 10, 1999).

²⁸ Domestic interested parties consist collectively of GBC Metals, LLC, of Global Brass and Copper, Inc., doing business as Olin Brass; Heyco Metals, Inc.; Luvata North America, Inc.; PMX Industries, Inc.; Revere Copper Products, Inc.; and International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, United Auto Workers (Local 2367 and Local 1024), and United Steelworkers AFL-CIO CLC.

²⁹ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany; Negative Final Determination of Circumvention of Antidumping Duty Order*, 56 FR 65884 (December 19, 1991).

³⁰ See *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Brass Sheet and Strip From Brazil, France and Korea*, 64 FR 48351 (September 3, 1999); *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany*, 64 FR 49767 (September 14, 1999); *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy*, 64 FR 48348 (September 3, 1999); and *Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Japan*, 64 FR 49765 (September 14, 1999) (collectively, *Sunset Review I*).

recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.³¹ Thus, the Department published the notice of continuation of the *Orders*..³²

The Department conducted the second sunset reviews on imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, and found that revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations.³³ After the ITC determined that revocation of the *Orders* would lead to a continuation or recurrence of injury to the domestic industry, the Department published a notice of continuation with respect to imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy and Japan.³⁴

The Department conducted the third sunset reviews on imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, and found that revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the same rates as found in the original investigations.³⁵ After the ITC determined that revocation of the *Orders* would lead to a continuation or recurrence of injury to the domestic industry, the Department published a notice of continuation with respect to imports of brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy and Japan.³⁶

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department is conducting this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that in making this determination, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before, and the period after, the issuance of the *Orders*.

In accordance with the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically the Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994) (SAA),³⁷ the House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) (House Report),³⁸

³¹ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, and Sweden*, 65 FR 20832 (April 18, 2000).

³² See *Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders and Countervailing Duty Orders: Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan*, 65 FR 25304 (May 1, 2000).

³³ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Italy and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 70 FR 45650 (August 8, 2005); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 71 FR 4348 (January 26, 2006) (collectively, *Sunset Review II*).

³⁴ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy, Germany, and Japan: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 71 FR 16552 (April 3, 2006).

³⁵ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 76 FR 39849 (July 7, 2011); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Full Third Five-Year (Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 77 FR 4762 (January 31, 2012) (collectively, *Sunset Review III*).

³⁶ See *Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy, Germany, and Japan: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 77 FR 24933 (April 26, 2012).

³⁷ Reprinted in 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4040 (1994).

³⁸ Reprinted in 1994 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3773 (1994).

and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994) (Senate Report), the Department's determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide, rather than company-specific, basis.³⁹ In addition, the Department normally determines that revocation of an AD order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping when, among other scenarios: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after issuance of the order; (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after issuance of the order; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.⁴⁰ Alternatively, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an AD order is not likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where dumping was eliminated after issuance of the order and import volumes remained steady or increased.⁴¹

In addition, as a base period for import volume comparison, it is the Department's practice to use the one-year period immediately preceding the initiation of the investigation, rather than the level of pre-order import volumes, as the initiation of an investigation may dampen import volumes and, thus, skew comparison.⁴² Also, when analyzing import volumes for second and subsequent sunset reviews, the Department's practice is to compare import volumes during the year preceding initiation of the underlying investigation to import volumes since the issuance of the last continuation notice.⁴³

Further, section 752(c)(3) of the Act states that the Department shall provide to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Generally, the Department selects a margin from the final determination in the original investigation, as these are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order in place.⁴⁴ However, the Department may use a rate from a more recent review where the dumping margin increased, as this rate may be more representative of a company's behavior in the absence of an order (*e.g.*, where a company increases dumping to maintain or increase market share with an order in place).⁴⁵ Finally, pursuant to section 752(c)(4)(A) of the Act, a dumping margin of "zero or *de minimis* shall not by itself require" the Department to determine that revocation of an AD order would not be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of sales at LTFV.⁴⁶

³⁹ See SAA at 879, and House Report at 56.

⁴⁰ See SAA at 889-90, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52. See also *Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*; Policy Bulletin 98.3, 63 FR 18871, 18872 (April 16, 1998) (*Sunset Policy Bulletin*).

⁴¹ See SAA at 889-90.

⁴² See, *e.g.*, *Stainless Steel Bar from Germany: Final Results of the Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 56985 (October 5, 2007), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

⁴³ See *Ferrovanadium from the People's Republic of China and the Republic of South Africa: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 79 FR 14216 (March 13, 2014) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

⁴⁴ See SAA at 890. See also *e.g.*, *Persulfates from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 11868 (March 5, 2008), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

⁴⁵ See SAA at 890-91.

⁴⁶ See *Folding Gift Boxes from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 16765 (April 5, 2007) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

In the *Final Modification for Reviews*, the Department announced that it was modifying its practice in sunset reviews such that it will not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology determined to be inconsistent with World Trade Organization (WTO) obligations, *i.e.*, zeroing.⁴⁷ The Department also noted that “*only in the most extraordinary circumstances* will the Department rely on margins other than those calculated and published in prior determinations.”⁴⁸ The Department further stated that, apart from the “most extraordinary circumstances,” it would “limit its reliance to margins determined or applied during the five-year sunset period that were not determined in a manner found to be WTO-inconsistent” and that it “may also rely on past dumping margins that were not affected by the WTO-inconsistent methodology, such as dumping margins recalculated pursuant to Section 129 proceedings, dumping margins determined based on the use of total adverse facts available, and dumping margins where no offsets were denied because all comparison results were positive.”⁴⁹

Consistent with this framework, we address the following two issues: (1) the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping; and (2) the magnitude of the dumping margin likely to prevail. We address the comments submitted by the domestic interested parties with respect to the antidumping orders covering exports from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

Below we address the comments submitted by the domestic interested parties. We received comments only from domestic interested parties with respect to each order.

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Comments from Domestic Interested Parties:

The domestic interested parties argue that revocation of these AD orders on brass sheet and strip from France, Germany, Italy, and Japan would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by the producers and exporters of the subject merchandise. The domestic interested parties cite section 752(c)(1) of the Act, which instructs the Department to determine whether revocation of an AD order would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping by considering the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and administrative reviews, and by considering the volume of imports of subject merchandise prior to and following issuance of the order.⁵⁰ The domestic interested parties refer to the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, which explains that declining import volumes accompanied by continued dumping following issuance of an order may indicate that dumping would be likely to continue absent an

⁴⁷ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*).

⁴⁸ *Id.* (emphasis added).

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – France at 10-12; Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – Italy at 13-14; Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – Germany at 19-21; Domestic Interested Parties’ Substantive Response – Japan 11-13.

order, because information would indicate that the exporter would need to dump to sell at pre-order volumes.⁵¹

Additionally, the domestic interested parties argue, the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* explains that the existence of dumping or the cessation of imports following implementation of an order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Thus, the domestic interested parties maintain, the Department will normally determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping where: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after issuance of an order; (b) imports of subject merchandise ceased following issuance of an order; (c) dumping was eliminated following issuance of an order but import volumes declined.⁵²

The domestic interested parties also refer to the *Final Modification for Reviews*, where the Department stated that it was modifying its practice in sunset reviews such that in determining whether dumping is likely to continue or recur upon the revocation of an antidumping duty order, it would no longer rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology that has been determined by the WTO Appellate Body to be inconsistent with the United States' WTO obligations - *i.e.*, margins calculated using the zeroing methodology. Additionally, the domestic interested parties state in the *Final Modification for Reviews*, that the Department further emphasized that it looks to whether dumping continued “at any level” after the issuance of an AD order, and that a decrease in import volumes of the subject merchandise, on its own, may establish that dumping is likely to continue or recur if an AD order is revoked.⁵³

Accordingly, the domestic interested parties contend, considering that the records of these proceedings continue to demonstrate that dumping has continued over the life of the *Orders* and that the respondents have persisted in dumping in the U.S. market, while also dramatically reducing their sales of subject merchandise, the Department should again conclude that dumping is likely to continue or recur were the *Orders* revoked, consistent with the previously completed sunset reviews.

- *France*: The domestic interested parties state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order and has not recovered. They also state that the Department recently completed an administrative review of this AD order and found that respondents were continuing to sell at the same LTFV found in the original investigation, a dumping margin of 42.24 percent. Thus, conclude the domestic interested parties, the continuation of above *de minimis* dumping margins and significant decline of import volumes following the issuance of the AD order demonstrate that

⁵¹ See *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18872; see also SAA at 889.

⁵² Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 11-12; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Germany at 19-20; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 13-14; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan at 11-12 (citing *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR at 18872; SAA at 890).

⁵³ Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 12; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 14-15; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Germany at 20-21; Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan 13-14 (citing *Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification*, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) (*Final Modification for Reviews*)).

revocation of the order will lead to continuation of dumping.⁵⁴

- *Germany*: The domestic interested parties state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order and has not recovered. They also state that the dumping margins have fluctuated between 3.81 and 55.60 percent, over the life of the order. In the two most recent administrative reviews since the final results of the third sunset review, the Department assigned the dumping margins of 22.61 percent and 55.60 percent, derived from the petition, as AFA, for several German producers. Thus, conclude the domestic interested parties, the continuation of above *de minimis* dumping margins and significant decline of import volumes following the issuance of the AD order demonstrate that revocation of the order will lead to continuation of dumping.⁵⁵
- *Italy*: The domestic interested parties state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order and has not recovered. They also state that the dumping margins have fluctuated between 4.70 and 22 percent, over the life of the order. In the two most recent administrative reviews since the final results of the third sunset review, the Department assigned the respondent an AFA rate of 22 percent, which is the highest rate alleged in the petition. Thus, conclude the domestic interested parties, the continuation of above *de minimis* dumping margins and significant decline of import volumes following the issuance of the AD order demonstrate that revocation of the order will lead to continuation of dumping.⁵⁶
- *Japan*: The domestic interested parties state that the volume of imports subject to this order declined significantly after the imposition of the order and has not recovered. They also state that, since there has never been an administrative review of this AD order, the dumping margins calculated in the investigation remain in effect and range from 13.30 to 57.98 percent. Thus, conclude the domestic interested parties, the existence of above *de minimis* dumping margins and significant decline of import volumes following the issuance of the AD order demonstrate that revocation of the order will lead to continuation of dumping.⁵⁷

Department's Position:

As explained in the Legal Framework section above, the determination of whether revocation of an order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping is based, in part, upon guidance provided by the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (*i.e.*, the SAA; House Report; and Senate Report). Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act instruct the Department to consider: (1) the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews; and (2) the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order. Furthermore, consistent with the SAA and House Report, the Department's determination of

⁵⁴ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 10-16.

⁵⁵ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Germany at 19-25.

⁵⁶ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 12-18.

⁵⁷ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan at 11-17.

likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping will be made on an order-wide basis for each proceeding.⁵⁸ In addition, the Department will normally determine that the revocation of an AD order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where: (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order; (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of an order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.⁵⁹ Additionally, as discussed above, it is the Department's practice to compare the volume of imports for the one-year period preceding the initiation of the LTFV investigation to the volume of imports during the period of review. We address the import volumes for all four orders below.

- *France*: The Department found dumping margins at above *de minimis* in the original antidumping duty investigation and in the only administrative review completed since the last sunset review.⁶⁰ Using statistics provided by the domestic interested parties, the Department finds that imports of brass sheet and strip from France averaged 12.76 million pounds annually in the four-year period (1983-1986) before the AD order was issued.⁶¹ The Department finds that imports of French brass sheet and strip from 2011 through 2016 have fluctuated between 11,645 and 126,465 pounds and remain significantly below pre-order volumes.⁶² Given that dumping continues at levels above *de minimis*, and imports are below pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.
- *Germany*: The Department found dumping margins at above *de minimis* in the original antidumping duty investigation and in several administrative reviews since the last sunset review.⁶³ Using statistics provided by the domestic interested parties, the Department finds that pre-order volumes of imports of brass sheet and strip averaged 53.63 million pounds annually in the four-year period (1983-1986) before the imposition of the AD order.⁶⁴ The Department finds that imports of German brass sheet and strip from 2011 through 2016 have fluctuated between 6,253,859 and 9,760,344 pounds, remaining significantly below pre-order volumes. Given that dumping continues at levels above *de minimis*, and imports are below pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.
- *Italy*: The Department found dumping margins at above *de minimis* in the original antidumping duty investigation and in the administrative reviews completed by the

⁵⁸ See SAA at 879 and House Report at 56.

⁵⁹ See SAA at 889-890, House Report at 63-64, and Senate Report at 52. See also *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 74 FR 5819 (February 2, 2009), and accompanying Issues & Decision Memorandum at 3, *Crawfish Tail Meat – PRC, and Folding Gift Boxes from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 72 FR 16765 (April 5, 2007), and accompanying Issues & Decision Memorandum at 5.

⁶⁰ See Attachment I at 17.

⁶¹ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 14-15.

⁶² See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 14-15.

⁶³ See Attachment I at 18-21.

⁶⁴ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Germany at 23-25.

Department since the last sunset review.⁶⁵ Using statistics provided by the domestic interested parties, the Department finds that imports of brass sheet and strip from Italy averaged 7.43 million pounds annually in the four-year period (1983-1986) before the AD order was issued.⁶⁶ The Department finds that imports of Italian brass sheet and strip from 2011 through 2016 have fluctuated between 1,786 pounds and 193,736 pounds and remain significantly below pre-order volumes.⁶⁷ Given that dumping continues at above *de minimis* levels and imports are below pre-order levels, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

- *Japan*: Using statistics provided by the domestic interested parties, the Department finds that imports of brass sheet and strip from Japan averaged 20.25 million pounds annually in the five-year period (1983-1987) before the AD order was published.⁶⁸ The Department finds that imports of Japanese brass sheet and strip from 2011 through 2016 have fluctuated between 553,436 pounds and 855,766 pounds and remain below pre-order levels. Given that there have been no reviews since the investigation, the present dumping margins and cash deposit rates above *de minimis* levels indicate that there is no evidence that dumping has ceased. Additionally, imports are below pre-order levels. The Department determines that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Margin of Dumping Likely to Prevail

Comments from Domestic Interested Parties:

The domestic interested parties explain that the Department normally will report to the ITC the company-specific weighted-average dumping margins that were determined in the original investigation, because those rates best represent the behavior of these producers and exporters in the absence of the discipline of an AD order. Additionally, the domestic interested parties cited the *Final Modification of Reviews*, where the Department modified its practice for sunset reviews such that it no longer relies on dumping margins that were calculated using the zeroing methodology.

With respect to brass sheet and strip imports from France, the domestic interested parties argue that the Department should report to the ITC dumping margins up to 42.24 percent established in the original investigation as the margin likely to prevail in the event of revocation, which is consistent with prior sunset review determinations completed by the Department.⁶⁹ They contend that for brass sheet and strip from Germany, the Department should rely on a dumping margin of 7.30 percent established in the original investigation as the margin likely to prevail upon revocation. However, if the Department declines to rely on the 7.30 percent rate due to use of the zeroing, the Department should then rely on the 55.60 percent AFA rate determined in the 2013-14 and 2014-15 administrative reviews, as the margin up to which dumping is likely to

⁶⁵ See Attachment I at 22-23.

⁶⁶ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 17-18.

⁶⁷ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 17-18.

⁶⁸ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan at 15-16.

⁶⁹ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – France at 17 (citing *Sunset Review III* at 76 FR 39850).

prevail if the order were revoked.⁷⁰ Similarly, they state that for brass sheet and strip imports from Italy, the Department should rely on the 5.44 percent margin established in the original investigation. Or, if the margin is declined due to use of zeroing, the Department should rely on the 22 percent AFA rate calculated during the current sunset review period as the margin up to which dumping is likely to prevail if the order was revoked.⁷¹ Finally, with respect to brass sheet and strip from Japan, the domestic interested parties argue that consistent with Department recent practice, the margin of 57.98 percent from the original investigation⁷² which was based on the best information available,⁷³ should be reported as the margin up to which is likely to occur upon revocation of the order.⁷⁴

Department's Position:

Section 752(c)(3) of the Act provides that the Department will report to the ITC the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if an order were revoked. The Department will normally select a rate from the final determination of the investigation because that is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order.⁷⁵ Under certain circumstances, however, the Department may select a more recent rate to report to the ITC.⁷⁶ As explained above, in accordance with the *Final Modification for Reviews*, the Department will not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the zeroing methodology found to be WTO-inconsistent.⁷⁷ Instead, we may rely on other rates that may be available, or we may recalculate weighted-average dumping margins using our current offsetting methodology in extraordinary circumstances.⁷⁸

With respect to the *France Order*, the Department assigned a best information available (BIA, the precursor to AFA) weighted-average dumping margin of 42.24 percent to the mandatory respondent and all other French producers and exporters in the original investigation.⁷⁹ The Department confirmed that the LTFV BIA rate assigned to respondent was the highest petition rate and was not calculated using the zeroing methodology.⁸⁰ Accordingly, the Department has determined that this rate does not need to be recalculated and will be reported to the ITC without modification.

⁷⁰ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Germany at 25-29.

⁷¹ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Italy at 18-22.

⁷² See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan at 17-20.

⁷³ “Best information available,” under the pre-URAA statute, is equivalent to the current, post-URAA application of “adverse facts available.”

⁷⁴ See Domestic Interested Parties' Substantive Response – Japan at 19.

⁷⁵ See SAA at 890 and *Eveready Battery Co., Inc. v. United States*, 77 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1333 n.9 (CIT 1999); see also e.g., *Persulfates from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 73 FR 11868 (March 5, 2008), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2.

⁷⁶ See section 752(c)(3) of the Act and *Final Results of Full Sunset Review: Aramid Fiber Formed of Poly Para-Phenylene Terephthalamide from the Netherlands*, 65 FR 65294 (November 1, 2000), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at “Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail,” Comment 3 (citing SAA at 890-91 and House Report at 64).

⁷⁷ See *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8103.

⁷⁸ See *Final Modification for Reviews*, 77 FR at 8103.

⁷⁹ See *France Final Determination*.

⁸⁰ See *France Final Determination*.

With respect to the *Germany Order*, the Department assigned a weighted-average dumping margin of 55.60 percent based on AFA in the most recent completed administrative reviews, 2013-14 and 2014-15. The margin is derived from the petition relied on for purposes of initiating the investigation. The Department confirmed the margin is not calculated using zeroing and remains in place for the respondent. Thus, the Department finds it appropriate to report to the ITC that the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if the order is revoked is up to 55.60 percent.

With respect to the *Italy Order*, the Department assigned a weighted-average dumping margin of 22.00 percent based on AFA in the most recent completed administrative reviews, 2013-14 and 2014-15. The margin is derived from the petition and relied on for purposes of initiating the investigation.⁸¹ The Department confirmed the margin was not calculated using zeroing and remains in place for the respondent. Thus, the Department finds it appropriate to report to the ITC that the magnitude of the margin of dumping that is likely to prevail if the order is revoked is up to 22.00 percent.

With respect to the *Japan Order*, the Department assigned a weighted-average dumping margin of 57.98 percent based on BIA for three of the mandatory respondents in the original investigation. There have been no administrative reviews completed by the Department since the issuance of the order, and the margins remain in place for all respondents. Because the dumping margin is the highest rate published from the original investigation and calculated without using zeroing, the Department finds it appropriate to report this dumping margin to the ITC.

FINAL RESULTS OF SUNSET REVIEWS

We determine that revocation of the order on brass sheet and strip from France would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins up to 42.24 percent.

We determine that revocation of the order on brass sheet and strip from Germany would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins up to 55.60 percent.

We determine that revocation of the order on brass sheet and strip from Italy would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins up to 22.00 percent.

We determine that revocation of the order on brass sheet and strip from Japan would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail would be weighted-average margins up to 57.98 percent.

⁸¹ See *Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy; Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 51 FR 11774 (April 7, 1986)

RECOMMENDATION


Based on our analysis of the substantive responses received, we recommend adopting all the above positions. If this recommendation is accepted, we will publish the final results of this review in the *Federal Register*, and notify the ITC of our determination.



Agree

Disagree

6/28/2017

X 

Signed by: RONALD LORENTZEN

Ronald K. Lorentzen
Acting Assistant Secretary
For Enforcement and Compliance

Attachment 1

History of the Orders

Investigation		
Country	Citation	Margin
France	<i>Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip From France</i> , 52 FR 812 (January 9, 1987), and <i>Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip From France</i> , 52 FR 6995 (March 6, 1987)	Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trefimetaux S.A. – 42.24% • All Others – 42.24%
Italy	<i>Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy</i> , 52 FR 816 (January 9, 1987); and <i>Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy</i> , 52 FR 6997 (March 6, 1987); <i>Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order</i> , 52 FR 11299 (April 8, 1987) and <i>Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Amendment of Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance with Decision Upon Remand: Brass Sheet and Strip from Italy</i> , 56 FR 23272 (May 21, 1991)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A. – 5.44% • All Others – 5.44%
Germany	<i>Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Brass Sheet and Strip From the Federal Republic of Germany</i> , 52 FR 822 (January 9, 1987), amended at <i>Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order: Brass Sheet and Strip From the Federal Republic of Germany</i> , 52 FR 35750 (September 23, 1987)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 3.81% • Langenberg – 16.18% • All Others – 7.30%
	<i>Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip from</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nippon Mining Co., Ltd. – 57.98%

Japan	<i>Japan</i> , 53 FR 23296 (June 21, 1988); and <i>Antidumping Duty Order of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brass Sheet and Strip from Japan</i> , 53 FR 30454 (August 12, 1988)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sambo Cooper Alloy Co., Ltd. – 13.30% • Mitsubishi Shindoh Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Kobe Steel Ltd. – 57.98% • All Others – 45.72%
-------	--	---

Administrative and Sunset Reviews			
Country	Segment	Citation	Margins
France	2014-2015 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014</i> , 80 FR 38437 (July 6, 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Griset SA – 42.24% • KME France SAS – 42.24% • All Others – 42.24%
France	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews: Brass Sheet and Strip From Brazil, France, and Korea</i> , 64 FR 48351 (September 3, 1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trefimetaux S.A. – 42.24% • All Others – 42.24%
France	2 nd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Italy and Japan; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> , 70 FR 45650 (August 8, 2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trefimetaux S.A.– 42.24% • All Others – 42.24%
France	3 rd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> , 76 FR 39849 (July 7, 2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trefimetaux S.A.– 42.24% • All Others – 42.24%
Germany	August 22, 1986 – February 29, 1988	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From the Federal</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland Group – 14.65%

	Administrative Review	<i>Republic of Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 56 FR 60087 (November 27, 1991) amended at Brass Sheet and Strip From the Federal Republic of Germany; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 57 FR 276 (January 3, 1992) and amended again at Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 38256 (July 17, 1997)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 14.65% • Langenbeg – 14.65% • William Prym – 19.59% • Schwermetall – 7.30% • All Others – 23.49%
Germany	1990-1991 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 60 FR 38542 (July 27, 1995) amended at Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 61 FR 18720 (April 29, 1996)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 2.57%
Germany	1991-1992 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 60 FR 38542 (July 27, 1995) amended at Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Amendment of Final</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 2.37%

		<i>Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews</i> , 61 FR 18720 (April 29, 1996)	
Germany	1992-1993 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews</i> , 60 FR 38542 (July 27, 1995) amended at <i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Amendment of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews</i> , 61 FR 18720 (April 29, 1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 0.46%
Germany	1993-1994 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 60 FR 38031 (July 25, 1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 0.495%
Germany	1994-1995 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not To Revoke in Part</i> , 61 FR 49727 (September 23, 1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 0.00%
Germany	1996-1997 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 63 FR 42823 (August 11, 1998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 16.18%
Germany	1997-1998 Administrative Review	<i>Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Brass Sheet and Strip</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 16.18%

		<i>From Germany, 64 FR 43342 (August 10, 1999)</i>	
Germany	2007-2008 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Amended Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 73 FR 52646 (September 10, 2008)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review rescinded at the request of Wieland
Germany	2008-2009 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 66347 (October 28, 2010).</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 0.00%
Germany	2009-2010 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 47548 (August 6, 2010)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review rescinded at the request of Wieland
Germany	2011-2012 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012, 77 FR 32507 (June 1, 2012)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review rescinded
Germany	2012-2013 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013, 78 FR 52759 (August 26, 2013)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review rescinded
Germany	2013-2014 Administrative	<i>See Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany: Final</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aurubis Stolberg GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61%

	Review	<i>Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014</i> , 80 FR 61369 (October 13, 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carl Schreiber GmbH – 22.61% • KME Germany AG & Co. KG – 22.61% • Messingwerk Plettenberg Herfeld GmbH & Co. KG – 55.60% • MKM Mansfelder Kupfer & Messing GmbH – 22.61% • Schlenk Metallfolien GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61% • Sundwiger Messingwerke GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61% • All others – 7.30%
Germany	2014-2015 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015</i> , 81 FR 44274 (July 7, 2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aurubis Stolberg GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61% • Carl Schreiber GmbH – 22.61% • KME Germany AG & Co. KG – 22.61% • Messingwerk Plettenberg Herfeld GmbH & Co. KG – 55.60% • MKM Mansfelder Kupfer & Messing GmbH – 22.61% • Schlenk Metallfolien GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61% • Sundwiger Messingwerke GmbH & Co. KG – 22.61% • All others – 7.30%
Germany	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Germany</i> , 64 FR 49767 (September 14, 1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 3.81% • Langenberg – 16.18% • All Others – 7.30%

Germany	2 nd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order</i> , 71 FR 4348 (January 26, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 3.81% • All Others – 7.30%
Germany	3 rd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Germany: Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order</i> , 71 FR 4348 (January 26, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wieland – 3.81% • All Others – 7.30%
Italy	August 22, 1986 – February 29, 1988 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews</i> , 57 FR 9235 (March 17, 1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A. – 9.49%
Italy	1989-1990 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy; Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews</i> , 57 FR 9235 (March 17, 1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A – 4.70%
Italy	1991-1992 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 57 FR 54969 (November 23, 1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A – 9.49%
Italy	2011-2012 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review</i> , 77 FR 49780, (August 17, 2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Rescinded
Italy	2012-2013 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy: Notice of Rescission of</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Rescinded

		<i>Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012-2013, 78 FR 52133 (August 22, 2013)</i>	
Italy	2013-2014 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014, 80 FR 38437 (July 6, 2015)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KME Italy SpA – 22.00% • All Others – 5.44%
Italy	2014-2015 Administrative Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015, 81 FR 15038 (March 21, 2016)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KME Italy SpA – 22.00% • All Others – 5.44%
Italy	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Italy, 64 FR 48348 (September 3, 1999)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A – 5.44% • All Others – 5.44%
Italy	2 nd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Italy and Japan; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 70 FR 45650 (August 8, 2005)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A – 5.44% • All Others – 5.44%
Italy	3rd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 76 FR 39849 (July 7, 2011)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMI-La Metalli Industriale, S.p.A – 5.44% • All Others – 5.44%
		<i>Final Results of</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nippon Mining Co.,

Japan	1 st Sunset Review	<i>Expedited Sunset Review: Brass Sheet and Strip From Japan</i> , 64 FR 49765 (September 14, 1999)	Ltd. – 57.98% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sambo Cooper Alloy Co., Ltd. – 13.30% • Mitsubishi Shindoh Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Kobe Steel Ltd. – 57.98% • All Others – 45.72%
Japan	2 nd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from Brazil, Canada, France, Italy and Japan; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> , 70 FR 45650 (August 8, 2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nippon Mining Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Sambo Cooper Alloy Co., Ltd. – 13.30% • Mitsubishi Shindoh Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Kobe Steel Ltd. – 57.98% • All Others – 45.72%
Japan	3 rd Sunset Review	<i>Brass Sheet and Strip from France, Italy and Japan: Final Results of the Expedited Third Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders</i> , 76 FR 39849 (July 7, 2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nippon Mining Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Sambo Cooper Alloy Co., Ltd. – 13.30% • Mitsubishi Shindoh Co., Ltd. – 57.98% • Kobe Steel Ltd. – 57.98% • All Others – 45.72%