

April 7, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Ronald K. Lorentzen
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

FROM: John M. Andersen
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

RE: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results in the
Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on
Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China

Summary

In the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), American Furniture Manufacturers Committee for Legal Trade ("AFM Committee"); Vaughan-Bassett Furniture Company, Inc. ("Vaughan-Bassett"); Dubois Woods Products Inc. ("Dubois"); The Jasper Group d/b/a Klem Hospitality ("Klem"); Solid Comfort, Inc. ("Solid Comfort"); Cabinet Makers, Millmen and Industrial Carpenters Local 721 ("Local 721"); UBC Southern Council of Industrial Workers Local 2305 ("Local 2305"); and Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Local 991 ("Local 991")(collectively the "Domestic Industry") have submitted timely notice of intent to participate and an adequate substantive response. No respondent interested party has submitted a substantive response. In accordance with our analysis of the Domestic Industry's adequate substantive response, we recommend that you approve the positions described in the instant memorandum. The following is a complete list of issues in the instant sunset review for which we received a substantive response:

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping; and
2. Magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail.

Background

On January 4, 2005, the Department of Commerce (the "Department") issued an antidumping duty order on imports of wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC.¹ Since that time the Department has completed three administrative reviews while currently undertaking the fourth and fifth administrative review. The Department has conducted nineteen scope inquiries and five

¹ See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China, 70 FR 329 (January 4, 2005).

changed circumstances reviews. In the preliminary results of the fourth administrative review, the Department found duty absorption for the mandatory respondent.²

On December 1, 2009, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the “Act”).³ On December 11, 2009, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from the Domestic Industry within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i).⁴ The AFM Committee, which includes Vaughan-Bassett, claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(E) of the Act as a trade or business association a majority of whose members manufacture, produce or wholesale a domestic like product. Dubois, Klem and Solid Comfort claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as producers of the domestic like product. Local 721, Local 2305, and Local 991 claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(D) of the Act as a certified union or recognized union or group of workers which is representative of an industry engaged in the manufacture, production, or wholesale in the United States of a domestic like product. On December 30, 2009, the Department received an adequate substantive response from the Domestic Industry within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).⁵ The Department did not receive a response from any respondent interested party to this proceeding. 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 determined to conduct an expedited review of the order.⁶

Legal Framework

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of Act, the Department conducted this sunset review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Sections 752(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the Act provide that, in making these determinations, the Department shall consider both the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews as well as the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order. As explained in the Statement of Administrative Action (“SAA”) accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, the Department normally determines that revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping when: (a) dumping continued at any level above de minimis after the issuance of the order; (b) imports of the subject

² See Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Rescind Review in Part, 75 FR 5952, 5955 (February 5, 2010).

³ See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review, 74 FR 62748 (December 1, 2009).

⁴ See Letter from the Domestic Industry regarding, “Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review of Antidumping Duty Order on Wooden Bedroom Furniture From The People’s Republic of China/Domestic Industry Notice Of Intent To Participate In Sunset Review,” dated December 11, 2009.

⁵ See Letter from the Domestic Industry regarding, “Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review of Antidumping Duty Order on Wooden Bedroom Furniture From The People’s Republic of China/The Domestic Industry’s Substantive Response To The Notice Of Initiation,” dated December 30, 2009 (“Substantive Response”).

⁶ See Letter to Ms. Catherine DeFilippo, Director, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”) regarding, “Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Orders Initiated in December 2009,” dated January 10, 2010.

merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order; or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.⁷ It is the Department's practice to use as a base period of import volume comparison 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.⁸ The Department makes its determination of likelihood on an order-wide basis.⁹

In addition, 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 the margin(s) from the final determination in the original investigation as this is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place.¹⁰ However, the Department may use a rate from a more recent review where the dumping margin increased as this rate may be a better 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).¹¹ Additionally, pursuant to section 752(c)(4)(A) of the Act, a dumping margin of "zero or *de minimis* shall not by itself require" that the Department determine that revocation of an antidumping duty order would not be likely to lead to a continuation of recurrence of sales at less than fair value.

Analysis

1. Likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping

Interested Party Comments

The Domestic Industry contends that revocation of the antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC would result in the resumption of significant imports from the PRC at prices less than fair value. The Domestic Industry argues that the history of high margins, decreasing imports of wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC to the United States, and the practice of certain exporters to maintain or increase their export volumes through continued dumping support the conclusion that revocation of the antidumping duty order would

⁷ See SAA, accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, attached to H.R. Rep. No. 103-316, Vol. 1, at 889-90 reprinted in 1994 U.S.C.A.N. 3733, 4163.

⁸ See 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.

⁹ See Section 751(c)(1) of the Act ("{T}he administering authority and the Commission shall conduct a review to determine . . . whether revocation of the countervailing or antidumping duty order . . . would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping{.}")

¹⁰ See, *e.g.*, SAA at 890; 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 "2. Magnitude of the Margins Likely to Prevail".

¹¹ See, *e.g.*, Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders, Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin") at paragraph II.B.2; see also, Barium Chloride From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Third Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order, 74 FR 55814, 55816 (October 29, 2009).

result in the continuation or recurrence of dumping.¹² In support of this argument, the Domestic Industry provided a history of the dumping margins calculated in each segment of the proceeding for the mandatory respondents, separate rate respondents, and the PRC-wide entity, which demonstrates the continued and widespread existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order.¹³ The Domestic Industry notes that in the three completed administrative reviews, the Department calculated weighted-average margins of 35.78 percent, 32.23 percent, and 29.89 percent.¹⁴

The Domestic Industry also provided value data from ITC dataweb of imports of wooden bedroom furniture because official import statistics for the volume of imports under the HTS categories specific to wooden bedroom furniture are not available. The Domestic Industry notes that the value of imports of wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC has decreased 18 percent from 2003 to 2008 and 35 percent from 2008 to 2009.¹⁵ The Domestic Industry argues that the finding of decreasing imports accompanied by the continued existence of dumping margins further demonstrates that dumping is likely to continue or occur if the order is revoked.

In addition to the continuation of dumping margins and decreased imports, the Domestic Industry asserts that the actions of individual exporters of wooden bedroom furniture further shows the willingness of Chinese exporters to continue to dump at higher margins if the order is revoked. Specifically, the Domestic Industry argues that a number of individual exporters have shown a trend of adopting aggressive dumping practices, particularly after receiving a relatively low cash deposit rate, that leads to the assignment of higher dumping margins when those companies undergo individual review.¹⁶ As one example, the Domestic Industry notes that Guangdong Yihua Timber Industry Co., Ltd. (a.k.a. Yihua Timber Industry Co., Ltd.) (“Yihua”) received the weighted-average rate of 7.24 percent for separate rate respondents in the final determination of the investigation.¹⁷ Petitioners note that while Yihua was not reviewed during the first or second administrative review, it was selected as a mandatory respondent during the third administrative review and the Department calculated a rate of 29.89 percent in the final results of the review.¹⁸

Given the prevalence of existing dumping margins after the imposition of the order accompanied by decreasing imports and the behavior of individual exporters demonstrating their willingness to continue or increase their dumping activity, the Domestic Industry argues the Department must find that dumping would be likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.¹⁹

¹² See Substantive Response at 7.

¹³ See Substantive Response at 8-14 and Attachment 8.

¹⁴ See Substantive Response at 7.

¹⁵ See Substantive Response at 14-15 and Attachment 11.

¹⁶ See Substantive Response at 15.

¹⁷ See Substantive Response at 21.

¹⁸ See Substantive Response at 21-22.

¹⁹ See Substantive Response at 24.

Department Position

As explained in the Legal Framework section above, the Department's determination concerning whether revocation of an antidumping duty order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping is based, in part, upon the guidance provided in the SAA. One consideration is whether the Department has continued to find dumping above de minimis levels in administrative reviews subsequent to imposition of the antidumping order. In this proceeding, the Department has found dumping at above de minimis levels in the administrative reviews it has conducted since the original antidumping duty investigation. For example, in the first administrative review, the Department found dumping at above de minimis levels ranging from 11.72 percent to 216.01 percent for mandatory respondents²⁰ and in the second administrative review, the Department found dumping at above de minimis levels ranging from 25.06 percent to 39.44 percent.²¹

As discussed above, 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 when determining whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. In the original investigation, the Department calculated weighted-average dumping margins for six of the seven mandatory respondents ranging from de minimis to 15.78 percent.²² In the first administrative review, the Department calculated weighted-average dumping margins for four of the five mandatory respondents ranging from 0.4 percent to 49.6 percent.²³ In the second administrative review, the weighted-average dumping margins the Department calculated for two of the three mandatory respondents were 25.06 percent and 39.44 percent.²⁴ In the third administrative review, the margin calculated for the mandatory respondent was 29.89 percent.²⁵

Import statistics provided by the Domestic Industry on subject imports between 2003 and 2009 demonstrate that following the issuance of the order, imports of wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC continued to increase until decreasing in 2007, the year in which the final results of the first administrative review were published, and have continued to decrease each year. Using data from the Global Trade Atlas ("GTA"), the Department confirmed the import data provided by

²⁰ See Second Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China, 72 FR 62834 (November 7, 2007) ("Second Amended Final Results of First Administrative Review").

²¹ See Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China, 74 FR 4916 (January 28, 2009) ("Amended Final Results of Second Administrative Review").

²² See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order/Pursuant to Court Decision: Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China, 71 FR 67099 (November 20, 2006).

²³ See Second Amended Final Results of First Administrative Review.

²⁴ See Amended Final Results of Second Administrative Review.

²⁵ See Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews, 74 FR 55810 (October 29, 2009) ("Amended Final Results of Third Administrative Review").

the Domestic Industry and also included the total value of imports for the two years preceding the filing of the petition.²⁶ As an initial matter, the Department has explained in prior segments of this proceeding that it cannot use the import data reported based on volume because the import data for volume are reported in differing units of measure (e.g., pieces or cubic meters).²⁷ Therefore, the Department has analyzed import volume based on the import data reported based on value. Using GTA data, the Department finds that imports decreased after the issuance of the order.²⁸ Specifically, the import volume measured in value dropped in 2007, the year in which the amended final results of the first administrative review were published and have continued to decline each year.

Therefore, given that (1) dumping has continued following the issuance of the order, (2) import volumes declined after the issuance of the order, and (3) the absence of argument and evidence to the contrary, we find that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Dumping Margins Likely to Prevail

Interested Party Comments

The Domestic Industry argues that the dumping margins which should be reported to the ITC as likely to prevail should the order be revoked are: (1) the highest of dumping margins calculated for a company in the investigation or a subsequent administrative review as the rate for any company identified as a mandatory respondent; (2) the 216.01 percent margin calculated for a company in the first new shipper review as the rate for the PRC-wide entity; and (3) the weighted-average margin from the first administrative review, as the rate for separate rate respondents.²⁹ The Domestic Industry asserts that the dumping margins calculated in the administrative reviews are more indicative of the respondents' behavior without the discipline of an order because these margins have often been higher than those from the investigation.³⁰ Therefore, the Domestic Industry argues that when the Department has calculated a margin for a mandatory respondent in an administrative review that is higher than the margin from the investigation, it should report that margin to the ITC.³¹ The Domestic Industry asserts that the most appropriate dumping margin to report to the ITC for the PRC-wide entity is the margin calculated for a company in the first new shipper review, which has been applied to the PRC-wide entity since the first administrative review.³² The Domestic Industry further asserts that it would be inappropriate to use the weighted-average margin from the investigation for separate-rate respondents that have not been individually reviewed because the weighted-average margin in the three completed administrative reviews exceeds the weighted-average margin from the

²⁶ See Attachment 1.

²⁷ See Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative and New Shipper Reviews and Partial Rescission of Review, 74 FR 6372, 6373 (February 9, 2009) (unchanged in Amended Final Results of Third Administrative Review).

²⁸ See Attachment.

²⁹ See Substantive Response at 25-26.

³⁰ See Substantive Response at 26-27.

³¹ See Substantive Response at 27.

³² See Substantive Response at 27-28.

investigation by more than a factor of four.³³ Thus, the Domestic Industry argues that the Department should report the weighted-average margin of 35.78 percent from the first administrative review.³⁴

Department Position

Normally the Department will provide to the ITC the company-specific margins from the investigation.³⁵ For companies not investigated individually, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the all-others rate from the investigation.³⁶ However, because this case involves the PRC, which the Department considers to be a non-market economy as defined by section 771(18) of the Act, the Department does not have an all-others rate; instead, there is a PRC-wide rate which applies to all imports from an exporter that has not established its eligibility for a separate rate. The Department's preference for selecting margins from the investigation is based on the fact that they are the only dumping rates that reflect the behavior of manufacturers, producers, and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place.³⁷ Under certain circumstances, however, the Department may select a more recently calculated margin to report to the ITC.³⁸

The Department disagrees with the Domestic Industry's argument concerning the choice of margins to report to the ITC. To support its argument that higher more recent rates are probative of PRC producers/exporters' behavior if the order were revoked, the Domestic Industry provided the aggregate value of imports of wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC for 2003 through 2009 and the quantity and value ("Q&V") responses for specific PRC exporters/producers for certain years. The Domestic Industry has argued that the increasing imports demonstrate that PRC producers/exporters were willing to increase their dumping margins in order to maintain or increase their market share.³⁹ However, steady or increasing imports, alone, is not sufficient to demonstrate steady or increasing market share. For example domestic consumption may have increased and, as a result, an increase in import volumes would not necessarily indicate a corresponding increase in market share. Additionally, the aggregate import data submitted by the Domestic Industry are not company-specific and thus do not provide evidence for reporting higher more recent rates for specific companies individually examined in the investigation. Further, the Domestic Industry has not explained how the company-specific Q&V data indicate

³³ See Substantive Response at 28.

³⁴ See *id.*

³⁵ See *Eveready Battery Co., Inc. v. United States*, 77 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1333 (CIT 1999).

³⁶ See Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine: Final Results of Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders, 71 FR 70506 (December 5, 2006), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 2 "Magnitude of the Margins Likely to Prevail".

³⁷ See SAA at 890.

³⁸ 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 the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 3 "Magnitude of the Margin Likely to Prevail."

³⁹ See Substantive Response at 26.

that the more recent rates are probative of PRC producers/exporters' behavior in the absence of an order. The Department's practice establishes that the onus is on the party requesting more recent rates to be reported to the ITC to provide the Department with the necessary data and in this case we find that the Domestic Industry has failed to do so.⁴⁰ For these reasons, the Department is reporting to the ITC the dumping margins from the investigation.

3. Duty Absorption

Interested Party Comments

The Domestic Industry requested that the Department notify the ITC of the absorption findings from the fourth administrative review.

Department Position

As noted in the Background section above, the Department preliminarily found duty absorption for the mandatory respondent in the preliminary results of the fourth administrative review. Specifically, the Department found that antidumping duties had been absorbed by Dongguan Sunrise Furniture Co., Ltd., Taicang Sunrise Wood Industry Co., Ltd., Taicang Fairmount Designs Furniture Co., Ltd., and Meizhou Sunrise Furniture Co., Ltd. on all U.S. sales of subject merchandise made through its affiliated importer. However, because this finding is only preliminary, the Department cannot officially report it to the ITC at this time.

Final Results of Review

We have determined that revocation of the order on wooden bedroom furniture from the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Exporter/Manufacturer	Margin (Percent)
Dongguan Lung Dong Furniture Co., Ltd., or Dongguan Dong He Furniture Co., Ltd.	2.32
Rui Feng Woodwork Co., Ltd., or Rui Feng Lumber Development Co., Ltd. or Dorbest Limited	7.87
Lacquer Craft Mfg. Co., Ltd.	Excluded
Markor International Furniture (Tianjin) Manufacturing Company, Ltd.	0.83
Shing Mark Enterprise Co., Ltd., or Carven Industries Limited (BVI), or Carven I Industries Limited (HK), or Dongguan Zhenxin Furniture Co., Ltd., or Dongguan Yongpeng Furniture Co., Ltd.	4.96
Starcorp Furniture (Shanghai) Co., Ltd., or Orin Furniture (Shanghai) Co., Ltd., or Shanghai Starcorp Furniture Co., Ltd.	15.78
Alexandre International Corp., or Southern Art Development Ltd., or	7.24

⁴⁰ See Sunset Policy Bulletin at paragraph II.B.2

Alexandre Furniture (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., or Southern Art Furniture Factory	
Art Heritage International, Ltd., or Super Art Furniture Co., Ltd., or Artwork Metal & Plastic Co., Ltd., or Jibson Industries Ltd., or Always Loyal International	7.24
Billy Wood Industrial (Dong Guan) Co., Ltd., or Great Union Industrial (Dongguan) Co., Ltd., or Time Faith Ltd.	7.24
Changshu HTC Import & Export Co., Ltd.	7.24
Cheng Meng Furniture (PTE) Ltd., or China Cheng Meng Decoration & Furniture (Suzhou) Co., Ltd.	7.24
Chuan Fa Furniture Factory	7.24
Classic Furniture Global Co., Ltd.	7.24
Clearwise Co., Ltd.	7.24
COE Ltd.	7.24
Dalian Guangming Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dalian Huafeng Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Decca Furniture Limited	7.24
Dongguan Cambridge Furniture Co., or Glory Oceanic Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Chunsan Wood Products Co., Ltd., or Trendex Industries Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Creation Furniture Co., Ltd., or Creation Industries Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Grand Style Furniture, or Hong Kong Da Zhi Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Great Reputation Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Hero Way Woodwork Co., Ltd., or Dongguan Da Zhong Woodwork Co., Ltd., or Hero Way Enterprises Ltd., or Well Earth International Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Hung Sheng Artware Products Co., Ltd., or Coronal Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Kin Feng Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Kingstone Furniture Co., Ltd., or Kingstone Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Liaobushangdun Huada Furniture Factory, or Great Rich (HK) Enterprise Co. Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Qingxi Xinyi Craft Furniture Factory (Joyce Art Factory)	7.24
Dongguan Singways Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dongguan Sunrise Furniture Co., or Taicang Sunrise Wood Industry Co., Ltd., or Shanghai Sunrise Furniture Co., Ltd., or Fairmont Designs	7.24
Dongying Huanghekou Furniture Industry Co., Ltd.	7.24
Dream Rooms Furniture (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.	7.24
Eurosa (Kunshan) Co., Ltd., or Eurosa Furniture Co., (PTE) Ltd.	7.24
Ever Spring Furniture Co. Ltd., or S.Y.C. Family Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
Fine Furniture (Shanghai) Ltd.	7.24
Foshan Guanqiu Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Fujian Lianfu Forestry Co., Ltd., or Fujian Wonder Pacific Inc.	7.24
Gaomi Yatai Wooden Ware Co., Ltd., or Team Prospect International Ltd., or Money Gain International Co.	7.24

Garri Furniture (Dong Guan) Co., Ltd., or Molabile International, Inc., or Weei Geo Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
Green River Wood (Dongguan) Ltd.	7.24
Guangming Group Wumahe Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Guangzhou Maria Yee Furnishings Ltd., Pyla HK, Ltd., and Maria Yee, Inc.	7.24
Hainan Jong Bao Lumber Co., Ltd., or Jibbon Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
Hamilton & Spill Ltd.	7.24
Hang Hai Woodcraft's Art Factory	7.24
Hualing Furniture (China) Co., Ltd., or Tony House Manufacture (China) Co., Ltd., or Buysell Investments Ltd., or Tony House Industries Co., Ltd.	7.24
Jardine Enterprise, Ltd.	7.24
Jiangmen Kinwai Furniture Decoration Co., Ltd.	7.24
Jiangmen Kinwai International Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Jiangsu Weifu Group Fullhouse Furniture Manufacturing. Corp.	7.24
Jiangsu Yuexing Furniture Group Co., Ltd.	7.24
Jiedong Lehouse Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
King's Way Furniture Industries Co., Ltd., or Kingsyear Ltd.	7.24
Kuan Lin Furniture (Dong Guan) Co., Ltd., or Kuan Lin Furniture Factory, or Kuan Lin Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Kunshan Lee Wood Product Co., Ltd.	7.24
Kunshan Summit Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Langfang Tiancheng Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Leefu Wood (Dongguan) Co., Ltd., or King Rich International, Ltd.	7.24
Link Silver Ltd. (V.I.B.), or Forward Win Enterprises Co. Ltd., or Dongguan Haoshun Furniture Ltd.	7.24
Locke Furniture Factory, or Kai Chan Furniture Co., Ltd., or Kai Chan (Hong Kong) Enterprise Ltd., or Taiwan Kai Chan Co., Ltd.	7.24
Longrange Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Nanhai Baiyi Woodwork Co., Ltd.	7.24
Nanhai Jiantai Woodwork Co., Ltd., or Fortune Glory Industrial Ltd. (H.K. Ltd)	7.24
Nantong Dongfang Orient Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Nantong Yushi Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Nathan International Ltd., or Nathan Rattan Factory	7.24
Orient International Holding Shanghai Foreign Trade Co., Ltd.	7.24
Passwell Corporation, or Pleasant Wave Ltd.	7.24
Perfect Line Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Prime Wood International Co., Ltd., or Prime Best International Co., Ltd., or Prime Best Factory, or Liang Huang (Jiaxing) Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
PuTian JingGong Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Qingdao Liangmu Co., Ltd.	7.24
Restonic (Dongguan) Furniture Ltd., or Restonic Far East (Samoa) Ltd.	7.24

RiZhao SanMu Woodworking Co., Ltd.	7.24
Season Furniture Manufacturing Co., or Season Industrial Development Co.	7.24
Sen Yeong International Co., Ltd., or Sheh Hau International Trading Ltd.	7.24
Shanghai Jian Pu Export & Import Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shanghai Maoji Imp and Exp Co., Ltd.	7.24
Sheng Jing Wood Products (Beijing) Co., Ltd., or Telstar Enterprises Ltd.	7.24
Shenyang Shining Dongxing Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shenzhen Forest Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shenzhen Jiafa High Grade Furniture Co., Ltd., or Golden Lion International Trading Ltd.	7.24
Shenzhen New Fudu Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shenzhen Wonderful Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shenzhen Xiande Furniture Factory	7.24
Shenzhen Xingli Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Shun Feng Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Songgang Jasonwood Furniture Factory, or Jasonwood Industrial Co., Ltd. S.A.	7.24
Starwood Furniture Manufacturing Co. Ltd.	7.24
Starwood Industries Ltd.	7.24
Strongson Furniture (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., or Strongson Furniture Co., Ltd., or Strongson (HK) Co.	7.24
Sunforce Furniture (Hui-Yang) Co., Ltd., or Sun Fung Wooden Factory, or Sun Fung Co., or Shin Feng Furniture Co., Ltd., or Stupendous International Co., Ltd.	7.24
Superwood Co., Ltd., or Lianjiang Zongyu Art Products Co., Ltd.	7.24
Tarzan Furniture Industries Ltd., or Samso Industries Ltd.	7.24
Teamway Furniture (Dong Guan) Ltd., or Brittomart Inc.	7.24
Techniwood Industries Ltd., or Ningbo Furniture Industries Limited, or Ningbo Hengrun Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Tianjin Fortune Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Tianjin Master Home Furniture	7.24
Tianjin Phu Shing Woodwork Enterprise Co., Ltd.	7.24
Tianjin Sande Fairwood Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Tube-Smith Enterprise (ZhangZhou) Co., Ltd., or Tube-Smith Enterprise (Haimen) Co., Ltd., or Billonworth Enterprises Ltd.	7.24
Union Friend International Trade Co., Ltd.	7.24
U-Rich Furniture (Zhangzhou) Co., Ltd., or U-Rich Furniture Ltd.	7.24
Wanhengtong Nueevder (Furniture) Manufacture Co., Ltd., or Dongguan Wanengtong Industry Co., Ltd.	7.24
Woodworth Wooden Industries (Dong Guan) Co., Ltd.	7.24
Xiamen Yongquan Sci-Tech Development Co., Ltd.	7.24
Jiangsu XiangSheng Bedtime Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Xingli Arts & Crafts Factory of Yangchun	7.24

Yangchun Hengli Co. Ltd.	7.24
Yeh Brothers World Trade, Inc.	7.24
Yichun Guangming Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Yida Co., Ltd., or Yitai Worldwide, Ltd., or Yili Co., Ltd., or Yetbuild Co., Ltd.	7.24
Yihua Timber Industry Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhang Zhou Sanlong Wood Product Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhangjiagang Zheng Yan Decoration Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhangjiagang Daye Hotel Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhangzhou Guohui Industrial & Trade Co. Ltd.	7.24
Zhanjiang Sunwin Arts & Crafts Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhong Shan Fullwin Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhongshan Fookyik Furniture Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhongshan Golden King Furniture Industrial Co., Ltd.	7.24
Zhoushan For-Strong Wood Co., Ltd.	7.24
PRC-Wide Rate	198.08

Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the substantive response received, we recommend adopting the above positions. If this recommendation is accepted, we will publish the final results of this sunset review in the Federal Register.

Ronald K. Lorentzen
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

(Date)

Attachment 1

Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China (A-570-890)

Value of Imports of Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China

United States (Consumption/Domestic) Import Statistics

Commodity: 940350, Bedroom Furniture, Wooden, Nes

	United States Dollars								
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
China	480,210,215	818,933,783	1,166,302,097	1,240,334,584	1,392,960,324	1,509,895,503	1,341,101,325	969,400,196	660,185,510