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

A-570-904
Sunset Review
Public Document
IA/NME/9: RJP

May 25, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

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

SUBJECT: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China

---

Summary

In the sunset review of the antidumping duty order covering certain activated carbon from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), Calgon Carbon Corporation, Norit Americas, Inc., and ADA Carbon Solutions LLC, domestic producers of certain activated carbon (collectively, "the domestic interested parties"), submitted adequate substantive responses. No respondent interested party submitted a substantive response. In accordance with our analysis of the domestic interested parties' substantive response, we recommend adopting the positions described in the instant memorandum. The following is a complete list of issues in this sunset review for which we received a substantive response:

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

Background

On March 1, 2012, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published the notice of initiation of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2).[1] On March 15, 2012, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i), the Department received timely and complete notices of intent to participate in the sunset review from domestic

---

[1] See Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review, 77 FR 12562 (March 1, 2012) ("Sunset Initiation").

interested parties.[2] On March 30, 2012, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i), domestic interested parties filed timely and adequate substantive responses within 30 days after the date of publication of the Sunset Initiation.[3] The Department did not receive substantive responses from any respondent interested party. 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 conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC.

History of the Order

On March 2, 2007, the Department published its final determination in the less than fair value ("LTFV") investigation of certain activated carbon from the PRC.[4] On April 27, 2007, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC.[5] In so doing, the Department found the following weighted-average dumping margins:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
Beijing Pacific Activated Carbon Products Co., Ltd.	67.14
Calgon Carbon Tianjin Co., Ltd.	69.54
Datong Juqiang Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Locomotive Coal & Chemicals Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Municipal Yunguang Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Yunguang Chemicals Plant	67.14
Hebei Foreign Trade and Advertising Corporation	67.14
Jacobi Carbons AB	61.95
Jilin Bright Future Chemicals Company, Ltd.	228.11
Jilin Province Bright Future Industry and Commerce Co., Ltd.	228.11
Ningxia Guanghua Cherishmet Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Ningxia Huahui Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Ningxia Mineral & Chemical Limited	67.14
Shanxi DMD Corporation	67.14
Shanxi Industry Technology Trading Co., Ltd.	67.14
Shanxi Newtime Co., Ltd.	67.14
Shanxi Qixian Foreign Trade Corporation	67.14
Shanxi Sincere Industrial Co., Ltd.	67.14

[2] See Letter from domestic interested parties, re: "Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of the Antidumping Order on Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Domestic Interested Parties' Intent to Participate," dated March 15, 2012.

[3] See Letter from domestic interested parties, re: "Five-Year ("Sunset") Review of the Antidumping Order on Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Domestic Industry's Substantive Response," dated March 30, 2012 ("Substantive Response").

[4] See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China, 72 FR 9508 (March 2, 2007) ("LTFV Investigation"); Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China, 72 FR 15099 (March 30, 2007).

[5] Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China, 72 FR 20988 (April 27, 2007) ("Order").

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
Shanxi Xuanzhong Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.	67.14
Tangshan Solid Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Tianjin Maijin Industries Co., Ltd.	67.14
United Manufacturing International (Beijing) Ltd.	67.14
Xi'an Shuntong International Trade & Industrials Co., Ltd.	67.14
PRC-Wide Entity	228.11

Administrative Reviews and New Shipper Reviews

Since the issuance of the antidumping duty order, the Department has completed three administrative reviews each with respect to certain activated carbon from the PRC.[6] Prior to the initiation of the sunset review by the Department, on October 24, 2011, the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the remand redetermination issued by the Department pursuant to the CIT's remand order for the first administrative review, which changed the surrogate values for carbonized materials, hydrochloric acid, and the surrogate labor rate, and applied those changes to the dumping margin calculated for Ningxia Guanghua Cherishmet Activated Carbon Co., Ltd., resulting in a dumping margin of 2.95 percent for that company.[7] Consequently, on November 9, 2011, the Department published in the Federal Register the amended final results of the first administrative review of certain activated carbon from the PRC.[8] The third administrative review is currently the subject of litigation before the CIT.[9] The fourth administrative review is ongoing. There have been no new shipper reviews.

Scope Inquiries, Changed Circumstances Reviews, and Duty Absorption

On December 7, 2009, the Department issued a final scope ruling stating that certain Chinese-origin fitted fish tank filters containing (1) less than 500 grams of activated carbon or (2) a combination of activated carbon and zeolite are outside the scope of the order.[10]

---

[6] See First Administrative Review of Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 57995 (November 10, 2009), as amended Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of Chain: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 66952 (December 17, 2009); Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Second Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 70208 (November 17, 2010) ("AR2 Carbon"); and Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Third Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 76 FR 67142 (October 31, 2011) ("AR3 Carbon").

[7] See Hebei Foreign Trade & Advertising Corp. v. United States, 807 F. Supp. 2d 1317, 1320-23 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2011); see also Final Results Of Redetermination Pursuant To Court Remand, Court No. 09-00524, dated July 25, 2011, available at: http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands/index.html. The previous action, Calgon Carbon Corp. v. United States, Court No. 09-00518, was "deconsolidated" which resulted in a caption change to Hebei Foreign Trade & Advertising Corp. v. United States, Court No. 09-00524.

[8] See Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision, 76 FR 69705 (November 9, 2011).

[9] See Albemarle Corp. v. United States, Consol. Court No. 11-451 (Ct. Int'l Trade filed Nov. 18, 2011).

[10] See Memorandum for John M. Andersen, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, from Jerry Huang, International Trade Analyst, Office 9, re: "Final Scope Ruling: Antidumping

On December 15, 2008, the Department received a request for a changed circumstance review and a request to revoke in part the Order with respect to the scope-ruling request regarding the certain fish tank filters described above.[11] On January 7, 2010, the Department rescinded the changed circumstance review based on the above scope ruling.[12]

On April 30, 2009, the Department initiated a changed circumstance review requested by Hebei Foreign Trade and Advertising Corporation ("Hebei Foreign") to determine whether Hebei Foreign had been succeeded by Hebei Shenglun Advertising and Exhibit Corporation.[13] On September 24, 2009, the Department rescinded the change circumstance review because the Department determined that there had been no change in Hebei Foreign's operations from the period of investigation and because the changed circumstance review was initiated on information that was later determined to be false.[14]

In the second administrative review, the Department determined that antidumping duties were being absorbed on Jacobi Carbon AB's ("Jacobi") U.S. sales of the subject merchandise through its affiliated importer, given that Jacobi did not rebut the duty absorption presumption with evidence that the unaffiliated U.S. purchaser paid the full duty ultimately assessed on the subject merchandise.[15]

Discussion of the Issues

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 Order would likely to lead to a 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 margin determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews, and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the periods before, and the periods after, the issuance of the antidumping duty order.[16]

Duty Order on Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China," dated December 7, 2009; see also Notice of Scope Rulings, 75 FR 14138 (March 24, 2010).

[11] See Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review, and Intent To Revoke Order in Part, 74 FR 4736 (January 27, 2009).

[12] See Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Changed Circumstances Review, 75 FR 981 (January 7, 2010).

[13] See Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review, 74 FR 19934 (April 30, 2009).

[14] See Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Changed Circumstances Review, 74 FR 48723 (September 24, 2009).

[15] See Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Preliminary Results of the Second Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Preliminary Rescission in Part, 75 FR 26927, 26930-31 (May 13, 2010), unchanged in AR2 Carbon.

[16] In its recent announcement in Final Modification for Reviews, the Department modified its practice in sunset reviews, stating that it would "not rely on weighted-average dumping margins that were calculated using the methodology determined by the Appellate Body to be {World Trade Organization ("WTO")}-inconsistent in US—Zeroing (EC), US—Zeroing (Japan), and US—Continued Zeroing (EC)." See Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Proceedings; Final Modification, 77 FR 8101, 8103 (February 14, 2012) ("Final Modification for Reviews"). Consequently, the

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, among other scenarios: (a) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after issuance of the order; or (b) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly.[17] Alternatively, the Department normally will determine that revocation of an antidumping duty 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.[18] In addition, as a base period of 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.[19]

Further, section 752(c)(3) of the Act states that the Department shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("ITC") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Generally, the Department selects the dumping 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 in place.[20]

Section 751(a)(4) of the Act states that the Department will provide to the ITC its findings regarding duty absorption for reviews in which the Department conducted a duty absorption analysis. Where the Department has found duty absorption, the Department will normally (a) determine that a company's current dumping margin is not indicative of the margin likely to prevail if the order is revoke; and (b) provide the ITC the higher of the dumping margin that the Department would otherwise report to the ITC or the most recent dumping margin for that company adjusted to account for the Department's findings on duty absorption.[21] In light of the Department's recent Final Modification of Review, the Department will only rely on the rates from the LTFV Investigation, which are consistent with the Final Modification of Review.[22]

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 antidumping duty

---

Department stated that it may rely on past dumping margins "that were not affected by the WTO-inconsistent methodology, such as dumping margins . . . determined based on the use of adverse facts available, and dumping margins where no offsets were denied because all comparison results were positive." See id. The Department announced that the new policy will apply to all sunset reviews pending before the Department for which either preliminary results of sunset review, or expedited final results of sunset review are issued more than 60 days after the date of publication of the Department's Final Modification for Reviews." Id. at 8109.

[17] See SAA, H.R. Rep. No. 103-316, Vol. 1 (1994), at 889-90; see also 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.

[18] See SAA at 889-90, and House Report at 63.

[19] 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.

[20] See SAA at 890; see also 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.

[21] See SAA at 885-86.

[22] See Final Modification of Reviews, 77 FR at 8109.

order would not be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of sales at LTFV. Our analysis of the comments submitted by domestic interested parties' follows.

Analysis

1. Likelihood of Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Domestic interested parties argue that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC would likely result in the continuation of dumping in the United States. Specifically, domestic interested parties contend that dumping has continued at rates exceeding de minimis levels since the order was imposed in 2007.[23] In addition, domestic interested parties assert that since the imposition of the order, the import volumes of certain activated carbon into the United States from PRC producers and exporters have generally declined.[24]

Department's 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 guidance provided by the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (i.e., the SAA; House Report, H. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994) ("House Report"); and Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994)). Consistent with the SAA, the Department will make its likelihood determination on an order-wide, rather than company-specific basis.[25] Further, when determining whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation of dumping, 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 (2) the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and after the issuance of the antidumping duty order.

In the instant review, for the reasons stated below, we find that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC would likely result in the continuation of dumping in the United States. In this sunset proceeding, the Department has relied on certain dumping margins consistent with the Final Modification for Reviews.[26] Specifically, in the LTFV Investigation, the Department calculated dumping margins where no offsets were denied because the Department determined that it would apply the Final Modification of Investigations for the final determination.[27] We consider these rates from the LTFV Investigation as demonstrating a likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping, given that they are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of an order in place and continue to be applicable during the sunset review period.[28]

[23] See Substantive Response at 16.
[24] See Substantive Response at 16-18.
[25] See SAA at 879, and House Report at 56.
[26] See Final Modification for Reviews, 77 FR at 8103.
[27] See LTFV Investigation, 72 FR at 9509 (citing Antidumping Proceedings: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin During an Antidumping Investigation; Final Modification, 71 FR 77722 (December 27, 2006) ("Final Modification of Investigations")), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4.
[28] See SAA at 890; see also 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; Final Modification of Investigations.

Moreover, the domestic interested parties provided import volume data from the Department from 2003 to 2011 showing imports of certain activated carbon from the PRC fluctuated for the period following imposition of the order. Based on HTSUS import data collected by Global Trade Atlas ("GTA"), the Department confirmed that import volumes from the PRC under the HTSUS numbers listed in the scope of the Order have declined and subsequently fluctuated over the period of this sunset review. Specifically, according to the GTA data for U.S. imports of certain activated carbon from the PRC, the import volume in the year following issuance of the Order (i.e., 2008) was lower than import volumes in both years preceding issuance of the Order (i.e., 2005 and 2006).[29] For the years 2008 through 2010, import volumes fluctuated, but in all three years import volumes remained below pre-order levels. Accordingly, we find that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the Order is revoked because import volumes for the subject merchandise declined after imposition of the Order and, thus, it "is reasonable to assume that exporters could not sell in the United States without dumping and that, to reenter the U.S. market, they would have to resume dumping."[30]

Finally, no respondent interested party filed a substantive response, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). Thus, we find that respondent interested parties have failed to file an adequate response in this sunset review. Additionally, as no respondent interested party submitted any evidence to the contrary, we find that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the Order is revoked.

2. Magnitude of the Dumping Margin Likely to Prevail

Domestic interested parties contend that the Department's recent modification of its practice for future sunset reviews in Final Modification for Reviews to no longer rely on dumping margins that were calculated using the "zeroing" methodology does not change the results in this proceeding because the weighted-average dumping margins calculated in the investigation were determined on the basis of partial adverse facts available ("AFA"), the PRC-wide rate was calculated without the use of zeroing, and, finally, there are no extraordinary circumstances where the Department need recalculate dumping margins.[31]

Additionally, domestic interested parties contend that, based on the Department's duty absorption finding in the second administrative review, the Department should report the higher of the margin that the Department would have reported to the ITC for Jacobi or the most recent margin for Jacobi adjusted to account for the Department's duty absorption findings.[32] Finally, the domestic interested parties suggest that the Department should report to the ITC the weighted-average dumping margins calculated in the investigation of certain activated carbon from the PRC, which is in accordance with the Sunset Policy Bulletin.[33]

---

[29] See Attachment I to this memorandum.
[30] See, e.g., SAA at 889-90.
[31] See Substantive Response at 22.
[32] See Substantive Response at 24.
[33] See Substantive Response at 23; see also Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871, 18872 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

Department's Position: Normally, the Department will provide to the ITC the company-specific, weighted-average dumping margin from the investigation for each company.[34] The Department's preference for selecting a dumping margin from the investigation is based on the fact that it is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of manufacturers, and exporters without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place.[35] For companies not investigated individually, or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department will normally provide a dumping margin based on the "All-Others" rate from the investigation.[36] However, the PRC, which the Department considers to be a non-market economy under section 771(18)(A) of the Act, the Department does not have an "All-Others" rate. Thus, in non-market economy cases, instead of an "All-Others" rate, the Department uses an established country-wide rate, which it applies to all imports from exporters that have not established their eligibility for a separate rate.[37]

The Department has determined that the weighted-average dumping margins established in the investigation of certain activated carbon from the PRC are the most likely to prevail if the order were revoked. In this sunset proceeding, the Department has relied on weighted-average dumping margins that were not affected by the methodology addressed in the Final Modification for Reviews.[38] Specifically, in the LTFV Investigation, the Department calculated weighted-average dumping margins with offsets.[39] Accordingly, we find it appropriate to provide the ITC with the final determination rates from the LTFV Investigation of certain activated carbon from the PRC for the following reasons: (1) import volumes initially declined after issuance of the Order; and (2) the final determination rates from the LTFV Investigation properly reflect the behavior of manufacturers, and exporters of certain activated carbon without the discipline of an order in place.[40] Moreover, respondent interested parties have failed to submit any evidence to the contrary. As a result, we will report to the ITC the weighted-average dumping margins listed in the "Final Results of Reviews" section below.

With respect to domestic interested parties' concern over duty absorption, according to the SAA and the House Report, "duty absorption is a strong indicator that the current dumping margins calculated by {the Department} in reviews may not be indicative of the margins that would exist in the absence of an order."[41] Accordingly, and consistent with the Department's new practice as articulated in Final Modification for Reviews,[42] the Department will report to the ITC the

---

[34] See Eveready Battery Co., Inc. v. United States, 77 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1333 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1999).
[35] See id.; see also SAA at 890.
[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.
[37] See Bristol Metals L.P. v. United States, 703 F. Supp. 2d 1370, 1378 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2010) (citation omitted); see Amanda Foods (Vietnam) Ltd. v. United States, 647 F. Supp. 2d 1368, 1379 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2009) (citation omitted).
[38] See Final Modification for Reviews, 77 FR at 8103.
[39] See LTFV Investigation, 72 FR at 9509, and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4.
[40] See Attachment I to this memorandum; see also 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 Comment 2.
[41] See SAA at 885; see also House Report at 60.
[42] See Final Modification for Reviews, 77 FR at 8103.

dumping margin calculated for Jacobi in the LTFV Investigation because Jacobi's LTFV Investigation weighted-average dumping margin was calculated with offsets.[43]

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average dumping margins:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
Beijing Pacific Activated Carbon Products Co., Ltd.	67.14
Calgon Carbon Tianjin Co., Ltd.	69.54
Datong Juqiang Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Locomotive Coal & Chemicals Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Municipal Yunguang Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Datong Yunguang Chemicals Plant	67.14
Hebei Foreign Trade and Advertising Corporation	67.14
Jacobi Carbons AB	61.95
Jilin Bright Future Chemicals Company, Ltd.	228.11
Jilin Province Bright Future Industry and Commerce Co., Ltd.	228.11
Ningxia Guanghua Cherishmet Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Ningxia Huahui Activated Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Ningxia Mineral & Chemical Limited	67.14
Shanxi DMD Corporation	67.14
Shanxi Industry Technology Trading Co., Ltd.	67.14
Shanxi Newtime Co., Ltd.	67.14
Shanxi Qixian Foreign Trade Corporation	67.14
Shanxi Sincere Industrial Co., Ltd.	67.14
Shanxi Xuanzhong Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.	67.14
Tangshan Solid Carbon Co., Ltd.	67.14
Tianjin Maijin Industries Co., Ltd.	67.14
United Manufacturing International (Beijing) Ltd.	67.14
Xi'an Shuntong International Trade & Industrials Co., Ltd.	67.14
PRC-Wide Entity	228.11

[43] See LTFV Investigation, 72 FR at 9509, and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4.

Recommendation

Based on our analysis of the substantive response received, we recommend adopting the above positions. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the final results of this sunset reviews in the Federal Register.

__________ __________
Agree Disagree

____
Paul Piquado
Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

____
(Date)

Attachment 1

United States (HS 8) Import Statistics From China Commodity: 380210, Activated Carbon									
Annual Series: 2006 - 2011									
Commodity	**Unit**	**Description**	**Quantity**						
			2005	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**
38021000	KG	Activated Carbon	38,110,391	36,477,429	21,265,809	20,855,514	11,969,239	12,444,089	16,920,275