



A-557-816

POR: 7/1/2018-06/30/2019

Public Document

E&C/OVI: PNC/JKD/GTB

November 16, 2020

MEMORANDUM TO: Jeffrey I. Kessler
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: James Maeder
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Decision Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Antidumping
Duty Administrative Review: Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia;
2018-2019

I. SUMMARY

The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain steel nails from Malaysia. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The administrative review covers 13 producers/exporters of the subject merchandise. Commerce selected two mandatory respondents: Inmax Sdn. Bhd. (Inmax Sdn.) and Inmax Industries Sdn. Bhd. (Inmax Industries) (collectively, Inmax); and Region System Sdn. Bhd. (Region System) and Region International Co. Ltd. (Region International) (collectively, Region). Commerce preliminarily finds that Inmax made sales of subject merchandise at prices less than normal value during the POR and that Region did not make sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value during the POR.

II. BACKGROUND

On July 31, 2019, Mid Continent Steel & Wire, Inc. (the petitioner) filed a timely request for review of thirteen companies,¹ and Inmax and Region filed timely requests for review of their companies.² Commerce published a notice of initiation of the review on September 9, 2019.³

On October 1, 2019, Commerce received a letter from Astrotech Steels Private Limited (Astrotech) reporting that it had no exports, sales, or entries of subject merchandise into the

¹ See Petitioner's Letter, "Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia: Request for Administrative Reviews," dated July 31, 2019.

² See Inmax's Letter, "Steel Nails from Malaysia: Request for Administrative Review," dated July 31, 2020; and Region's Letter, "Steel Nails from Malaysia," dated July 31, 2019.

³ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 84 FR 47242 (September 9, 2019).



United States during the POR.⁴ On October 4, 2019, Commerce received a letter from Trinity Steel Private Limited (Trinity) reporting it had no exports, sales, or entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR.⁵ Similarly, on October 9, Commerce received a letter from Jinhai Hardware Co. Ltd. (Jinhai) reporting it had no sales, shipments, exports, or entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR.⁶ On February 14, 2020, in accordance with our standard practice, we transmitted a “No-Shipment Inquiry” to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regarding Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai.⁷ CBP responded that it found no information indicating shipments or entries of certain steel nails from Malaysia produced and/or exported by Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai during the POR.⁸

Between December 2019 and January 2020, Inmax⁹ and Region¹⁰ submitted timely responses to Commerce’s antidumping duty questionnaire. Between January and September 2020, Region timely responded to additional questionnaires from Commerce,¹¹ and between March and October 2020, Inmax timely responded to additional questionnaires from Commerce.¹²

On March 25, 2020, we extended the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of the review to no later than July 30, 2020.¹³ On April 24, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by 50 days.¹⁴ On July 21, 2020, Commerce further tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by an additional 60 days.¹⁵ The deadline for the preliminary results of this review is now November 17, 2020.

⁴ See Astrotech’s Letter, “Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia Request for No Shipment during the Period of Review (POR),” dated October 1, 2019.

⁵ See Trinity’s Letter, “Certain Steel Nails – Malaysia Notice of No sales during the Period of Review (POR),” dated October 4, 2019.

⁶ See Jinhai’s Letter, “Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia: Submission of Statement of No Shipments,” dated October 9, 2019.

⁷ See Memorandum, “No shipment inquiry with respect to the companies below during the period 07/01/2018 through 06/30/2019,” dated February 25, 2020 (Customs Liaison Unit Memorandum).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ See Inmax’s Section A Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Section A Questionnaire Response,” dated December 13, 2019 (Inmax Section A Response); and Inmax’s Sections B-D Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Section B-D Questionnaire Response,” dated December 23, 2019.

¹⁰ See Region’s Section A Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated December 12, 2019 (Region Section A Response); and Region’s Sections B-D Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated January 13, 2020.

¹¹ See Region’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated January 29, 2020; *see also* Region’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated March 25, 2020; Region’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated June 24, 2020; and Region’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated September 23, 2020.

¹² See Inmax’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Section A-D Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” dated March 3, 2020; *see also* Inmax’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Second Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” dated April 6, 2020; Inmax’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Third Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” dated July 9, 2020; and Inmax’s Supplemental Response, “Steel Nails from Malaysia – Fourth Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” dated October 6, 2020.

¹³ See Memorandum, “Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia: Extension of Deadline for Preliminary Results for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2018-2019,” dated March 25, 2020.

¹⁴ See Memorandum, “Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews in Response to Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19,” dated April 24, 2020.

¹⁵ See Memorandum, “Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews,” dated July 21, 2020.

III. SCOPE OF THE ORDER

The merchandise covered by the antidumping duty order is certain steel nails having a nominal shaft length not exceeding 12 inches.¹⁶ Certain steel nails include, but are not limited to, nails made from round wire and nails that are cut from flat-rolled steel. Certain steel nails may be of one piece construction or constructed of two or more pieces. Certain steel nails may be produced from any type of steel, and may have any type of surface finish, head type, shank, point type and shaft diameter. Finishes include, but are not limited to, coating in vinyl, zinc (galvanized, including but not limited to electroplating or hot dipping one or more times), phosphate, cement, and paint. Certain steel nails may have one or more surface finishes. Head styles include, but are not limited to, flat, projection, cupped, oval, brad, headless, double, countersunk, and sinker. Shank styles include, but are not limited to, smooth, barbed, screw threaded, ring shank and fluted. Screw-threaded nails subject to this proceeding are driven using direct force and not by turning the nail using a tool that engages with the head. Point styles include, but are not limited to, diamond, needle, chisel and blunt or no point. Certain steel nails may be sold in bulk, or they may be collated in any manner using any material.

Excluded from the scope of this order are certain steel nails packaged in combination with one or more non-subject articles, if the total number of nails of all types, in aggregate regardless of size, is less than 25. If packaged in combination with one or more non-subject articles, certain steel nails remain subject merchandise if the total number of nails of all types, in aggregate regardless of size, is equal to or greater than 25, unless otherwise excluded based on the other exclusions below.

Also excluded from the scope are certain steel nails with a nominal shaft length of one inch or less that are (a) a component of an unassembled article, (b) the total number of nails is sixty (60) or less, and (c) the imported unassembled article falls into one of the following eight groupings: (1) builders' joinery and carpentry of wood that are classifiable as windows, French-windows and their frames; 2) builders' joinery and carpentry of wood that are classifiable as doors and their frames and thresholds; 3) swivel seats with variable height adjustment; 4) seats that are convertible into beds (with the exception of those classifiable as garden seats or camping equipment); 5) seats of cane, osier, bamboo or similar materials; 6) other seats with wooden frames (with the exception of seats of a kind used for aircraft or motor vehicles); 7) furniture (other than seats) of wood (with the exception of (i) medical, surgical, dental or veterinary furniture; and ii) barbers' chairs and similar chairs, having rotating as well as both reclining and elevating movements); or 8) furniture (other than seats) of materials other than wood, metal, or plastics (*e.g.*, furniture of cane, osier, bamboo or similar materials). The aforementioned imported unassembled articles are currently classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 4418.10, 4418.20, 9401.30, 9401.40, 9401.51, 9401.59, 9401.61, 9401.69, 9403.30, 9403.40, 9403.50, 9403.60, 9403.81 or 9403.89.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are steel nails that meet the specifications of Type I, Style 20 nails as identified in Tables 29 through 33 of ASTM Standard F1667 (2013 revision).

¹⁶ The shaft length of certain steel nails with flat heads or parallel shoulders under the head shall be measured from under the head or shoulder to the tip of the point. The shaft length of all other certain steel nails shall be measured overall.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are nails suitable for use in powder-actuated hand tools, whether or not threaded, which are currently classified under HTSUS subheadings 7317.00.20.00 and 7317.00.30.00.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are nails having a case hardness greater than or equal to 50 on the Rockwell Hardness C scale (HRC), a carbon content greater than or equal to 0.5 percent, a round head, a secondary reduced-diameter raised head section, a centered shank, and a smooth symmetrical point, suitable for use in gas-actuated hand tools.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are corrugated nails. A corrugated nail is made up of a small strip of corrugated steel with sharp points on one side.

Also excluded from the scope of this order are thumb tacks, which are currently classified under HTSUS subheading 7317.00.10.00.

Certain steel nails subject to this order are currently classified under HTSUS subheadings 7317.00.55.02, 7317.00.55.03, 7317.00.55.05, 7317.00.55.07, 7317.00.55.08, 7317.00.55.11, 7317.00.55.18, 7317.00.55.19, 7317.00.55.20, 7317.00.55.30, 7317.00.55.40, 7317.00.55.50, 7317.00.55.60, 7317.00.55.70, 7317.00.55.80, 7317.00.55.90, 7317.00.65.30, 7317.00.65.60 and 7317.00.75.00. Certain steel nails subject to this order also may be classified under HTSUS subheadings 7907.00.60.00, 7806.00.80.00, 7318.29.00.00, 8206.00.00.00 or other HTSUS subheadings.

While the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION OF NO SHIPMENTS

As noted in the “Background” section, Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai submitted letters containing certifications that each company had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. Additionally, CBP indicated that it found no evidence of shipments of subject merchandise produced and/or exported by Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai during the POR.¹⁷ Therefore, we preliminarily determine that Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. However, consistent with our practice, we are not rescinding the review with respect to Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai but, rather, we will complete the review and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of this review.¹⁸

¹⁷ See Customs Liaison Unit Memorandum.

¹⁸ See, e.g., *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2012–2013*, 79 FR 15951, 15952 (March 24, 2014), unchanged in *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Final Determination of No Shipments, and Partial Rescission of Review; 2012–2013*, 79 FR 51306 (August 28, 2014).

V. COMPANIES NOT SELECTED FOR INDIVIDUAL EXAMINATION

Commerce did not select the following companies for individual examination as mandatory respondents: Astrotech; Chia Pao Metal Co., Ltd.; Come Best (Thailand) Co., Ltd.; Jinhai; Kerry-Apex (Thailand) Co., Ltd.; Tag Fasteners Sdn. Bhd.; Trinity; Vien Group SDN. BHD.; and WWL India Private Ltd. As discussed above, we preliminarily determine that Astrotech, Trinity, and Jinhai had no shipments during the POR. With respect to the remaining companies, none of these companies: (1) were the subject of a withdrawal of request for review; (2) requested to participate as a voluntary respondent; or (3) submitted a claim of no shipments. As such, these companies remain non-selected respondents.

The statute and Commerce's regulations do not address the establishment of a rate to be applied to companies not selected for individual examination when Commerce limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Act). Generally, Commerce looks to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a market economy investigation, for guidance when calculating the rate for companies which were not selected for individual examination in an administrative review. Under section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the all-others rate is normally "an amount equal to the weighted average of the estimated weighted average dumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any zero or *de minimis* margins, and any margins determined entirely {on the basis of facts available}."

In this review, we have preliminarily assigned a weighted-average dumping margin for the remaining six companies using the calculated rates of the mandatory respondents, excluding any margins that are zero, *de minimis*, or determined entirely based on facts available. We preliminarily calculated a weighted-average dumping margin of 1.59 percent for Inmax and 0.00 percent for Region for the POR. Therefore, for these preliminary results, pursuant to section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, we assigned the weighted-average dumping margin calculated for Inmax, 1.59 percent, to the following non-selected companies: Chia Pao Metal Co., Ltd.; Come Best (Thailand) Co., Ltd.; Kerry-Apex (Thailand) Co., Ltd.; Tag Fasteners Sdn. Bhd.; Vien Group SDN. BHD.; and WWL India Private Ltd.

VI. DISCUSSION OF THE METHODOLOGY

A. Collapsing of Affiliated Companies

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.401(f), Commerce will treat affiliated producers as a single entity where producers have production facilities for similar or identical products that would not require substantial retooling to restructure manufacturing priorities and there is a significant potential for manipulation of price or production.¹⁹ The regulation further states that, in identifying a significant potential for manipulation, Commerce may consider factors including:

¹⁹ While 19 CFR 351.401(f) uses the term "producers," Commerce's practice is to apply this regulation to resellers and other affiliated companies as well. See, e.g., *Certain Fresh Cut Flowers from Colombia; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 42833, 42853 (August 19, 1996) (citing *Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value; Certain Granite Products from Spain*, 53 FR 24335, 24337 (June 28, 1988) (*Colombian Flowers*)).

(1) the level of common ownership; (2) the extent to which managerial employees or board members of one firm sit on the board of directors of an affiliated firm; and (3) whether operations are intertwined, such as through the sharing of sales information, involvement in production and pricing decisions, the sharing of facilities or employees, or significant transactions between the affiliated producers. Commerce also previously explained its practice of collapsing affiliated companies:

Because Commerce calculates margins on a company-by-company basis, it must ensure that it reviews the entire producer or reseller, not merely part of it. Commerce reviews the entire entity due to its concerns regarding price and cost manipulation. Because of this concern, Commerce normally examines the question of whether reviewed companies “constitute separate manufacturers or exporters for purposes of the dumping law.”²⁰

The U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) has recognized that when determining whether there is a significant potential for manipulation, 19 CFR 351.401(f)(2)(i), (ii), and (iii) are considered by Commerce in light of the totality of the circumstances; no one factor is dispositive in determining whether to collapse the producers.²¹ Also, while 19 CFR 351.401(f) applies only to producers, Commerce has found it to be instructive in determining whether non-producers should be collapsed and has used the criteria in the regulation in its analysis.²²

Based on this collapsing analysis, we preliminarily determine that Inmax Sdn. and Inmax Industries are ultimately owned by, and under common control of, the same group of individuals and, therefore, are affiliated in accordance with section 771(33)(F) of the Act. Furthermore, because both Inmax Sdn. and Inmax Industries produced and sold foreign like product or subject merchandise during the POR, we preliminarily find that, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f)(1), the companies had production facilities for similar or identical products that would not require substantial retooling to restructure manufacturing priorities. We also find that the record shows that there is a significant potential for manipulation of price or production between the two companies, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f), due to: (1) the significant level of common ownership between Inmax Sdn. and Inmax Industries; (2) the considerable overlap in the directorship and management of the Inmax companies; and (3) the intertwined operations between Inmax Sdn. and Inmax Industries. Further, the companies maintain a shared website which includes common pricing information and share a common president, who has the authority to set and approve sales prices for both companies. Thus, we preliminarily determine

²⁰ See *Colombian Flowers*, 53 FR at 24337.

²¹ See *Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 516 F. Supp. 2d 1323, 1346 (CIT 2007) (citing *Light Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from Turkey*; *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 69 FR 53675 (September 2, 2004), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Comment 10).

²² See, e.g., *Honey from Argentina: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 1458, 1461-62 (January 10, 2012), unchanged in *Honey from Argentina: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 36253 (June 18, 2012); and *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil*, 69 FR 76910 (December 23, 2004), and accompanying IDM at Comment 5. The CIT has found that collapsing exporters is consistent with a “reasonable interpretation of the antidumping duty statute.” See *Hontex Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 248 F. Supp. 2d. 1323, 1338 (CIT 2003).

that these two companies should be treated as a single entity for antidumping purposes, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f).²³

With respect to Region, we preliminarily determine that Region System, a producer of subject merchandise, is affiliated with Region International, the company that exports its subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 771(33)(B) and (F) of the Act. We also preliminarily determine that Region System and Region International should be treated as a single entity for antidumping purposes, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.401(f). As explained in the Region Analysis Memorandum, these companies are ultimately owned by, and under common control of, the same group of individuals and, therefore, are affiliated in accordance with section 771(33)(F) of the Act. In addition, there is significant common ownership and other shared operations between the producing affiliate and the exporting company. We also preliminarily determine that there is a significant potential for the manipulation of prices among these companies, as evidenced by the level of common ownership, the degree of management overlap, and the intertwined nature of the operations of these companies. Thus, we have preliminarily treated these companies as a single entity.²⁴

B. Date of Sale

According to 19 CFR 351.401(i), “{i}n identifying the date of sale of the subject merchandise or foreign like product, the Secretary normally will use the date of invoice, as recorded in the exporter or producer’s records kept in the ordinary course of business.” The regulation provides further that Commerce may use a date other than the date of invoice if the Secretary is satisfied that a different date better reflects the date on which the exporter or producer establishes the material terms of sale.²⁵ Commerce has a long-standing practice of finding that, where shipment date precedes invoice date, shipment date better reflects the date on which the material terms of sale are established.²⁶

For its home market sales, we found that Inmax reported the actual sales/tax invoice date as its date of sale because that date represented the earliest date on which all material terms of sale, specifically quantity and value, are fixed. Inmax also reported that the tax invoice is issued at the time of delivery. Inmax reported the date of the delivery order as the date of sale for its U.S. sales because the material terms of sale did not change after the issuance of this document. Based on the above, we preliminarily find that the actual sales/tax invoice date is the most

²³ For a more detailed analysis for Inmax, see “Analysis Memorandum for Inmax Sdn. Bhd. and Inmax Industries Sdn. Bhd. in the Preliminary Results of the 2018/2019 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated concurrently with this memorandum (Inmax Analysis Memorandum) at 4.

²⁴ For a more detailed analysis for Region, see “Analysis Memorandum for Region International Co. Ltd. and Region Systems Sdn. Bhd. in the Preliminary Results of the 2018/2019 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Steel Nails from Malaysia,” dated concurrently with this memorandum (Region Analysis Memorandum) at 1-4.

²⁵ See 19 CFR 351.401(i); see also *Allied Tube & Conduit Corp. v. United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1090 (CIT 2001) (quoting 19 CFR 351.401(i)).

²⁶ See, e.g., *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Negative Final Determination of Critical Circumstances: Certain Frozen and Canned Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand*, 69 FR 76918 (December 23, 2004), and accompanying IDM at Comment 10; see also *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Structural Steel Beams from Germany*, 67 FR 35497 (May 20, 2002), and accompanying IDM at Comment 2.

appropriate date of sale for Inmax's home market sales, as the record indicates that the terms of sale are established by the time that the actual sales/tax invoice is issued, and that the date of the delivery order is the most appropriate date of sale for U.S. sales, as the record shows that the terms of sale for these sales are established by this date.²⁷

Region reported the invoice date as the date of sale for its home market sales because the invoice is the first document in which the final price and quantity for sale are agreed upon and memorialized in Region's records in their ordinary course of business.²⁸ Therefore, we preliminarily find that Region's invoice date is the most appropriate date of sale for its home market sales, as the record indicates that the terms of sale are established and no longer subject to change. For U.S. sales, Region reported the invoice date or shipment date from the factory, whichever occurred first, as the date of sale.²⁹ We preliminarily find that the date of sale is the earlier of the invoice date or shipment date from the factory, as the record shows that the terms of sale for U.S. sales are established by this date.

C. Comparisons to Normal Value

Pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and (d), in order to determine whether Inmax and Region's sales of the subject merchandise from Malaysia to the United States were made at less than normal value, Commerce compared the export price to the normal value as described in the "Export Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this memorandum.

1. Determination of Comparison Method

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1), Commerce calculates weighted-average dumping margins by comparing weighted-average normal values to weighted-average export prices (or constructed export prices) (*i.e.*, the average-to-average method) unless the Secretary determines that another method is appropriate in a particular situation. In less-than-fair-value investigations, Commerce examines whether to compare weighted-average normal values with the export prices (or constructed export prices) of individual sales (*i.e.*, the average-to-transaction method) as an alternative comparison method using an analysis consistent with section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act. Although section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act does not strictly govern Commerce's examination of this question in the context of administrative reviews, Commerce nevertheless finds that the issue arising under 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) in administrative reviews is, in fact, analogous to the issue in less-than-fair-value investigations.³⁰

In recent investigations, Commerce applied a "differential pricing" analysis for determining whether application of the average-to-transaction method is appropriate in a particular situation

²⁷ For a more detailed analysis, *see* Inmax Analysis Memorandum at 4.

²⁸ *See* Region Section A Response at 22 and 26.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, and Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; 2010–2011*, 77 FR 73415 (December 10, 2012), and accompanying IDM at Comment 1; *see also Apex Frozen Foods Private Ltd. v. United States*, 37 F. Supp. 3d 1286 (CIT 2014).

pursuant to 19 CFR 351.414(c)(1) and section 777A(d)(1)(B) of the Act.³¹ Commerce finds that the differential pricing analysis used in those investigations may be instructive for purposes of examining whether to apply an alternative comparison method in this administrative review. Commerce will continue to develop its approach in this area based on comments received in this and other proceedings, and on Commerce's additional experience with addressing the potential masking of dumping that can occur when Commerce uses the average-to-average method in calculating a respondent's weighted-average dumping margin.

The differential pricing analysis used in these preliminary results examines whether there exists a pattern of export prices (or constructed export prices) for comparable merchandise that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. The analysis evaluates all export sales by purchaser, region and time period to determine whether a pattern of prices that differ significantly exists. If such a pattern is found, then the differential pricing analysis evaluates whether such differences can be taken into account when using the average-to-average method to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin. The analysis incorporates default group definitions for purchasers, regions, time periods, and comparable merchandise. Purchasers are based on the reported consolidated customer codes. Regions are defined using the reported destination code (*i.e.*, state for Region, and zip code for Inmax) and are grouped into regions based upon standard definitions published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Time periods are defined by the quarter within the period of review based upon the reported date of sale. For purposes of analyzing sales transactions by purchaser, region and time period, comparable merchandise is defined using the product control number and all characteristics of the U.S. sales, other than purchaser, region and time period, that Commerce uses in making comparisons between export price (or constructed export price) and normal value for the individual dumping margins.

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

³¹ See, *e.g.*, *Xanthan Gum from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 78 FR 33351 (June 4, 2013); *Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar from Mexico: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 79 FR 54967 (September 15, 2014); and *Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Turkey: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 80 FR 61362 (October 13, 2015).

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

If both tests in the first stage (*i.e.*, the Cohen’s *d* test and the ratio test) demonstrate the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly such that an alternative comparison method should be considered, then in the second stage of the differential pricing analysis, Commerce examines whether using only the average-to-average method can appropriately account for such differences. In considering this question, Commerce tests whether using an alternative comparison method, based on the results of the Cohen’s *d* and ratio tests described above, yields a meaningful difference in the weighted-average dumping margin as compared to that resulting from the use of the average-to-average method only. If the difference between the two calculations is meaningful, then this demonstrates that the average-to-average method cannot account for differences such as those observed in this analysis, and, therefore, an alternative comparison method would be appropriate. A difference in the weighted-average dumping margins is considered meaningful if: (1) there is a 25 percent relative change in the weighted-average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method where both rates are above the *de minimis* threshold; or (2) the resulting weighted-average dumping margins between the average-to-average method and the appropriate alternative method move across the *de minimis* threshold.

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

2. Results of the Differential Pricing Analysis

For Inmax, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, Commerce preliminarily finds that 63.77 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen’s *d* test,³² and confirms the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions, or time periods. Further, Commerce preliminarily determines that the average-to-average method cannot account for such differences because the weighted-average dumping margin crosses the *de minimis* threshold when calculated using the average-to-average method and when calculated using an alternative comparison method based on applying the average-to-transaction method to those

³² See Inmax Analysis Memorandum at 11.

U.S. sales which passed the Cohen's *d* test and the average-to-average method to those sales which did not pass the Cohen's *d* test. Thus, for these preliminary results, Commerce is applying the average-to-transaction method to those U.S. sales which passed the Cohen's *d* test and the average-to-average method to those sales which did not pass the Cohen's *d* test to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for Inmax.

For Region, based on the results of the differential pricing analysis, Commerce preliminarily finds that 19.04 percent of the value of U.S. sales pass the Cohen's *d* test;³³ this result does not confirm the existence of a pattern of prices that differ significantly among purchasers, regions or time periods. Thus, the results of the Cohen's *d* and ratio tests do not support consideration of an alternative to the average-to-average method. Accordingly, Commerce preliminarily determines to apply the average-to-average method for all U.S. sales to calculate the weighted-average dumping margin for Region.

3. Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we compared prices for goods produced by Inmax and Region and sold in the home market on the basis of the comparison product which was either identical or most similar in terms of the physical characteristics to the product sold in the United States. In the order of importance, these physical characteristics are: (1) nail form; (2) product form; (3) steel type; (4) surface finish; (5) diameter; (6) shank length; (7) collation material; (8) head style; (9) shank style; and (10) heat treatment.

4. Export Price

Section 772(a) of the Act defines export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of subject merchandise outside of the U.S. to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the U.S., as adjusted under subsection (c)." In accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, we used the export price methodology for both Inmax and Region because the first sale to an unaffiliated party was made before the date of importation and the use of constructed export price was not otherwise warranted.

With respect to Inmax, in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, and where appropriate, we made deductions for certain movement expenses for foreign inland freight, domestic brokerage and handling, international freight, U.S. brokerage and handling, U.S. duties, and other import fees. Pursuant to section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made additional adjustments to export price for other direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, bank and fumigation charges), credit expenses, and indirect selling expenses.

For Region, in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, and where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price for certain movement expenses (*e.g.*, foreign inland freight, and domestic brokerage and handling). Pursuant to section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made additional adjustments to export price for warranty expenses, bank charges, credit expenses, certificate of origin expenses, and indirect selling expenses.

³³ See Region Analysis Memorandum at 7.

D. Normal Value

1. Home Market Viability as Comparison Market

To determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales of nails in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating normal value (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is five percent or more of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), Commerce compared the volume of Inmax and Region's respective home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act.³⁴ Based on this comparison, we determine that each company had a viable home market during the POR. Consequently, we based normal value on home market sales to unaffiliated purchasers made in the usual quantities in the ordinary course of trade, described in detail below.

2. Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, and to the extent practicable, we determine normal value based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the export price or constructed export price.³⁵ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.412(c)(1)(iii), the level of trade for normal value is based on the starting price of the sales in the comparison market or, when normal value is based on constructed value, the starting price of the sales from which we derive selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A), and profit.

To determine if normal value sales are at a different level of trade than export price sales, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer.³⁶ If the comparison-market sales are at a different level of trade and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which normal value is based and comparison-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we make a level-of-trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

Based on the sales process and selling-function information provided by Inmax, we found that its home market sales were made at one level of trade to dealers or end users during the POR. We further found, based on the information provided by Inmax about its U.S. sales, that these sales were made to traders and distributors at one level of trade. Because there was only one level of trade in the home market and no data were available to determine the existence of a pattern of price differences within that market, and because we do not have any other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment, we have not calculated a level-of-trade adjustment. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we have matched Inmax's export-price sales to its home market sales without making a level-of-trade adjustment to normal value.³⁷

³⁴ See Inmax Section A Response at Exhibit A-1; *see also* Region Section A Response at Exhibit A-1.

³⁵ See section 773(a)(7) of the Act.

³⁶ See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2).

³⁷ For a more detailed analysis, *see* Inmax Analysis Memorandum at 5.

Region stated there is only one channel of distribution in each market and all sales were shipped directly to the unaffiliated customer. Region identified four customer categories in the home market: (1) end users; (2) trading companies; (3) distributors, and (4) retailers, and just one customer category in the U.S. market: trading companies.³⁸ Region made little distinction in selling functions based on channels of distribution or customer categories. Region identified one selling function which it always performed on sales to the U.S. market but only frequently performed for home market sales: provision of freight and delivery.³⁹ Additionally, Region identified one selling function that is never performed on sales to the U.S. market but is sometimes performed for home market sales: commission payments.⁴⁰ Aside from these small differences, Region stated that there is no difference in the selling functions between the customer categories in the home market and the U.S. market. Commerce preliminarily finds that, for Region, there were no significant differences in selling and marketing practices between their respective home and U.S. markets, and that a single level of trade exists in each market. Because there was only one level of trade in the home market and no data was available to determine the existence of a pattern of price differences within that market, and because we do not have any other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment, we have not calculated a level-of-trade adjustment. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we matched Region's export price sales to its home market sales without making a level-of-trade adjustment to normal value.⁴¹

3. Sales to Affiliates

We exclude from our margin analysis comparison market sales to affiliated customers that are not made at arm's-length prices because we consider them to be outside the ordinary course of trade.⁴² To test whether the respondents' comparison market sales are made at arm's-length prices, we compare the prices of sales of comparable merchandise to affiliated and unaffiliated customers, net of all rebates, movement charges, and direct selling expenses. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.403(c) and in accordance with our practice, when the prices charged to an affiliated party are, on average, between 98 and 102 percent of the prices charged to unaffiliated parties for merchandise comparable to that sold to the affiliated party, we determine that the sales to the affiliated party are at arm's-length prices.⁴³ Because neither Inmax nor Region reported sales to affiliates in the comparison market, we did not test to see if such sales were made at arm's-length prices for our preliminary results.

4. Cost of Production

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2) of the Act,⁴⁴ Commerce required that both respondents provide constructed-value and cost of production (COP) information to determine if there were

³⁸ See Region Section A Response at 15-20 and Exhibit A-5.

³⁹ *Id.* at 18-21 and Exhibit A-5.

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ See section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act.

⁴² See 19 CFR 351.403(c).

⁴³ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Affiliated Party Sales in the Ordinary Course of Trade*, 67 FR 69186 (November 15, 2002).

⁴⁴ See 19 USC 1677b(b)(2)(A)(ii).

reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of foreign like product had been made at prices that represented less than the COP of the product.

a. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for SG&A expenses and packing. For these calculations, we used the COP information submitted by Inmax and Region but made certain adjustments to the data.

For Inmax, we found significant differences in the energy, labor, and overhead costs when comparing products with similar or identical control numbers (CONNUMs) produced by Inmax Sdn. and Inmax Industries. Further, we noted that these differences appeared to be related to where the product was produced, rather than due to differences in the physical characteristics of the merchandise. Therefore, we recalculated the reported energy, labor, and overhead costs to eliminate these differences.⁴⁵

For Region, we adjusted the reported amounts for services obtained from affiliated providers for electroplating, heat treatment and annealing of certain products to reflect transactions disregarded from these providers. In addition, we adjusted Region's reported yield loss to account for differences in the processing yield loss for merchandise under consideration and non-merchandise under consideration.⁴⁶

b. Test of Comparison Market Sales Prices

On a product-specific basis, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, we compared the adjusted weighted-average COPs to the per-unit price of the comparison-market sales of the foreign like product to determine whether the sales prices were below the COPs. For purposes of this comparison, we used COP exclusive of selling and packing expenses. The prices were net of billing adjustments, discounts, movement expenses, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses, where appropriate.

c. Results of the COP Test

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

⁴⁵ For a more detailed discussion of these adjustments, see Inmax Analysis Memorandum at 9.

⁴⁶ For a more detailed discussion of these adjustments, see Region Analysis Memorandum at 5-7.

in “substantial quantities.” Where 20 percent or more of a respondent’s sales of a given product are at prices less than the COP, we disregard the below-cost sales when: (1) they were made within an extended period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act; and (2) based on our comparison of prices to the weighted-average COPs for the period of review, they were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

We found that, for certain products, more than 20 percent of Inmax and Region’s home market sales during the period of review were at prices less than the COP, they were made within and extended period of time, and such sales did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. We therefore excluded these sales and used the remaining sales, if any, as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

5. Calculation of Normal Value Based on Comparison Market Prices

We calculated normal value for Inmax and Region based on the reported packed, ex-factory, or delivered prices to comparison-market customers.

With respect to Inmax, we made adjustments, where appropriate, to normal value for inland freight revenues. We also made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for certain movement expenses (*i.e.*, inland freight) and for certain direct selling expenses (*e.g.*, warranty and credit expenses), pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. In accordance with our practice, we capped the amount of inland freight revenues permitted to offset gross unit price at no greater than the amount of the corresponding inland freight expenses incurred by Inmax. We added U.S. packing costs and deducted home market packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B)(i) of the Act.

For Region, we made adjustments, where appropriate, to normal value for certain billing adjustments and other discounts. Additionally, we made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for certain movement expenses (*i.e.*, inland freight and inland insurance) and for certain direct selling expenses (*i.e.*, credit, warranty, commission, and bank expenses), pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. We added U.S. packing costs and deducted home market packing costs, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B)(i) of the Act.

When comparing U.S. sales with comparison-market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, we also made adjustments for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable cost of manufacturing of the foreign-like product and that of the subject merchandise.

6. Price-to-Constructed Value Comparison

Where we were unable to find a home market match for identical or similar merchandise, we based normal value on constructed value, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act.

Where appropriate, we made adjustments to constructed value in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated constructed value based on the sum of the respondents' material and fabrication costs, SG&A expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. We calculated the COP component of constructed value as described above in the "Calculation of Cost of Production" section of this memorandum. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondents in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. Commerce's normal practice is to rely on the financial information most contemporaneous with the period of review.⁴⁷ Because the majority of Inmax's and Region's fiscal year 2018-2019 fell within this period, we have relied on Inmax and Region's general and administrative and financial expense rates for fiscal years 2018 and 2018-2019, respectively.⁴⁸

VII. CURRENCY CONVERSION

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.415, based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. The exchange rates are available on Enforcement and Compliance's website at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/exchange>.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION

We recommend applying the above methodology for these preliminary results.



Agree



Disagree

11/16/2020

X 

Signed by: JEFFREY KESSLER

Jeffrey I. Kessler
Assistant Secretary
for Enforcement and Compliance

⁴⁷ See, e.g., *Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 64580 (November 16, 2007), and accompanying IDM at Comment 3.

⁴⁸ As Inmax's fiscal year coincides with the calendar year, its financial information is based on the first six months of the period of review. See Inmax Section A Response at A-21; see also Region Section A Response at 29-30.