Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted average margin (percentage)
ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V	14.38 percent.

Public Comment

The Department intends to disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). An interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of these preliminary results. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication or, if that date falls on a holiday or weekend, the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date per 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c). Rebuttal briefs limited to issues raised in the case briefs may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for submitting the case briefs. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities. Further, parties submitting case briefs and/or rebuttal briefs are requested to provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such argument on diskette. The Department intends to issue final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such argument or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results, unless extended. See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h).

Duty Assessment

Upon completion of this administrative review, the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate importer-specific ad valorem assessment rates for the merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. The total customs value is based on the entered value reported by Mexinox for all U.S. entries of subject merchandise initially entered for consumption to the United States made during the POR. See Preliminary Analysis Memorandum. In

accordance with 19 CFR 356.8(a), the Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP on or after 41 days following the publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the company included in these preliminary results for which the reviewed company did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company or companies involved in the transaction.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Furthermore, the following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of S4 in coils from Mexico entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent (de minimis within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1)), the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the allothers rate of 30.85 percent, which is the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. See Order. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the

Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: August 2, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–19579 Filed 8–6–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-405-803]

Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland; Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce. **SUMMARY:** In response to requests from Aqualon Company, a division of Hercules Inc., (the petitioner) and respondents CP Kelco Oy and CP Kelco U.S., Inc. (collectively, CP Kelco), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on purified carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from Finland. The review covers exports of the subject merchandise to the United States produced by CP Kelco. The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

We preliminarily find that CP Kelco made sales at less than normal value (NV) during the POR. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties based on differences between the export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) and NV.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 9, 2010. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tyler Weinhold or Robert James, AD/

Tyler Weinhold or Robert James, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1121 or (202) 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published the antidumping duty order on CMC from

Finland on July 11, 2005. See Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands, and Sweden, 70 FR 39734 (July 11, 2005). On July 11, 2009, the Department published the notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of CMC from Finland for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009. See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review, 74 FR 31406 (July 1, 2009).

On July 20, 2009, the petitioner requested a review of CP Kelco for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009. On July 29, 2009, CP Kelco requested an administrative review for the same period. On August 25, 2009, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part, 74 FR 42873 (August 25, 2009).

On August 31, 2009, the Department issued its standard antidumping questionnaire (the Antidumping Questionnaire) to CP Kelco. CP Kelco submitted its response to section A of the Antidumping Questionnaire on October 2, 2009 (CP Kelco's Section A Response). CP Kelco submitted its responses to sections B and C of the Antidumping Questionnaire on October 30, 2009 (CP Kelco's Section B Response and CP Kelco's Section C Response, respectively). Because the Department disregarded sales at prices below the cost of production in the most recently completed administrative review as of the initiation of the instant review, we are conducting a sales-at-below-cost investigation in this review. See Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland; Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 16180 (April 9, 2009) (2009 Preliminary Results) (unchanged in Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland; Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 28886 (June 18, 2009). Accordingly, CP Kelco submitted its response to section D of the Antidumping Questionnaire on October 30, 2009 (CP Kelco's Section D Response).

On December 10, 2009, the
Department issued a supplemental
questionnaire to CP Kelco regarding its
responses to section D of the
Antidumping Questionnaire. CP Kelco
submitted its response to the
Department's section D supplemental
questionnaire on January 20, 2010 (CP

Kelco's January 20, 2010, Response). On December 16, 2009, the Department issued a supplemental questionnaire to CP Kelco regarding its responses to sections A, B, and C of the Antidumping Questionnaire. CP Kelco submitted its response to the Department's sections A, B, and C supplemental questionnaire on January 28, 2010 (CP Kelco's January 28, 2010, Response). On December 29, 2009, the Department issued a second supplemental questionnaire to CP Kelco regarding its responses to sections A, B, and C of the antidumping questionnaire. CP Kelco submitted its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire on January 14, 2010 (CP Kelco's January 14, 2010, Response). On February 18, 2010, CP Kelco voluntarily submitted a section D cost comparison (CP Kelco's February 18, 2010, Submission). On March 16, 2010, the Department issued a third supplemental questionnaire to CP Kelco regarding its responses to sections A, B, and C of the Antidumping Questionnaire. CP Kelco submitted its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire on March 30, 2010, (CP Kelco's March 30, 2010, Response). On July 15, 2010, the Department issued another supplemental questionnaire to CP Kelco regarding its responses to sections A, B, C, and D of the antidumping questionnaire. CP Kelco submitted its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire on July 20, 2010, (CP Kelco's July 20, 2010, Response).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order is all purified carboxymethylcellulose (CMC), sometimes also referred to as purified sodium CMC, polyanionic cellulose, or cellulose gum, which is a white to offwhite, non-toxic, odorless, biodegradable powder, comprising sodium CMC that has been refined and purified to a minimum assay of 90 percent. Purified CMC does not include unpurified or crude CMC, CMC Fluidized Polymer Suspensions, and CMC that is cross-linked through heat treatment. Purified CMC is CMC that has undergone one or more purification operations which, at a minimum, reduce the remaining salt and other by-product portion of the product to less than ten percent. The merchandise subject to this order is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States at subheading 3912.31.00. This tariff classification is provided for convenience and customs purposes; however, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of CMC in the United States were made at less than normal value (NV), we compared U.S. price to NV, as described in the "Export Price" (EP), "Constructed Export Price" (CEP), and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), we calculated monthly weighted-average NVs and compared these to individual U.S. transactions. Because we determined that CP Kelco made both EP and CEP sales during the POR, we used both EP and CEP as the basis for U.S. price in our comparisons. We used the invoice date, as recorded in CP Kelco's normal books and records, as the date of sale for CP Kelco's EP, CEP, and home market sales. See 19 CFR 351.401(i). For a more detailed discussion of these calculations, see Memorandum from Tyler Weinhold, to the File, "Analysis of Data Submitted by CP Kelco Oy and CP Kelco U.S. Inc. (collectively, CP Kelco) in the Preliminary Results of the 2008-2009 Administrative Review of Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from Finland," dated August 2, 2010 (Preliminary Analysis Memorandum).

Product Comparisons

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Tariff Act, we considered all products produced by CP Kelco covered by the "scope of the order" section and sold in the home market during the POR to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. We relied on five characteristics to match U.S. sales of subject merchandise to home market sales of the foreign like product (listed in order of priority): 1) grade; 2) viscosity; 3) degree of substitution; 4) particle size; and 5) solution gel characteristics. See the Antidumping Questionnaire at Appendix 5. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the next most similar foreign like product on the basis of these product characteristics and the reporting instructions listed in the antidumping questionnaire. Because there were sales of identical or similar merchandise in the home market suitable for comparison to each U.S. sale, we did not compare any U.S. sales to constructed value (CV).

CP Kelco reported that it sold material which was suitable for pharmaceutical grade applications and for other regulated applications as well (*i.e.*, food,

cosmetic, personal care).¹ In its responses to section B, C, and D of our antidumping questionnaire, CP Kelco reported these sales as sales of grade "2" material, "regulated—other (food)." At our request, CP Kelco differentiated between (a) sales which were individually certified as pharmaceutical grade and (b) other sales of the same commercial product in its March 30, 2010, Response. We asked them to report sales for which there was a certification as grade "1" products, and to report sales for which there was no such certification as grade "2" products.

However, it has been the Department's practice to consider a product to be identified according to the strictest requirements of subject merchandise which has multiple specifications. All of the relevant commercial products were manufactured to be suitable both for the strictest specifications, that of regulated pharmaceutical grade CMC, and for a less-strict specification, that of regulated-other (food) grade CMC. In accordance with our practice, we, therefore, asked CP Kelco to report these sales as sales of products which meet the strictest specification to which the material was manufactured: regulated pharmaceutical grade material. 2 CP Kelco complied with this request. See CP Kelco's July 20, 2010, Response.

Export Price

Section 772(a) of the Tariff Act defines EP 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 United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States," as adjusted under section 772(c) of the Tariff Act. In accordance with section 772(a) of the Tariff Act, we used EP for a number of CP Kelco's U.S. sales. We preliminarily find that these sales are properly classified as EP sales because these sales were made before the date of importation and because our CEP methodology was not otherwise warranted.

We based EP on the prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. We made adjustments for price or billing adjustments and discounts, where applicable. We also made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, which included, where appropriate: foreign inland freight; international freight; marine insurance; U.S. brokerage and handling; and direct selling expenses (credit expenses).

CP Kelco incurred certain expenses as a result of factoring certain sales with an affiliated financial institution (i.e., selling the accounts receivable associated with certain commercial sales in exchange for an immediate payment). See CP Kelco's Section B Response at B–22 to B–23; CP Kelco's Section C response at C-24 to C-25; and CP Kelco's January 28, 2010, Response, B-1 to B-4, and C-1 to C-3. In past segments of this proceeding we made adjustments to gross unit price based upon the difference between the face value of the accounts receivable factored and the immediate payment received upon the factoring of those accounts receivable (factoring discount).

The date of factoring represents the date upon which CP Kelco received the (discounted) payment from the factoring institution, as the full payment from the customer went to the factoring institution at a later date. See CP Kelco's Section B Response at B-16 to B-17, and B-28 to B-29; see also CP Kelco's Section C Response C–17 to C–18 and C-37 to C-39. Accordingly, in past segments of this proceeding, where we made an adjustment for factoring discount, we also calculated imputed credit according to the date on which the sales were factored, rather than the date of payment from the customer.

In past segments of this proceeding, we recognized that factoring expenses are actual direct selling expenses incurred by CP Kelco. However, in the most recently completed review of the concurrent proceeding of CMC from the Netherlands, to which CP Kelco U.S., Inc. and CP Kelco Oy's affiliate, CP Kelco BV are respondents, we stated our intent to re—examine the

appropriateness of including the affiliated party factoring expenses. Subsequently, we have re–examined the appropriateness of including the factoring expenses in the administrative review of CMC from Finland as well. We have examined the arm's-length nature of these transactions and found that there is insufficient information available to continue to treat factoring expenses as expenses incurred during arm's-length transactions. Therefore, we have not made an adjustment for factoring expenses.3 Accordingly, we have used CP Kelco's imputed credit expenses as calculated normally (according to the date of payment by the customer rather than the date of factoring of the accounts receivable associated with the invoice).

We reduced movement expenses, where appropriate, by the amount of freight revenue paid by the customer to CP Kelco in reimbursement for CP Kelco arranging and initially paying for freight. See CP Kelco's Section B Response at B-25; CP Kelco's Section C Response at C-28; CP Kelco's January 28, 2010, Response, Section B, at 9 to 11, and Section C, at 11 to 14. We limited the amount of freight revenue deducted to no greater than the amount of movement expenses in the home market. See Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 6857 (February 11, 2009) (Bags from the PRC) and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 6. As the Department explained in *Bags* from the PRC, section 772 (c)(1) of the Tariff Act provides that the Department shall increase the price used to establish either export price or constructed export price in only the following three instances: (A) when not included in such price, the cost of all containers and coverings and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the subject merchandise in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States; (B) the amount of any import duties imposed by the country of exportation which have been rebated, or which have not been collected, by reason of the exportation of the subject merchandise to the United States; and (C) the amount of any countervailing duty imposed on the subject merchandise under subtitle A to offset an export subsidy. In addition, section

¹ See CP Kelco's March 30, 2010, Response at page 18, referencing CP Kelco's brochures in CP Kelco's Section A Response at Exhibit A-33.

² See, e.g., Rautaruukki Oy v. United States, 23 C.I.T. 257 (CT. Int'l Trade 1998), in which the court found that the Department should have considered all steel plate products graded as "A" under different national classification standards to be identical merchandise in the absence of a showing of any significant physical distinction between the products. See also, Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Finland; Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review in Accordance With Final Court Decision, 64 FR 68669 (December 8, 1999). Further, it is the Department's practice to consider the strictest requirements of subject merchandise which has multiple specifications (i.e., the strictest specifications). See, e.g., Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe From Romania: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination Not To Revoke Order in Part, 70 FR 7237 (February 11, 2005) and the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 13, where the Department states: "To establish the most appropriate match for the triple-certified pipe in the comparison market, we looked for products that met most closely the strictest requirements of the subject merchandise with multiple specifications."

³ See Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 24822, 24827 (May 26, 2009) unchanged in Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from the Netherlands: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 52742 (October 14, 2009).

351.401(c) of the Department's regulations directs the Department to use a price in the calculation of U.S. price which is net of any price adjustments that are reasonably attributable to the subject merchandise. The term "price adjustments" is defined under 19 CFR 351.102(b) (38) as "any change in the price charged for subject merchandise or the foreign like product, such as discounts, rebates, and post—sale adjustments, that are reflected in the purchaser's net outlay."

In past cases, we have declined to treat freight-related revenues as either an addition to U.S. price under section 772(c) of the Tariff Act or as price adjustments under 19 CFR 351.102(b). Rather, we have incorporated these revenues as offsets to movement expenses because they relate to the transportation of subject merchandise. See, e.g., Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 72 FR 51414 (September 7, 2007) (Steel Wire Rod Preliminary) (unchanged in Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Sweden: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 72 FR 12950 (March 1, 2008)). Our offset practice limits the granting of an offset to situations where a respondent incurs expenses and realizes revenue for the same type of activity. Steel Wire Rod Preliminary, 72 FR 51415. According to CP Kelco's responses, freight revenues are revenues received from customers for invoice items covering transportation expenses and they arise not when freight is included in the selling price under the applicable terms of delivery, but rather when CP Kelco arranges and prepays freight for the customer. See CP Kelco's Section B Response at B-25; see also CP Kelco's Section C response at C-27. Therefore, we have limited the amount of the freight revenue used to offset CP Kelco's movement expenses to the amount of movement expenses incurred on the sale of subject merchandise. See Preliminary Analysis Memorandum at page 2.

Constructed Export Price

In accordance with section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, CEP is "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) in the United States before or after the date of importation by or for the account of the producer or exporter of such merchandise, or by a seller affiliated with the producer or exporter, to a purchaser not affiliated with the producer or exporter," as adjusted under sections 772(c) and (d) of the Tariff Act. In accordance with section 772(b) of the Tariff Act, we used

CEP for a number of CP Kelco's U.S. sales because CP Kelco sold merchandise to affiliate CP Kelco U.S., Inc. in the United States; CP Kelco U.S., Inc. in turn sold subject merchandise to unaffiliated U.S. customers. We preliminarily find that these U.S. sales are properly classified as CEP sales because they occurred in the United States after importation and were made through CP Kelco U.S. Inc. to unaffiliated U.S. customers.

We based CEP on the prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments for price or billing adjustments, and early payment discounts, where applicable. We also made deductions for movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, which included, where appropriate: foreign inland freight; foreign brokerage and handling; international freight; marine insurance; customs duties; U.S. brokerage; U.S. inland freight; and U.S. warehousing expenses. We also reduced movement expenses, where appropriate, by the amount of freight revenue paid by the customer to CP Kelco. In accordance with our treatment of freight revenue on U.S. sales of subject merchandise (see "Export Price" section, above), we capped the amount of freight revenue deducted at no greater than the amount of movement expenses in the home market. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Tariff Act, we deducted those selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (imputed credit expenses), inventory carrying costs, and indirect selling expenses. We also made an adjustment for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Tariff Act.

Further-Manufactured U.S. Sales

In the administrative review CMC from Finland covering the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, CP Kelco reported that it had made certain sales of subject merchandise to affiliated companies in the United States. See Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland; Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 16180 (April 9, 2009) at 16182. However, now, CP Kelco reports that one of the alleged affiliates in question was not, in fact, an affiliate of CP Kelco. See CP Kelco's Section A Response at A-49 to A-50. CP Kelco explains that it had erroneously reported that the further manufacturer was affiliated with CP Kelco during the previous review. CP Kelco now reports that the requisite criteria for affiliation thought to be present in the July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, administrative review were not actually present then and are not present in this POR. Further, CP Kelco reports that no other affiliated U.S. customers engaged in further manufacturing.

The following persons shall be considered to be "affiliated" or "affiliated persons" according to Section 771(33) the Tariff Act: (A) Members of a family, including brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants; (B) Any officer or director of an organization and such organization; (C) Partners; (D) Employer and employee; (E) Any person directly or indirectly owning, controlling, or holding with power to vote, 5 percent or more of the outstanding voting stock or shares of any organization and such organization; (F) Two or more persons directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with, any person; or (G) Any person who controls any other person and such other person. Section 771(33) of the Tariff Act further provides that "a person shall be considered to control another person if the person is legally or operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction over the other person.'

The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act states the following:

The traditional focus on control through stock ownership fails to address adequately modern business arrangements, which often find one firm "operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction" over another even in the absence of an equity relationship. A company may be in a position to exercise restraint or direction, for example, through corporate or family groupings, franchises or joint venture agreements, debt financing, or close supplier relationships in which the supplier or buyer becomes reliant upon the other.

See SAA, H.R. Doc. 103–316, vol. 1 at 838 (1994).

Section 351.102(b)(3) of the Department's regulations defines affiliated persons and affiliated parties as having the same meaning as in section 771(33) of the Tariff Act and states that:

In determining whether control over another person exists, within the meaning of section 771(33) of the Act, the Secretary will consider the following factors, among others: corporate or family groupings; franchise or joint venture agreements; debt financing; and close supplier relationships. The Secretary will not find that control exists on the basis of these factors unless the relationship has the potential to impact decisions concerning the production, pricing, or cost of the subject merchandise or foreign like product. The Secretary will consider the temporal aspect of a relationship in determining whether control exists; normally, temporary circumstances will not suffice as evidence of control.

The record of this review does not show that any of the above-mentioned criteria are present with regard to the further manufacturer. Thus, we preliminarily determine that the further manufacturer is not affiliated with CP Kelco. In the instant review, CP Kelco made sales of subject merchandise only to the further manufacturer, to the above-mentioned affiliated CEP reseller. and to unaffiliated customers. Therefore, CP Kelco reports that no sales were made to affiliates during this period of review other than to the CEP importer-reseller CP Kelco U.S., Inc. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine that there were no sales made to affiliates in the United Sates during the instant POR which were further manufactured and sold to unaffiliated customers as non-subject merchandise.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Market

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (i.e., the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the respondent's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Tariff Act. As CP Kelco's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined the home market was viable. Therefore, we have based NV on home market sales in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

In accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Tariff Act, we are conducting a sales—below-cost investigation in this review because the Department disregarded some of CP Kelco's sales as having been made at prices below the cost of production in

the previous administrative review. See 2009 Preliminary Results

C. Calculation of Cost of Production

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Tariff Act, we calculated the weighted-average cost of production (COP) for each model based on the sum of CP Kelco's materials and fabrication costs for the foreign like product, plus an amount for home market selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, financial expenses, and packing costs. We relied on the COP data submitted by CP Kelco except in the following instance: we included certain factoring expenses in CP Kelco's financial expense calculation since we did not adjust the sales prices for factoring expenses. For a more detailed discussion of this matter, see Memorandum from Sheikh M. Hannan, Accountant to Neal Halper, Director, Office of Accounting, regarding "Cost of Production and Constructed Value Calculation Adjustments for the Preliminary Results CP Kelco Oy" dated August 2, 2010.

We compared the weighted-average COP of CP Kelco's home market sales to home market sales prices of the foreign like product (net of billing adjustments, discounts, any applicable movement expenses, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing), as required under section 773(b) of the Tariff Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP. 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 Tariff Act, whether such sales were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time; We also examined whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable

D. Results of the Cost Test

period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act, where less than 20 percent of CP Kelco's sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. Where 20 percent or more of CP Kelco's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were made: (1) within an extended period of time and in "substantial quantities" within the POR, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Tariff Act; and (2) at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a

reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Tariff Act (*i.e.*, the sales were made at prices below the weighted—average per—unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Tariff Act.

E. Price-to-Price Comparisons

We calculated NV based on prices to unaffiliated customers. We made adjustments for billing adjustments, early payment discounts, and rebates, where appropriate. We made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Tariff Act. We also reduced foreign inland freight, where appropriate, by the amount of freight revenue paid by the customer to CP Kelco. In accordance with our treatment of freight revenue on U.S. sales of subject merchandise (see "Export Price" section, above), we capped the amount of freight revenue deducted at no greater than the amount of movement expenses in the home market. In addition, when comparing sales of similar merchandise, we made adjustments for differences in cost (i.e., DIFMER), where those differences were attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Tariff Act and section 351.411 of the Department's regulations. We also made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale (COS) in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act and section 351.410 of the Department's regulations. We made COS adjustments for imputed credit expenses. We also made an adjustment, where appropriate, for the CEP offset in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act. See "Level of Trade and CEP Offset" section below. Finally, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Tariff Act.

F. Constructed Value (CV)

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Tariff Act, we base NV on CV if we are unable to find a contemporaneous comparison market match of identical or similar merchandise for the U.S. sale. Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act provides that CV shall be based on the sum of the cost of materials and fabrication employed in making the subject merchandise, SG&A expenses, profit, and U.S. packing costs. We calculated the cost of materials and fabrication for CP Kelco based on the methodology described in the COP section of this notice. In accordance

with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by CP Kelco in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. However, for these preliminary results, we did not base NV on CV in any instances.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act, to the extent practicable, we base NV on sales made in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the export transaction. The NV LOT is based on the starting price of sales in the home market or, when NV is based on CV, on the LOT of the sales from which SG&A expenses and profit are derived.

With respect to CEP transactions in the U.S. market, the CEP LOT is defined as the level of trade of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer. See section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff

Act.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than CEP sales, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the customer. See 19 CFR 351.412(c)(2). If the comparison-market sales are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Tariff Act. For CEP sales, if the NV LOT is more remote from the factory than the CEP LOT and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act (the CEP offset provision). See, e.g., Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Greenhouse Tomatoes From Canada, 67 FR 8781 (February 26, 2002) and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Comment 8; see also Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon Quality Steel Products from Brazil: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 70 FR 17406, 17410 (April 6, 2005) (unchanged in final results of review, 70 FR 58683 (October 7, 2005)). For CEP sales, we consider only the selling activities reflected in the U.S. price after the deduction of expenses incurred in the U.S. and CEP profit under section 772(d) of the Tariff Act. See Micron Technology, Inc. v. United States, 243

F.3d 1301, 1314–1315 (Fed. Cir. 2001). We expect that if the claimed LOTs are the same, the functions and activities of the seller should be similar. Conversely, if a party claims the LOTs are different for different groups of sales, the functions and activities of the seller should be dissimilar. See Porcelain–on-Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 65 FR 30068 (May 10, 2000) and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum at Comment 6.

In the current review, CP Kelco reported only one level of trade in the home market. CP Kelco reported two levels of trade in its U.S. sales listing: the EP level of trade and the CEP level of trade. See CP Kelco's Section C

Response at page C–25.

CP Kelco reported it sold CMC to end users and distributors in both the home market and in the United States. CP Kelco identified two channels of distribution for sales in both the home market and the U.S. market: end users (channel 1) and distributors (channel 2). See, e.g., CP Kelco's Section A Response at A–16 to A–17, and CP Kelco's Section B Response at B–19 to B–20. CP Kelco made both direct (EP) sales of subject merchandise to U.S. customers and indirect (CEP) sales of subject merchandise through its affiliate, CP Kelco U.S., Inc.

We obtained information from CP Kelco regarding the marketing stages involved in making its reported home market and U.S. sales. See CP Kelco's Section A response at A–32. CP Kelco described all selling activities performed, and provided a table comparing the selling functions performed among each channel of distribution for both markets. Id., at A-34. We reviewed the nature of the selling functions and the intensity to which all selling functions were performed for each home market channel of distribution and customer category; we then compared CP Kelco's EP and home market channels of distribution and customer categories.

While we found differences in the levels of intensity performed for some of these functions between the home market end user and distributor channels of distribution, such differences are minor and do not establish distinct and separate levels of trade in Finland. Based on our analysis of all of CP Kelco's home market selling functions, we find all home market sales were made at the same LOT. Further, we find only minor differences between the sole home market LOT and that of CP Kelco's EP sales. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine CP Kelco's

home market and EP sales were made at the same LOT.

CP Kelco claims that it did not make home market sales at a level of trade comparable to the CEP level of trade. Therefore, CP Kelco requests the Department make a CEP offset. See CP Kelco's Section A Response at A–34 to A–35, CP Kelco's Sections B Response at B–23, and CP Kelco's Sections C Response at C–2.

Thus, we compared the NV LOT (based on the selling activities associated with the transactions between CP Kelco and its customers in the home market) to the CEP LOT (which is based on the selling activities associated with the transaction between CP Kelco and its affiliated importer, CP Kelco U.S., Inc.) Our analysis indicates the selling functions performed for home market customers are either performed at a higher degree of intensity or are greater in number than the selling functions performed for CP Kelco U.S., Inc. For example, in comparing CP Kelco's selling activities, we find most of the reported selling functions performed in the home market are not a part of CEP transactions (i.e., sales negotiations, credit risk management, intermediate warehousing, collection, sales promotion, direct sales personnel, technical support, guarantees, and discounts). For those selling activities performed for both home market sales and CEP sales (i.e., customer service, logistics, inventory maintenance, packing, and freight/delivery), CP Kelco reported it performed each activity at either the same or at a higher level of intensity in one or both of the home market channels of distribution. For both the packing and the freight/ delivery selling functions, each function is performed at the same level of intensity in one home market channel of distribution, but at a lower level of intensity in the other home market channel of distribution.

We further note that CEP sales from CP Kelco to CP Kelco U.S., Inc., generally occur at the beginning of the distribution chain, representing essentially a logistical transfer of inventory. In contrast, all sales in the home market occur closer to the end of the distribution chain and involve smaller volumes; they require more customer interaction and consequently the performance of more selling functions. Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage than the CEP LOT.

Because we found the home market and U.S. CEP sales were made at different LOTs, we examined whether a LOT adjustment or a CEP offset may be appropriate in this review. As we found only one LOT in the home market, it was not possible to make a LOT adjustment to home market sales, because such an adjustment is dependent on our ability to identify a pattern of consistent price differences between the home market sales on which NV is based and home market sales at the LOT of the U.S. sales. See 19 CFR 351.412(d)(1)(ii). Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a LOT adjustment. Because the data available do not form an appropriate basis for making a LOT adjustment, and because the NV LOT is at a more advanced stage of distribution than the CEP LOT, we have made a CEP offset to NV in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Tariff Act.

Currency Conversions

CP Kelco reported certain U.S. sales prices and certain U.S. expenses and adjustments in euros. Therefore, we made euro—U.S. dollar currency conversions, where appropriate. Conversions were based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales, as certified by the Federal Reserve Board, in accordance with section 773A(a) of the Tariff Act.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily find the following weighted—average dumping margin exists for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009:

Manufacturer / Exporter	Weighted Average Margin (percent- age)
CP Kelco	6.10%

The Department will disclose calculations performed within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with section 351.224(b) of the Department's regulations. An interested party may request a hearing within thirty days of publication. See section 351.310(c) of the Department's regulations. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date pursuant to section 351.310(d) of the Department's regulations. Requests should contain the party's name, address, and telephone number, the number of participants, and a list of the issues to be discussed. At the hearing, each party may make an affirmative presentation only on issues raised in that party's case brief and may make rebuttal presentations only on arguments included in that party's rebuttal brief.

Comments

Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than 30 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results of review. See 19 CFR 351.309(c). Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed no later than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument: 1) a statement of the issue; 2) a brief summary of the argument; and 3) a table of authorities. Further, parties submitting written comments should provide the Department with an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. The Department will issue final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this administrative review, pursuant to section 351.212(b) of the Department's regulations, the Department will calculate an assessment rate on all appropriate entries. CP Kelco has reported entered values for all of its sales of subject merchandise to the U.S. during the POR. Therefore, in accordance with section 351.212(b)(1) of the Department's regulations, we will calculate importer-specific duty assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the total entered value of the examined sales of that importer. These rates will be assessed uniformly on all entries the respective importers made during the POR. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP fifteen days after publication of the final results of review.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by the respondent for which it did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such

instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate un–reviewed entries at the all–others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. *Id.*

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of CMC from Finland entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: 1) the cash deposit rate for CP Kelco will be the rate established in the final results of review; 2) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and 3) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be the all-others rate of 6.65 percent ad valorem from the LTFV investigation. See Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands and Sweden, 70 FR 39734 (July 11, 2005). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double the antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act.

Dated: August 2, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–19581 Filed 8–6–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S