

## EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATIONS ON ADEQUACY

in

### *Sulfanilic Acid from China and India*

Inv. Nos. 701-TA-318 and 731-TA-538 and 561 (Fourth Review)

On December 5, 2016, the Commission unanimously determined to conduct expedited reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(3)(B).

The Commission received a response to the notice of institution from Nation Ford Chemical Company, a domestic producer of sulfanilic acid. The Commission found its individual response to be adequate. Because the Commission received an adequate response from a domestic producer accounting for a substantial share of U.S. production of sulfanilic acid, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate in each review.

The Commission also received a response from Archroma U.S., Inc. (“Archroma”), an importer of sulfanilic acid from China. The Commission found its individual response to be adequate. Because the Commission received an adequate response from an importer accounting for a substantial share of U.S. imports of sulfanilic acid from China, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was adequate in the review of the order on subject imports from China.

No respondent interested party filed a response to the notice of institution with respect to the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India. Consequently, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate in each review.

Despite having found that the respondent interested party group response was adequate in the review of the antidumping duty order on China, the Commission determined that it would not be appropriate to conduct a full review of that order. After submitting its response to the notice of institution, Archroma filed a statement with the Commission indicating that it no longer supported revocation of the orders. The Commission therefore found that Archroma was unlikely to participate in full reviews, and no other party opposing continuation of the order on sulfanilic acid from China indicated that it was interested in participating in a review or furnishing information to the Commission.

The Commission did not find that any other circumstances warranted conducting full reviews with respect to any of the orders under review. Therefore, the Commission determined to conduct expedited reviews of the orders on sulfanilic acid from China and India.

A record of the Commissioners’ votes is available from the Office of the Secretary and the Commission’s website (<http://www.usitc.gov>).