EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION ON ADEQUACY
in

Artists’ Canvas from China
Inv. No. 731-TA-1091 (Second Review)


The Commission received a response to the notice of institution from Tara Materials, Inc. (“Tara”), a U.S. producer of artists’ canvas.¹ The Commission found Tara’s individual response to be adequate. The Commission further determined that the domestic interested party group response was adequate because Tara accounted for substantially all domestic production of artists’ canvas in 2015.

The Commission did not receive a response to the notice of institution from any respondent interested party. Consequently, the Commission determined that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate.

The Commission also found that there were no other circumstances warranting a full review. Therefore, the Commission determined to conduct an expedited review of the antidumping duty order.

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

¹ Tara filed its response with BF Inkjet Digital, Inc. (“BF Inkjet”), IJ Technologies, Inc. (IJ Technologies”), and Permalite, Inc. (“Permalite”). BF Inkjet, IJ Technologies, and Permalite are “converters” of canvas to print canvas. In the original investigation and first five-year review, the Commission found that “print converters” were not engaged in sufficient production-related activities to be deemed domestic producers of artists’ canvas. Consequently, BF Inkjet, IJ Technologies, and Permalite did not contend that they were interested parties pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1677(9) and they were not treated as such for purposes of this determination.